United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 1960

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Our Father God, in the quiet of this moment of prayer we whose inner selves are so often cluttered with unhallowed trifles, would make our hearts the sanctuary of Thy spirit.

We know in very truth that we cannot in reality draw near to Thee unless we are close to Thy children under all skies, whose needs are even as our own.

Make us sensitive to the pangs of our fellows and conscious that if our brethren anywhere are oppressed, we are oppressed, and if they hunger, we hunger, and that every starving person in the world is on our own doorstep.

Give us to see and feel that complacency with our own comfort and safety unfits us to be Thy instruments for the healing of the world's ills. So join us to those who like a mighty army are marching in the great crusade to bring sense and system to this disordered globe to the end that all men's good shall be each man's rule through all the circle of the golden years which are on Thy calendar.

We ask it in the name of the Master who said, "The field is the world." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 18, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, 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 appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that I am constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. Morning business under the rule is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES REQUIRED FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the establishment or development of installations and facilities required for advanced research projects, for the period January 1, 1960, to June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the international educational exchange program for the period January 1–June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NARINDER SINGH SOMAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3469. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to public sales (Rept. No. 1848).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 12619. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1849).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 3688. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the Act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1850).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an additional amendment:

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1855).

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

S. 3834. A bill to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1852).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 7124. An act to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1854).

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

S. 3835. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1853).

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

S. 3605. A bill to amend sections 4504, 4511, 4520, and 4549 of the Revised Statutes, relating to shipping articles (Rept. No. 1851).

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

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 1856.)

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Finance be authorized to file their views on House bill 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 3867. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S. 3868. A bill for the relief of John T. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3869. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 364) relative to the sitting of committees of the Senate during Senate sessions, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 1856, WITH MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 365) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1856, being the report on social security amendments for 1960, together with minority views, which was considered and agreed to.

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

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a bill which I am about to introduce would exempt the new National Guard Memorial, located at 1 Massachusetts Avenue NW., from District of Columbia real estate taxes.

This memorial building is occupied by the National Guard Association of the United States. It was completed less than a year ago at a total cost of approximately $2 million, raised through voluntary contributions of over 250,000 members of the National Guard in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

The purposes of the National Guard Association of the United States as stated in its constitution and bylaws are:

First, to promote and improve adequate national security; and

Second, to foster and improve the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Commonwealths, the Territories, and the District of Columbia; and the Army National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States as components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The National Guard Memorial contains a magnificent authentic display of the flags of the States and the District of Columbia, arranged in the order of admittance to the Union, in what is termed the "Hall of States."

It also contains a memorial lobby with marble cuts honoring the memory of all National Guardsmen; a trophy room which will contain replicas and originals of the many trophies which are eligible of attainment by National Guard units; and a library which is devoted to historical aspects of the militia and the National Guard. Ultimately, it will also contain a minuteman statue, bronze busts of former Presidents of the United States who were members of the National Guard, and other historical paraphernalia.

This memorial is open to the public 5 days a week, from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

I introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 3867) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely: On page 5, line 7, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000".

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12619, making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ARTHUR S. LANE TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of Arthur S. Lane, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Jersey, vice Phillip Forman, elevated, for 10:30 a.m., Friday, August 26, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

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

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

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

Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of New York, for the term of 4 years, vice Leonard P. Moore, resigned.

George M. Yeager, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney, district of Alaska, for the term of 4 years.

On behalf of the Committee of the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, August 26, 1960, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

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. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him at Miami Beach, Fla., before the National Association of County Officials.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by the Vice President regarding the administration medical care bill.

PAUPER'S OATH FOR HEALTH INSURANCE DEPLORED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have had many letters in the past few days that have expressed their grave disappointment in the decision made by the Finance Committee to reject the social security approach to health insurance. One of those letters, which I have in my hand, is from a Milwaukee attorney who is extremely concerned about the plight of one of his elderly clients.

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

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

DEAR SENATOR: No issue more dominates the average voter's mind today than does the medical care for the aged. It is unthinkable not to have such aid under the social security program. The needs test is so unbelievable as to be revolting, and even it does not cover all. For instance, I have an 83-year-old spinster client who worked all her life as a housekeeper for Catholic priests. She is now confined in a Milwaukee hospital. The first 25 days her bill was $910, which I paid. I then received another bill for $176 for 5 days.

I hope that you will be successful in your efforts, the most popular and needed legislation since social security, and that you will support it.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my bill (S. 3829) to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes, for a second reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the bill comes before the Senate automatically for a second reading.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read the second time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have we reached that stage in the proceedings in the morning hour yet?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At any time during the morning hour the second reading of a bill is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to reserve a point of order against this proceeding. I do not want to interrupt the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he desires to make a statement, but I wish to reserve a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Following the rule, we will now have the presentation of petitions and memorials, and the reports of committees.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, that is what I thought. We have not yet reached the stage where a second reading can be ordered. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order. If there be no petitions or memorials, reports of committees are in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The introduction of bills, under the rule, is now in order.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, under the heading of "A Rule of Germaneness in the Senate," which appears at page 16647 o fthe RECORD——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will suspend. Under the rule, at this point the introduction of bills only is in order.

Mr. CLARK. I was about to submit a resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed with his resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. At what point in the morning hour may I ask the clerk to lay before the Senate S. 3829, which has had only a first reading?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the request of the Senator from Texas as agreed to, as soon as the resolution has been disposed of, a second reading of the Senator's bill will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall seek recognition at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I have my request acted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania have a resolution?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. May I be permitted to comment on the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has propounded a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—will this interfere with my right, which has been ruled upon, to call up my bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will not.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday, under the heading "A Rule of Germaneness in the Senate," which appears in the RECORD at page 16647, I submitted a resolution which would change the Senate rules of procedure by establishing a rule of germaneness. Today I send to the desk for appropriate referral a resolution changing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so far as the Senate is concerned, in order to make it possible for the standing committees of the Senate to meet at any time while the Senate is in session. The present procedure is such that committees can meet only by unanimous consent when the Senate is in session.

I send the resolution to the desk, and ask that it may be read and that it may lie on the table until Tuesday of next week for additional cosponsors.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 364) as follows:

Resolved, That section 134 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)), enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, is amended with respect to the Senate to read as follows:

"(b) No standing committee of the House, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit, without special leave, while the House is in session."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution, I should like to point out that no one Senator should have the power to block all meetings of the 16 standing committees of the Senate and the 86 subcommittees of those standing committees. This power has been used solely for purposes of delay. Actually it has been used several times during this August session. All Senators will recall the many times when consent for committees to meet was denied during the long civil rights debate of last winter and spring.

The objective of the rule has always been to increase attendance in the Senate. However, this objective has not been achieved. Every Senator knows that Senators do not come to the floor when matters in which they are not interested are being discussed. The fact that their committee is or is not sitting has no bearing on whether Senators come or do not come to the floor. Moreover, any time a majority of the members of a committee think it inadvisable for the committee to meet while the Senate is in session, they have complete authority to call off any committee meeting which the chairman might have attempted to convene.

Senators do not miss Senate debates because they are sitting in committee. Any Senator who wishes to come out of a committee to listen to Senate debate or to participate in it, can, I am confident, arrange to do so on a friendly basis by the giving of proxies or by other similar devices familiar to all of us.

I submit that the question whether a committee should meet during a Senate session should be decided by a majority of the members of the committee concerned, not by the decision of a single Senator in refusing unanimous consent on the floor.

Special and select committees are not now prevented from meeting under the existing rule, and there has been no objection by the members of those committees about their inability to attend Senate debates.

This proposal is the second in a series of suggested rule changes which I intend to offer from time to time during this session.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 364), submitted by Mr. CLARK, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENFORCEMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate, for a second reading, Senate bill 3829, which the clerk will report.

The bill (S. 3829) to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe it pertinent now to make a few brief comments regarding my purposes with respect to this bill. I believe I may now be considered to have won the championship in connection with my efforts to get the bill referred to committee—rather routine action, but perhaps indicative of the state of concern in this Chamber about the entire civil rights matter. Of course, I believe it properly a cause for concern on the part of all of us; and therefore I believe it necessary again—as we did a week ago today—to put the matter into focus.

The primary and first consideration is that the responsibility for providing the Senate with an opportunity to consider any civil rights measure, no matter how elementary, is the responsibility of the majority. The responsibility for the passage of it is a bipartisan one, as it has always been.

I say this because I think the American people are sufficiently adult to understand that one cannot be "thrown" by charges of politics—inasmuch as politics is the very essence of our national life—in a body which will determine whether action will or will not be taken upon measures which some of us consider to be in the urgent national interest. It would be so easy to attempt to suppress the procedure here in connection with any issue, merely by trying to affix to it the label of "politics."

The fact is that we have come back from two great national conventions with the most complete and specific pledges on civil rights. So, Mr. President, at the very least an earnest on those pledges should be given, and it should be on a parity with what we do in regard to other measures proposed to be taken up at this brief session.

There are before us two measures which are very well known to all; I refer to the bill which calls for placing a statutory floor under the Commission on Government Contracts, as regards discrimination in employment by Government contractors; and the bill to provide technical aid to school districts which seek to desegregate. Lengthy hearings have been held on those measures.

For example, the bill which calls for the giving of technical assistance to school districts which seek to desegregate has been before the Judiciary Committee since April 10, 1959. That measure is Senate bill 958. It has been the subject of hearings and consideration, and its passage has been recommended by the President.

I believe that all of us are indebted to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who on last Saturday stated for us exactly the procedure by which those very elementary measures could be considered and debated and voted on without causing any material interference with the other business of this session, if the great majority in this Chamber, which feels that it wants some minimal earnest on civil rights given at this session, would join in voting cloture.

Mr. President, at this time I do not intend to press for any Senate action on this civil rights bill which would result in extended debate on it.

I point out again, as I have before, that notwithstanding the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body are in favor of the passage and enactment of some minimal civil-rights legislation, we still leave it within the power of a very small minority, by the mere threat to tie up the procedure here by means of extended debate, to determine whether the Senate will or will not handle this business.

However, I believe it only fair to point out how the majority voted on Tuesday, August 9, when it had an opportunity just to place on the calendar a bill of this minimal character—in fact, not even to do that—and thereby put us in a position to take up this subject at the earliest time we possibly could. Now a great many of the Members of this body, in my opinion, have determined to see what can be done about the passage of this measure, which is considered a "must," and which a majority held should have priority over even minimal "must" legislation in other fields at this session.

Mr. President, last night the Senate passed a minimum wage bill; and I believe it extremely revealing to note that many of the Members who regularly argue most heatedly that a civil-rights measure should not be brought up at this session, because, so they argue, its consideration here would interfere with Senate consideration of many other important measures of great urgency to the people, were among the number of Senators who argued against passage of the minimum wage bill, when that bill was before us. It is interesting to note that among the 18 Members of this body who traditionally are opposed most vigorously to civil rights, 13 voted against the minimum wage bill.

When the medical-care bill is before the Senate, we shall again have an opportunity to see whether Senators who feel so strongly that Senate consideration of a civil rights bill would interfere with the passage of the other "must" measures will be urging in their full strength and spirit for the passage of the medical-care bill or will be opposing its passage.

Mr. President, I have not relinquished my view that at least these minimal measures should be acted on now. Although it is now 1 week later, I still feel that the majority has made its bed and must lie in it.

Now that the majority has rejected the opportunity to have this civil rights bill placed on the calendar, certainly there are many ways by which we can bring up the bill again. For instance, we can, as we did before, move to have the bill placed on the calendar; or we can move to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the bill, once the bill has been referred to committee; or we can proceed by means of a series of other steps.

I believe that every week we should call the roll; for the record, on this proposition, as I am doing today.

Finally, I should like to make the point that I do not believe that any charge that any Senator is trying to block Senate action on other important or must legislation by attempting to have the Senate debate and act on a civil rights

bill will lie in the eyes of the American people, so long as there continues among us our deep conviction and sense of responsibility in favor of the enactment of civil rights legislation. It is not our purpose merely to keep badgering the Senate about it and continue, every day, to bring up the subject for discussion. Instead, it is our purpose to follow an orderly course of procedure, with accommodation to other measures which we, or at least I, consider as important as civil rights legislation, but not more important, and to allow the civil rights bill to take its turn.

But, Mr. President, what I wish to emphasize today—and my only reason for speaking today, when I will allow this bill to go to committee—is to emphasize that before we are through it shall have its turn, which is the important point we ought to bear in mind.

I wish to make this one other point, in fact. By recessing the Senate since last Thursday, the mere reference of this bill to a committee, so that a committee might have a look at it and hold hearings on it, has been deferred. I think that fact bears upon the whole proposition as to whether we shall regard civil rights legislation, even of this minimal character, as a nuisance, something that gets into our hair, or whether it represents an important issue to the American people domestically, and to the foreign policy of the United States, and we shall regard it at least as being on a parity with the other measures which are listed as "must" bills in this session.

I close by saying we will return to this. We will return to it at a time which shall reflect the kind of responsibility which has induced Senators like myself not to press for it or not to press for amendments to the minimum wage bill, so as not to be occupying time which might interfere with a matter of this importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 3829) to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Senators DIRKSEN, SALTONSTALL, ALLOTT, BEALL, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, FONG, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SCOTT), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, are there any further bills or joint resolutions to be introduced? Concurrent and other resolutions? The Chair hears none, and morning business is concluded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is morning business I have to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Illinois that the Chair would be happy to recognize him, but there was objection to the usual 3-minute limitation in morning business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for recognition, and will conform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

ADVICE FOR AMERICANS: KEEP UP YOUR NERVE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, now and then one encounters a statement or editorial that is so timely, so well reasoned, and so pointed as to merit the consideration of every citizen. This is especially true when uncertainty and anxiety beset us and inspire many citizens to write their views to Members of Congress.

At the moment there is profound concern over Cuba, and many suggestions are made for a course of action.

The threats and menacing gestures of Khrushchev quite naturally inspire a bellicose reaction on our part. Patience and restraint are often taxed to a point where summary action is demanded.

In such a season, the editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on August 7, 1960, can serve as a most timely reminder of our national duty and responsibility. But more than that, it sounds the trumpet of hope and indicates the reasons for renewed faith in the ultimate victory of the cause of freedom.

Because I think it is worthy of the scrutiny of every citizen in the land, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADVICE FOR AMERICANS: KEEP UP YOUR NERVE

Shadows were falling on Washington's Pentagon Building late one afternoon in the spring of 1948. The writer of this editorial was seated at the desk of the late James V. Forrestal, the first U.S. Secretary of Defense. Near the close of the interview, Forrestal was asked this question:

"What do you see for the long-range security of the country?"

Forrestal, who was articulate and intelligent, puffed thoughtfully at his pipe. After a moment he replied substantially as follows:

"The best we can hope for is an armed truce with the Communists. It may last a generation or two. Perhaps longer. The Russians will keep pressing us and the American people had better keep up their nerve. The pressures are going to be terrific. We will have to get strong and stay strong. That will mean heavy sacrifices. And if we can't hold up our end, we will find ourselves in deep trouble. The alternative to an armed truce is world war. We had better face up to it. It will be one or the other."

Twelve years later, Forrestal's prophecy has stood the test of time. The Soviet Union—with the latter-day support of Red China—has steadily maintained pressure on the free world. The history of the last dozen years has been a succession of crises that started with the Communist grab of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

Civilization could have been blown to smithereens several times in the past decade. But it wasn't. That's the all-important fact. Each crisis has passed or gone into suspension. Some of the worst danger spots, Formosa for example, flare up year after year.

A great many Americans work themselves into a frightful stew whenever trouble erupts. They are alternately excited and depressed. Lately the Castro campaign against the United States and the Cuban dictator's linkup with communism have stirred wild reactions in this country. You hear such irresponsible mutterings as: "We ought to send the marines down to Cuba. That's the way the Russians took care of Hungary."

But this is 1960. The practice of sending troops to intervene in Latin American countries was discarded almost 30 years ago. And after all these years it has left resentment and hate against the United States. Dispelling this hostility is a big problem for the U.S. Government.

Today every policy and action must be weighed against its probable effect on hemisphere and world thinking. A U.S. expeditionary force to Haiti or Nicaragua would be out of the question. Properly we refused to take such action against the Communist-line government that was overthrown in Guatemala in 1954. And no responsible person has been known to suggest military intervention in Cuba in 1960. The new era demands adroitness and restraint.

But some politicians are quick to cry doom at every unpleasant development in the international field. In their view, the U.S. policy, prestige and power are in tatters. They picture this Nation as stumbling through the gloom toward Armageddon.

It is not surprising that Americans are worked up to a state of permanent alarm punctuated by periodic hysteria. Such is the mass psychology of our times. Yet the history of the 1950's show that the overall world situation has grown better instead of worse for the United States and its allies. Consider these extremely important gains:

In the decade our three principal European NATO partners have made remarkable economic recoveries. Ten years ago Britain, France and West Germany were still struggling out of the near ruin of war. Today all three are more prosperous than before World War II. The West Germans have built their way to democratic strength from the shambles of total defeat. Today the Germans provide the largest army on European duty with NATO. It is growing to a strength of 12 fully equipped and modern divisions.

France, despite the running sore of Algeria, has achieved political stability at last. The embarrassingly frequent turnovers in the Paris government ended when General Charles de Gaulle returned to power in the spring of 1958. The Fifth Republic was created in the image of a strong executive. The U.S. prophets of doom said the rise of the nationalistic De Gaulle would mean the collapse of NATO.

De Gaulle still has his own ideas about revising NATO. But he has not tried to wreck the grand military alliance as some suspicious leaders in the West feared he would do. Thus NATO, armed with A-bombs and missiles, continues to discourage any attack on free Europe. And France is a much more stable country today than it was a few years ago.

Recall the events in the Far East. In 1949 the Communist forces finally triumphed on the Chinese mainland. It was widely predicted that communism quickly would overrun the whole of southeast Asia.

So far, the fear hasn't materialized. The Reds have gained only the north part of Vietnam. It was the unavoidable price of an armistice halting the Communist uprising in Indochina.

The anti-Communist nation of south Vietnam was formed. At first even the optimists gave it little chance to remain free and independent. But south Vietnam has achieved stable government. The outstanding leadership of President Ngo Dinh Diem had much to do with the achievement. So did the extensive economic and military aid supplied by the United States.

The Reds have not given up their designs on South Vietnam or nearby Laos and Cambodia. But their ambitions have been thwarted for a decade. The SEATO pact, backed by the armed power of the United States, warns the Communists to keep hands off the entire area. They have stopped short of outright aggression, perhaps to avoid retaliation by the SEATO powers.

In Malaya, as in the Philippines previously, a Communist insurrection has been crushed. A 12-year state of emergency ended officially last Sunday. Malaya is now an independent state, released from colonial rule by Britain. Her great riches of rubber and tin have been saved for the free world.

Japan is even a more brilliant example of a trend generally going our way. Ten years ago Japan faced a bleak outlook. Its world markets were gone and unemployment soared. Now the war-battered Japanese have made an economic recovery comparable to that of West Germany. Japan cannot defend herself. But she remains linked with the United States in a 10-year military alliance. This tie holds the most advanced industrial nation of Asia on the side of the West.

The recent demonstrations against the United States-Japan defense treaty reflected a certain amount of growing neutralist sentiment. Some domestic issues also were involved. But it appears fairly apparent that the Communist-led rioters and demonstrators did not speak for a majority of the 93 million Japanese people.

To the southwest the Red Chinese broadcast their propaganda threats against Chiang's Formosan stronghold. But, so far, they have not dared challenge the might of the U.S. 7th Fleet on patrol duty in Formosa Straits.

In Korea the guns have now been silent for 7 years. The U.S. 8th Army and South Korea's 600,000 troops bar the way to further Communist aggression. The fighting from 1950 to 1953 was not permitted to ignite a global war. Korea's own government has been stabilized with a comparatively enlightened administration.

In the Middle East conditions are calmer now than at any time in the last 15 years. Yet it was only 2 years ago that the United States risked troop landings in Lebanon at the urging of the Lebanese Government. A rebellion subsided. Order was restored in the half-Christian, half-Moslem country.

A bloody revolt had just overthrown the pro-Western regime in Iraq and sent the U.S. prophets of doom to the depths of despair. There seemed to be real danger that pro-Nasser, anti-Western forces of Arab nationalism would seize control of Lebanon, Jordan, and possibly Saudi Arabia plus the tier of small sheikdoms rich in oil. Lurking in the shadows were Soviet plotters eager to dominate the entire Middle East.

But quiet came, just as it had come in late 1956 when United Nations action (morally led by the U.S. Government) cooled off the Suez crisis. Today Nasser's United Arab Republic and revolutionary Iraq are held apart by self-interest and mutual suspicion. They are alike only in that neither has fallen for the traps and lures of Soviet imperialism. Both remain ostensibly neutral in the cold war. They have taken Russia's grants of economic and military aid without surrendering their independence.

The Arabs' highly emotional differences with Israel still smolder. But the powder keg of the Middle East is out of sight in the desert sands. Around it are the remains of intermittent crises.

The Communists are nosing around for opportunities in Africa, a continent quivering with nationalism. Some headway may have been made with the new Republic of Guinea. But so far communism has not established a reliable beachhead in Africa. Moscow threatened to move in when the Congo disorders exploded. But the Russians thought better of it as the United Nations acted fast to save the Congo from chaos.

It was one of the U.N.'s finest hours. The current effort in the Congo will be remembered along with crises in Iran, Greece, Berlin in 1948–49, Kashmir, and the Suez. On each of these occasions the U.N. displayed its unique ability to stamp out raging fires.

Of course, even the U.N. has not been able to compose the fundamental differences and tensions between communism and the West. Russia and the United States are the two great centers of power. Each distrusts the other. And if our people are worried about Soviet intent and capability, consider the predicament Russia is in.

The United States and its allies have ringed the Communist land masses with forward air, ground, and naval bases. U.S. planes and ships operate from 80 bases in 25 lands and territories. Our planes buzz near the very frontiers of the Soviet Union. The U–2 missions are now history. But they did far more than bring back intelligence data and aerial photographs. They demonstrated, to the distress of the men in the Kremlin, that manned aircraft can penetrate the vaunted air defenses of the Russian heartland.

Yet Americans cry in anguish over the Communist influence in Cuba. Suppose we were in the Russian situation. In that case the United States would be a potential target for bombers and missiles based in Canada, Mexico, and most of Central America. Russian planes would be skirting our shores or flying over Kansas.

For a decade the Communist world has been held in line but it is not shrinking. Armed strength has materialized to block further Communist expansion. The retaliatory power developed by the West evidently did not figure in Russia's calculations when she started spreading out into Eastern Europe and the Balkans.

It was good advice that James Forrestal offered 12 years ago. Americans should keep up their nerve. There is no cause for panic. We have made our way past many crises. There will be more. We had better learn to live with them and to surmount them as they come.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The call of the calendar under rule VIII is in order.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the calendar be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1075) to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior was announced as first in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1474) to make permanent the provision of the Reorganization Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 4012) to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 5140) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1961, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1851) for the establishment of a commission on a Department of Science and Technology was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1789) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2308) to validate certain extended oil and gas leases was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1711) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human beings and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2522) to provide for the enrichment and sanitary packaging of certain donated commodities and to establish experimental food stamp allotment programs was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over by request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1734) to amend section 409(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to presentations in any case of adjudication which has been designated for a hearing by the Federal Communications Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2086) to provide for the establishment of a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 883) to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2402) to clarify the authority of the Postmaster General to provide for the expeditious, efficient, and economical transportation of mail and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2673) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2850) to provide for the appointment of one circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF EILEEN G. FOSTER

The bill (S. 511) for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claim for credit or refund of overpayment of income taxes for the taxable years 1949 to 1953, inclusive, made by Eileen G. Foster of Denver, Colorado, may be filed at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The provisions of sections 322(b), 3774, and 3775 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall not apply to the refund or credit of any overpayment of tax for which credit or refund is filed under the authority of this Act within such one-year period.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3560) to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalities for malicious damage to certain communication facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1787) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2893) to permit weekly publications to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any 1 calendar year without loss of second-class mail privilege was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1868) to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, over, unless there is an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the calendar committee wishes to have passed over all bills down to Calendar 1711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

H.R. 4601, to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

S. 1638, to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government.

S. 1425, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the protection of railroad employees by regulating the use of track motorcars and for other purposes.

S. 2917, to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat.

S. 3292, to provide for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3421, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act.

S. 1342, to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons.

H.R. 10, to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

H.R. 9662, to make technical revisions in the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates trusts, partners and partnerships, and for other purposes.

H.R. 11953, to provide for the assessing of Indian trust lands and restricted fee patent Indian lands within the Lummi Indian diking project in the State of Washington.

S. 3258, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

H.R. 4306, to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3228) to amend the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act which authorizes certain operations within a State as a common carrier by motor vehicle engaged in interstate or foreign commerce if State authorized was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

The bill (S. 2561) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital," to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I request the withholding of any objection for a moment until I can make a unanimous-consent request in regard to the bill.

The junior Senator from South Dakota would object to the passage of the bill, and his objections are fortified by the statement which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, credited to the daughter of Theodore Roosevelt, Alice Roosevelt Longworth.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the article setting forth Mrs. Longworth's statement as it appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

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

MRS. LONGWORTH LIKES ISLAND AS IT IS—THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL PLANS WOULD DESECRATE ANYONE'S MEMORY, DAUGHTER SAYS

(By Carole H. Bowie)

Alice Roosevelt Longworth, daughter of President Theodore Roosevelt, said yesterday that the celestial sphere proposed as a memorial to her father would desecrate the memory of anyone.

"I'm sure anyone—my father or Woodrow Wilson or anyone—would feel just as I do about the globular jungle gym," Mrs. Longworth exclaimed as she sat in the sun-drenched parlor of her home at 2009 Massachusetts Avenue NW.

The spirited 76-year-old widow said she remembers "vaguely" being consulted about plans, now before the Senate, to build the

67-foot sphere, vehicular approach bridge and a 200-car parking lot on tiny Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac.

"But I was too horrified even to think about them," she said. "I only wondered why they hadn't thought to add Muzak."

"I suppose those people think they are doing a nice thing," she said of backers of the memorial proposal, who include the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission and the National Park Service.

"But really," she protested, throwing up her hands, "it's utter folly to spend all that money, especially now, on something no one wants."

Mrs. Longworth thinks that the $900,000 cost of the project would be more appropriately spent on preserving the island in its present natural state, or to provide scholarships for naturalists.

"There are too few areas in this country now where one can walk and enjoy wildlife in its primeval state," remarked Mrs. Longworth, who is an enthusiastic walker.

"That lovely, wild island should be left just as it is," she insisted, recalling the days when, as a child, she picnicked in its forests. "It's a splendid memorial for my father."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I will not object, I wish recognition in respect to this question. This is my bill to provide for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital. I point out that Calendar No. 1905, House bill 8665, is a bill which came over from the House exactly in the same form as the one before the Senate relating to this subject. I call attention to the fact that the memorial has been designed, and has been approved by the appropriate agencies of the Government, the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, the Commission on Fine Arts, the Theodore Roosevelt Association, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

I appreciate the importance of Alice Roosevelt Longworth's views, and I appreciate the importance of the artistic views of Senators, some of whom have objections to the bill. I have no quarrel with them, though I do not pretend myself to pass upon the design of the memorial, with which I had nothing to do. But whatever may be the reasons for the objection, the point is that the bill which has now passed the House, and which has been pending here for a considerable time, is getting absolutely nowhere, though it is on the calendar. It seems to be bogged down because certain Senators have artistic objections, and now because a member of the Roosevelt family has an artistic objection.

In the first place, it is a little unfortunate that we allowed to go through the Senate, in quite an enthusiastic way, a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of our great Presidents, of course, without worrying about designs, and so forth, and then have this bill blocked. This is not the kind of a thing one would want to bring up for debate and fight about it.

I would respectfully ask, in a sense of responsibility and patriotism, my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and others, who feel, for whatever reason that they believe proper that they wish to object to the proposal, if they would not come forward with a concrete, affirmative suggestion. I say this in all good spirit and in a sense of friendship and comradeship, so that we could get this bill acted upon in some way which would leave to some agency in Government in which our people have confidence, to choose the memorial design, because apparently the one that has been proposed has raised difficulties of sufficient importance to hold up the whole bill.

I am not passing on the artistic merits. I wish to point to the distinguished and important agencies specified in the bill, which are in the business in our Government for this purpose, who have approved of the memorial. However, I repeat that this is not the kind of thing that I would want debated or argued about in any oppositional sense. It is for that reason that I respectfully suggest the idea of making a constructive suggestion by the Senators who feel keenly about it, so that we would be able to get the bill passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am not opposed to a proper memorial to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt was one of my boyhood heroes. In the State of South Dakota, as well as in the State of North Dakota, which is represented by the able Senator who now graces the chair [Mr. BURDICK], the name of Theodore Roosevelt is a name of one of the Presidents of the United States for whom we have the greatest admiration.

The State of South Dakota is proud of the fact that we have a mountain named for Theodore Roosevelt, Mount Roosevelt, at Deadwood, S. Dak., where Theodore Roosevelt used to come frequently when he lived on the ranch on the Little Missouri at Medora, N. Dak.

We are proud of the fact that one of the four great Presidents immortalized, we hope, by the figures on Mount Rushmore, is that of Theodore Roosevelt. We have great respect for the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. We think it highly appropriate that there should be a memorial to the great Theodore Roosevelt in or near the city of Washington.

When I served as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I sought to protect Theodore Roosevelt Island, by having the approval of the memorial association when the bridge matter came up. My objection at this time stems not from a desire to oppose a memorial, but to assure a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt that will be an appropriate memorial, one which will reflect the character and vigor and ruggedness that we associate with a man who was the leader of the Rough Riders. There are still in my State people who were associated with the Rough Rider company which Theodore Roosevelt led up San Juan Hill. We want a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt which will express the character and vigor and ideals that the man had and gave to this country.

Some of us feel that the proposed design is hardly worthy or representative of the man. I am not passing upon it from an artistic sense. I am merely suggesting that some of us feel that the proposed memorial does not reflect the character and vigor of the man whom it is proposed to memorialize. That feeling was reinforced this morning when I referred to the statement of Theodore Roosevelt's daughter, who commented upon the memorial. Another person with whom I spoke about the matter this morning told me that one of the grandsons of Theodore Roosevelt felt similarly about the memorial.

On that basis it seems to me that a concrete suggestion would be that the bill be so amended that it will leave the approval of the memorial to the descendants or relatives of Theodore Roosevelt. I think it highly inappropriate to build a memorial or to create a memorial that is unpleasing to the relatives of the person to be memorialized.

That is a concrete suggestion, I say respectfully to the Senator from New York; that we seek not merely to please the artists or some people with perhaps a fanciful idea of Theodore Roosevelt, but to please the people who knew the man, and who feel they are the inheritors of his spirit, and in that way try to get a memorial accomplished at the earliest possible time.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make a few observations. I do not know how else to obtain the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will withhold my request, if necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not object to the request of the Senator from South Dakota, because I am in complete accord with the observation he has made. I wish to say a few words about this matter because I had lodged the original objection to the passage of the bill and because the distinguished senior Senator from New York has referred to me in the course of his remarks.

I can assure the Senator from New York that my objection is not captious. I certainly have no desire to promote a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt and to withhold one to Theodore Roosevelt.

Theodore Roosevelt was a boyhood hero of mine. The Spanish-American War was still fresh in the memory of the country when I was growing up. The pictures of Teddy Roosevelt charging up San Juan Hill at the front of his Rough Riders were vividly etched in my mind at a very early age. I admired him so much that my father, when I was 9 years old, took me from our home near Winder to Atlanta in order that I might shake hands with Theodore Roosevelt.

I became involved in this matter after seeing a picture of the proposed memorial in a newspaper some months ago. I read that some people who looked at the picture had laughed. I did not laugh when I looked at it. When I looked at it I almost wept. Although I have limited knowledge in matters of art, I think it would almost be a matter of national mourning to symbolize the life and achievements of Theodore Roosevelt with such a monstrosity.

I freely confess, as I have said, that I am not an art critic. My first reaction when I saw a picture of the proposed memorial was that it looked like a gadget in a Rube Goldberg cartoon. It was in no way typical of the rugged Americanism of Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I believe that today we need more of the rugged Americanism typified by Theodore Roosevelt. I should like to see erected a memorial which will emphasize that quality.

I do not claim to be an artist. I may not be able to appreciate the fine points of the type of memorial that is proposed. However, I think I am an average American. I think my reaction to it would be pretty much the same as that of the tens of thousands of tourists who pass through Washington every week.

For every person who was skilled and steeped in the appreciation of the arts, who could stand and look at such a memorial with all its resplendent brass and glory which only artists could appreciate, there would be hundreds—yes thousands—of Americans like myself who would think such a memorial was an outrage to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt.

The statement has been made that a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt will be built. I do not know what type of memorial it will be. However, I have too much respect for Franklin D. Roosevelt to hope that it will be a memorial of stars, half moons, wires, and illuminated metals of one kind or another.

In my opinion, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota made an excellent suggestion when he said that we might submit this question to the heirs and descendants in each branch of the family of Theodore Roosevelt. Let them meet and pass on it. They may see fit to approve it. They may be of the opinion that the proposed memorial would be one of the finest specimens of artistry, modeling, and sculpture. If they approved it, I would, of course, withdraw my objection; but I would never go to see that memorial, because in my humble, earthy, American opinion, I think it would be a reflection on Theodore Roosevelt the man.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I suggest to those who are interested in a concrete suggestion that they go to Statuary Hall in the Capitol and there see the figure of Colonel Greenway, which was placed there by the State of Arizona. Colonel Greenway was a member of the Rough Riders. The sculptor of the figure of Greenway has carried into his product some of the verve, vigor, and character which I ascribe to Theodore Roosevelt. Certainly a memorial of that sort would portray the character of Theodore Roosevelt more vividly than such a sphere as has been proposed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think we ought to make some practical progress. When I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, we had before us bills to provide memorials to Vice President Barkley, exactly the same as this proposal, with Government agencies giving their consent. After informal consultation with the members of the family, Mrs. Barkley, who liked the proposal very much, approved it highly.

I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that, unless we were to insist on writing such a proposal into the bill, which would be rather unusual, I should be glad—and I hope the cosponsors will join with me—to suggest to the agencies which are referred to in the bill that they confer with the members of the family of Theodore Roosevelt, in order to produce a design which would be agreeable to them. Then, I gather, the bill could be passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am reluctant to agree to that suggestion at this time. My position is a consistent one. Some years ago a proposal was made to memorialize Gutzon Borglum, the sculptor of Mount Rushmore. When the plan was presented, I felt it should have the approval of the lineal descendants of Gutzon Borglum. So action was deferred on the memorial until Lincoln Borglum, his son, and the sister of Gutzon Borglum, could be consulted.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly my suggestion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I feel that that should be done in this instance. I think the committee or the Commission should not take action until the lineal descendants of Theodore Roosevelt have been satisfied. I should like to have a report made to Congress, if possible, on this question.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the views of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I know there have been many discussions on this matter. Although I am a coauthor of the bill, I do not believe we should seek to enact legislation which is unacceptable to the daughter of the man whom we are seeking to honor. If Mrs. Longworth objects to the design proposed, I do not believe we should accept it or pass the bill before us. I say this even though I am a coauthor of the bill. I would not want to have a bust or a sphere erected to my memory by the U.S. Government if my daughter objected to it. I think that until Mrs. Longworth and the other members of the Theodore Roosevelt family have been brought into the considerations with respect to the proposed memorial, we should defer action on the bill.

I want to make it clear that I should like very much to see action taken at this session. I hope steps will be taken to confer with Mrs. Longworth and the other members of the family of Theodore Roosevelt in order to accomplish our purpose as soon as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I find myself in complete agreement with those who have spoken on this subject. I shall do my utmost—and I am glad my colleague [Mr. KEATING] will join with me—in seeking to bring about the result we hope for. I trust steps will be taken to insure that that will happen, so that we may get action on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made, and the bill will be passed over.

BROADCAST OF STORM WARNINGS BY WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on last September 8, I wrote the Secretary of Commerce and proposed that the Weather Bureau initiate a 24-hour continuous broadcast schedule of storm warnings and forecasts over a network of frequency modulation radio stations. He replied to me under date of September 16 and today the Weather Bureau issued a press release reporting that they are establishing a test program with two FM radio stations in the New England area.

As part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of these two letters, and also of the press release issued today by Ralph L. Carlson, our efficient, capable chief meteorologist of the Weather Bureau at Providence, R.I.

These letters and the Weather Bureau's press release will, I believe, be of interest to all who are concerned with the expansion of the activities and services of the Weather Bureau.

I know that all who are interested in the activities of the Weather Bureau will join with me in the hope that this test program will prove successful and will result in the expansion of this new service throughout the country.

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

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

SEPTEMBER 8, 1959.

The Honorable FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you well know, I have been a stanch supporter of improved storm warning and weather services for many years.

Recently I proposed that the Weather Bureau initiate and maintain a 24-hour continuous broadcast schedule over a national network of frequency modulation radio stations as a means of reducing unnecessary loss of life and property that may result from inadequate dissemination of Weather Bureau storm warnings and forecasts.

As you may note from enclosed correspondence, it is of great significance that static free frequency modulation broadcasts often are able to reach audiences that cannot be reached by standard audio modulation broadcasts. FM broadcasts are also ideally suited for pickup and rebroadcast by AM stations.

The importance of getting the latest weather information immediately, especially during or before severe conditions, to all segments of the public, including such interests as inland and coastal boating, transportation, civic utilities, and agriculture, cannot be overemphasized.

I am interested in having Congress take appropriate action without further delay. Accordingly, I would like the Weather Bureau to explore all possibilities for establishing such a network of FM stations and to initiate whatever action that may be required to establish several test FM radio weather broadcasting programs.

Please keep me advised of all existing problems and feel free to make any recommendations on this important matter. You can be sure of my full cooperation.

Enclosed are copies of several letters which I have recently received and which indicate some of the enthusiasm and support for a program of this kind.

Yours sincerely,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1959.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: We have referred to the Weather Bureau your proposal, as outlined in your letter of September 8, 1959, that they initiate and maintain a continuous 24-hour frequency-modulation radio network to disseminate weather information.

They are carefully studying the proposal and examining the many phases of the problems which can be anticipated should this means of disseminating weather information be adopted. Because of the multiple technical problems which would be involved it will be necessary for them to give immediate attention to this aspect. It appears there may be several promising approaches to the problem which would help to realize a nationwide network of radio broadcast outlets.

The Weather Bureau will keep you informed of progress in the study of this proposal and a recommendation will be forthcoming soon.

May we express our appreciation for your interest in what has become a serious and major Weather Bureau problem, the rapid and efficient dissemination of timely weather information and advisories.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

WEATHER BUREAU ANNOUNCES EXPERIMENTAL RADIO BROADCAST PROGRAM

Ralph L. Carlson, chief meteorologist of the Providence Weather Bureau, today announced that the local Weather Bureau station will soon begin an experimental radio weather broadcasting program designed to investigate the feasibility of establishing a new weather communications system to provide the public with continuous round-the-clock, up-to-the-minute weather information.

The new experimental program is the result of a request made by Senator GREEN to the Secretary of Commerce, asking that the Weather Bureau explore all possibilities for establishing a national network of FM radio stations for continuous broadcasting of the latest weather information.

The Weather Bureau is cooperating in this test program with the Travelers Weather Research Center and the Travelers Broadcasting Service Corp. of the Travelers Insurance Co. of Hartford, Conn., who are conducting a similar study for the Hartford area.

Initially, it is planned to broadcast a local continuous weather dissemination program approximately 12 to 16 hours a day. Special emphasis will be placed on weather information which could affect such activities as marine, agriculture, forestry, and commerce.

The Providence Weather Bureau will maintain a constant watch on weather developments, gather weather information, prepare the forecasts, and make the broadcast. The broadcast will be made directly from the Weather Bureau station and disseminated over a multiplex channel of Providence Journal Co. radio station WPJB–FM.

A continuing evaluation of the experimental program will be made. Results of the evaluation will determine the feasibility of implementing such a meteorological service on a nationwide basis.

The call of the calendar was resumed.

LICENSING OF INDEPENDENT FOREIGN FREIGHT FORWARDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H.R. 5068) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, prior to the passage of this bill, a statement which I send to the desk.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

I am very pleased that the Senate is today considering H.R. 5068, a bill having to do with the operations and licensing of freight forwarders.

This is a bill in which I have long been very much interested and which is supported by a number of public and private groups in New York State.

On February 19, when this bill was the subject of hearings before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I testified in support of the bill in the form originally reported by the Special Subcommittee on Freight Forwarding of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I will not detain the Senate at this time with the materials and arguments put forth in my testimony. However, I submit the following excerpts from my testimony of February 19:

"TESTIMONY OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE CONCERNING S. 2300 AND H.R. 5068

"Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for this opportunity to appear this morning with regard to S. 2300 and H.R. 5068, legislation affecting the role and practices of freight forwarders. This legislation is of great importance to the State and city of New York and to the Port of New York Authority, which as you know is a self-supporting corporate agency of the States of New York and New Jersey.

"There are two bills presently before this committee: S. 2300, introduced by Chairman MAGNUSON, and H.R. 5068. The latter was passed by the House on August 18, 1959.

"I recommend that the committee report out favorably S. 2300, or in the alternative H.R. 5068 with amendments that would make it conform with S. 2300 and at the same time with the version of H.R. 5068 reported out last year by the Special Subcommittee on Freight Forwarding of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. The latter bill was in many respects similar to S. 2300 introduced by Senator MAGNUSON.

"However, there are significant differences between H.R. 5068 as finally passed by the House and S. 2300. H.R. 5068 in its present form would, I believe, foment litigation, shackle business, and cause wasteful, expensive, and protracted proceedings before the Federal Maritime Board.

"Mr. Chairman, last year, the State of New York represented by its attorney general, the city of New York represented by its corporation counsel, and the Port of New York Authority by its own counsel, filed a joint brief with the Maritime Board on many of the important matters contained in the legislation under consideration today. This entire subject and all of its ramifications was then involved in proceedings pending before the Board.

"The New York brief contains an excellent and forthright statement concerning all of the most important and most frequently discussed factors covered by the bills presently before this committee.

"Both S. 2300 and H.R. 5068 amend the Shipping Act of 1916, and are intended 'to provide licensing for independent freight forwarders, and for other purposes.' At the present time, forwarders merely register with the Maritime Board. To the best of my knowledge, all of the major interests involved; shippers, consignors, steamship companies, and the foreign freight forwarders themselves, favor licensing. It is the 'other purposes' which these bills are designed to carry out that is the most important part of these bills, and it is this subject that I wish to discuss this morning in greater detail.

"H.R. 5068 says that the Maritime Board shall prescribe 'rules and regulations including maximum brokerage fees.' S. 2300 wisely omits this prescription. The records of hearings available to this committee indicate clearly that oceangoing carriers have been paying brokerage fees to freight forwarders for generations. These fees are paid in honorable practice by one great segment of American commerce to another group of American businesses for valuable and essential services under agreements openly arrived at. The committee already has before it the statements of the majority of American steamship lines on this subject. They indicate that there is little controversey here and that freight forwarders definitely earn the fees which they receive for the valuable and indispensable services which they render. H.R. 5068 in calling for 'rules and regulations including maximum brokerage fees' raises the prospect of a new limitation on American businesses in this important field. It would very likely lead to more bureaucracy, more expenses, and in general more of a burden on international and domestic commerce.

"Mr. Chairman, these then in brief are some of the reasons that I favor S. 2300 or H.R. 5068 as amended to conform. This committee hardly needs to be told that foreign freight forwarders are a vital factor in the field of American commerce. There are about 1,200 of them in the principal ports and cities of the United States. The facts are all contained in reports and documents available to this committee. What the foreign freight forwarders do was well described in the excellent and informative brief filed jointly by New York State, New York City, and the Port of New York Authority, which I have asked to have inserted in the record.

"Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge a favorable report on S. 2300, or, in the alternative, on H.R. 5068 with amendments to confirm to S. 2300."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, prior to the passage of the bill, a statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I wish to announce my support of H.R. 5068 dealing with the licensing of ocean freight forwarders and the terms under

which they may be compensated by ocean carriers for services rendered to them. The regulation and licensing of freight forwarders by the Federal Maritime Board is a matter of particular interest and importance to the State of New York because freight forwarding is an integral and vital part of the operation of the great Port of New York.

New York is a general cargo port, the largest in the country, and it is used by thousands of shippers for the exportation of their goods of their oversea customers. These exporters have always made use of the ocean freight forwarders in the port. The official figures of the Federal Maritime Board show that 75 percent of the cargo handled by forwarders throughout the United States passes through New York. Without the skilled services of the forwarder at the port the steamship carriers would find it most difficult, if not impossible, to obtain the cargo at the right time and properly documented.

Approximately one-half of the forwarders presently registered with the Federal Maritime Board are in the New York area and 30 percent of their revenue is derived from compensation from ocean carriers, known as "brokerage." In dollar volume this amounts to $7 million per year. The New York forwarders bring to the steamship lines approximately $560 million a year in freight revenue.

Legislation, licensing forwarders and allowing them compensation for services rendered to carriers is necessary not only to preserve the ocean freight forwarding industry but also to assure the Port of New York effective and reliable service in the handling of general cargo.

The bill now pending, would be most helpful to all segments of our foreign commerce. It is endorsed by the city and State of New York, the Port of New York Authority, exporter groups and virtually all steamship lines.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I urge quick passage of the amendment. At hearings conducted by the House and Senate committees, the Department of State recommended that certain changes be made in the Shipping Act of 1916. The purpose of these amendments it to make it clear that the licensing provisions apply only to a person or firm engaged in the business of dispatching shipments on behalf of other persons and not to an exporter who performs his own export traffic work. The Senate, after consideration of the bill, recommended a compensation provision that will permit the ocean common carrier to pay and allow the foreign freight forwarder to receive a fee known as brokerage.

Uncontradicted testimony was placed on the records of the Congress indicating that these fees have been paid over the past 100 years or more at various ports including Texas gulf ports, and it is the considered opinion of the best informed governmental and industrial leaders in the forwarding industry that this custom should be continued and that this payment will enable the forwarding industry to perform export traffic services in an efficient and economical manner.

As the testimony indicated that a carrier is not generally in a position to check on the validity of individual brokerage claims, it was the committee's consensus of opinion that a minimum standard should be adopted by which a carrier might easily determine whether or not the forwarder is eligible to receive this payment.

The bill makes mandatory a written statement by the independent freight forwarder to the carrier, certifying that the standards established by the Federal Maritime Board have been met and that at least two of a list of six services have been performed. Thus the carrier may easily and quickly determine that the independent freight forwarder has performed a minimum number of services and has been recognized by an official licensing board as a competent and satisfactory operator.

This amendment will enable both carriers and independent freight forwarders to pursue their business interests in a more efficient and economical manner. Previously to this time independent freight forwarders were required only to register with the Federal Maritime Board to obtain a certificate. This bill provides that certain minimum standards be met before any license is granted; carriers will be assured of certain minimum performance ratings, and freight forwarders will be able to increase the effectiveness of their operations. In addition, the independent freight forwarders must perform a minimum number of services to be eligible for the fee.

The carrier will be assured in writing by the licensed freight forwarder that at least two of six services have been performed—see section 43(e) of the bill.

This legislation has been urgently needed for many years to insure improved standards and practices in our merchant shipping operations. Witness after witness has agreed that the Federal Maritime Board should be allowed to establish rules and regulations for the licensing of independent ocean freight forwarders. Complaint after complaint, by carriers and freight forwarders alike, has pointed to the confusion and even false representation that too often plague this vital area of commercial endeavor. For the insurance of fair treatment and increased efficiency in our merchant marine, I heartily endorse the proposed amendment to the Shipping Act of 1916 and urge speedy passage on this important measure, H.R. 5068, with the amendments recommended by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first section of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 801), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"The term 'carrying on the business of forwarding' means the dispatching of shipments by any person on behalf of others, by oceangoing common carriers in commerce from the United States, its territories, or possessions to foreign countries, or between the United States and its territories or possessions, or between such territories and possessions, and handling the formalities incident to such shipments.

"An 'independent ocean freight forwarder' is a person carrying on the business of forwarding for a consideration who is not a shipper or consignee or a seller or purchaser of shipments to foreign countries, nor has any beneficial interest therein other than a lien, nor directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by such shipper or consignee or by any person having such a beneficial interest."

SEC. 2. The Shipping Act, 1916, is further amended by redesignating section 44 as section 45, and inserting immediately after section 43 the following new section:

"SEC. 44. (a) No person shall engage in business as an independent ocean freight forwarder as defined in this Act unless such person holds a license issued by the Federal Maritime Board to engage in such business.

"(b) A forwarder's license shall be issued to any qualified applicant therefor if it is found by the Board that the applicant is, or will be, an 'independent ocean freight forwarder' as defined in this Act and is fit, willing, and able properly to carry on the business of forwarding and to conform to the provisions of this Act and the requirements, rules, and regulations of the Board issued thereunder, and that the proposed forwarding business is, or will be, consistent with the national maritime policies declared in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; otherwise such application shall be denied. Any independent ocean freight forwarder who, on the effective date of this Act, is carrying on the business of forwarding under a registration number issued by the Board may continue such business for a period of one hundred and twenty days thereafter without a license, and if application for such license is made within such period, such forwarder may, under such regulations as the Board shall prescribe, continue such business until otherwise ordered by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall prescribe reasonable rules and regulations to be observed to regulate the licensing of independent ocean freight forwarders and no such license shall be issued or remain in force unless such forwarder shall have furnished a bond or other security approved by the Board, in such form and amount as in the opinion of the Board will insure financial responsibility and the supply of the services in accordance with contracts, agreements, or arrangements therefor.

"(d) Licenses shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until suspended or terminated as herein provided. Any such license may, upon application of the holder thereof, in the discretion of the Board, be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may upon complaint, or on the Board's own initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended or revoked for willful failure to comply with any provision of this Act, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Board promulgated thereunder.

"(e) A common carrier by water may compensate an independent ocean freight forwarder, and such person may receive compensation from such carrier, in connection with any shipment dispatched by such person on behalf of others when, and only when, such person is licensed hereunder and has performed with respect to such shipment two or more of the following services:

"(1) The solicitation and securing of the cargo for the ship or the booking of, or otherwise arranging for space for, such cargo;

"(2) The coordination of the movement of the cargo to shipside;

"(3) The preparation and processing of the ocean bill of lading;

"(4) The preparation and processing of dock receipts or delivery orders;

"(5) The preparation and processing of consular documents or export declarations;

"(6) The payment of the ocean freight charges on such shipments.

Before any such compensation is paid to or received by any person carrying on the business of forwarding, such person shall, if he is qualified under the provisions of this paragraph to receive such compensation, certify in writing to the common carrier by water by which the shipment was dispatched that he is licensed by the Board as an independent ocean freight forwarder and that he performed two or more of the services enumerated in this paragraph with respect to such shipment. Such carrier shall be entitled to rely on such certification unless it knows that the certification is incorrect."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3739) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand this measure is not proper calendar business, and that the Calendar Committee has asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

EDWARD KETCHUM

The bill (H.R. 7263) for the relief of Edward Ketchum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3340) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the bill should go over, as not being proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 5547) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, before we proceed further, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question:

I have been reviewing some of the provisions of H.R. 5547, which was reported by the Senator from Oklahoma for our Committee on Finance. I would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question with respect to section 12 of the bill, which provides that in determining the constructive ownership of stock for personal holding company purposes, the stock owned by a trust or an estate shall be considered as being owned by the beneficiaries in proportion to their actuarial interests. It was my understanding that our committee agreed to the amendment not only because we felt that the rule it prescribed was sound and perhaps the only available rule, but also because it was confirmation of the present law. Let me ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether my understanding is correct.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that is my view, and certainly the view of a majority of the committee—that the present law requires an allocation of the stock among beneficiaries of a trust or an estate in proportion to their actuarial interests. The committee's purpose in recommending enactment of this provision of the bill is simply to make the rule explicit in the statute. The committee was prompted to do so because we had been advised that the Internal Revenue Service might assert that the entire value of stock owned by a trust should be allocated to the beneficiary owning the present interest, with nothing allocated to the beneficiary owning a future interest. Such a position, in our opinion, is directly contrary to the present law, and probably will merely promote costly and unnecessary litigation. It is for this reason that the amendment is specifically made effective on the effective date of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

I believe that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. FREAR. Yes, I think it does. I thank the Senator for his response, and I now state that his view is in accordance with mine.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY OF BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it is a pleasure and honor for me today to welcome into the "90-Year Club" one of our most distinguished Americans, Bernard M. Baruch. As many of us know, today, August 19, marks the 90th birthday of our "park bench statesman," and I know all Senators join me in sending him warm greetings.

On Tuesday of this week in Washington, Mr. Baruch's birthday was celebrated by the dedication, with appropriate ceremonies, of his favorite park bench in Lafayette Park as "The Bernard Baruch Bench of Inspiration." The National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America and the Scouts' national headquarters jointly sponsored this memorable event. Since the Boy Scouts this year are celebrating the 50th anniversary of their founding, it is also a significant and important year for them.

As an honorary member of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America and of Providence Troop No. 31 of the Narragansett Council in Rhode Island, I was greatly disappointed that I was unable, because of senatorial duties, to attend the ceremony in Lafayette Park. As a long-time friend and admirer of Mr. Baruch, I would have liked to join with the more than 400 Boy Scout leaders, Government officials, and civic-minded citizens who gathered together to honor one of our greatest living Americans.

I request unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excellent articles about the ceremony, that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 16 and the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 17. In addition to the distinguished citizens and the three Boy Scouts mentioned in these newspaper stories, the ceremonies were attended by a number of dignitaries, including: John M. Schiff, honorary vice president and former president of the Boy Scouts of America; Hon. Joseph E. Talbot, chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission; Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American National Red Cross; Samuel H. Kauffmann, president of the Washington Evening Star; Hon. True Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture; Daniel W. Bell, chairman of the American Security and Trust Co. and former president of the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America; Hon. Conrad L. Wirth, director of the National Park Service; J. Frederic Wiese, chairman of region 3 of the Boy Scouts of America; Harry L. Merrick, vice president of the National Capital Area Council; Col. William H. Press, executive vice president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; and last, but not least, two esteemed Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee.

Though he was unable to be present at this ceremony, Mr. Baruch telephoned a personal message which was taped for the audience. I wish to place in the RECORD also a copy of his meaningful words on that occasion, as well as selected excerpts from his philosophy, and the very pertinent remarks about Mr. Baruch which were delivered by my old friend, Morris V. Rosenbloom, who served as chairman of the Boy Scout committee to honor Mr. Baruch. In addition, I request permission to include a copy of the proclamation, issued by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, designating August 16 as "Bernard Baruch Day" in the Nation's Capital, and

excerpts of statements received on this important occasion from many world-renowned persons, including Sir Winston Churchill, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and former President Harry S. Truman.

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

REMARKS OF MORRIS V. ROSENBLOOM, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOY SCOUT COMMITTEE TO HONOR MR. BERNARD M. BARUCH AT THE CEREMONIES IN LAFAYETTE PARK, 12 O'CLOCK NOON, AUGUST 16, 1960

Thank you very much, President Phil, for that overgenerous introduction. I feel privileged to play a part in this memorable occasion and for being asked to say a few words about one of our most distinguished Americans, who has been such an inspiration to me.

It was in 1942 when I first came to know, admire, and respect Bernard Baruch. As our acquaintance deepened, my warmth and affection did the same. I have been impressed, as I am sure most of you have been, with the multifaceted aspects of the significant contributions he has made over the years to his country. Time does not permit expanding on this subject. However, a few pertinent points are in order.

Here is a man who has been above political considerations. As evidenced by this cross section of America that is here today who have come to do him honor, and by the outpouring of congratulatory messages which I'm sure there will be this Friday, on his 90th birthday, this fact is abundantly clear. To be the trusted adviser to each of our last seven Presidents—Republicans and Democrats alike—what a unique and vital role for a man to play.

"Dr. Facts," as President Wilson liked to call Mr. Baruch, has consistently applied one test to the advice he has given—advice which those of us who are Scouts and Scouters are quick to recognize. It has frequently been a strong admonition to "be prepared." The test he has applied has not been palatability nor political feasibility—it has been what is right realistically. Thus, his advice has not always been acceptable nor popular. Yet, in his own lifetime, he has become a legend because of his role in tackling the tough problems that have led to building our strength against aggression and, as Arthur Krock so aptly pointed out, as our "economic conscience."

Each of us in this Washington audience might benefit from pondering the meaningful words of Woodrow Wilson about his friend, Bernard Baruch, when he spoke about the latter's job when he was in charge of our industrial mobilization during World War I. President Wilson commented, "I like to watch men who are called to Washington for high responsibility. Some of them merely swell—some grow. Bernie grew."

I should like to point out that this park bench of Mr. Baruch's has not been used by him solely for reviewing the weighty problems of the day—such as the rubber report, a good part of which was composed on that park bench. No; it is not unusual for this "park bench office" and the one he uses in New York's Central Park to be frequented by young children playing nearby. I can speak from personal experience when I say that Mr. Baruch has often been more captivated with them—and them with him—than with the serious park bench conferences which have become his trademark.

And now I should like to let you in on a little treat. Mr. Baruch was so concerned about not being able to be with us here today that yesterday afternoon he phoned us his message which we have taped and will now bring you in his own words. In addition, a little later in this program, we will bring you—also in Mr. Baruch's own words—a memorable bit of his valuable philosophy. Let us listen, at this point, to the voice of Bernard Baruch:

"I have been looking forward with much anticipation to being present in Lafayette Park on Tuesday so that I might express in person my appreciation for the honor that has been conferred on me, an honor that touches me deeply and for which I am profoundly grateful. Unfortunately, I cannot make the trip to Washington. Believe me I am keenly disappointed.

"This honor has a special significance to me because it has been bestowed by the Boy Scouts of America, one of the great youth organizations of the world. I know that this is the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Scouts. By my standards that is pretty young, but the good which the Scouts have done in these 50 years in preserving American values, inculcating the principles of fair play, tolerance, service, and love of country is inestimable.

"I am well aware of the Scouting program and of its emphasis on self-discipline and the promotion of the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others. I fully subscribe to this doctrine and believe that adherence to it is a prime necessity in the perilous days ahead. The fact that your program is now being brought to more than 5 million Boy Scouts in this country bodes well for the future health and strength of our Nation.

"The Boy Scout motto, 'Be Prepared,' has always appealed to me. This is a motto that our Nation might well adopt in these dangerous times. Again, my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Rosenbloom, to the new chief Scout executive, Joseph Brunton, and to all who have selected this means of commemorating my 'park bench office' and for extending 90th birthday greetings."

That applause is especially heartwarming because this entire ceremony is being taped so that Mr. Baruch will be able to hear it for himself. It is particularly appropriate, I feel, that Mr. Baruch who, in 1947, was awarded Scouting's highest honor—the Silver Buffalo "for distinguished service to boyhood"—should today be receiving renewed evidence of our esteem and affection.

In conclusion, and in particular to our young people to whom Mr. Baruch has so often referred as the future of our country: As you sit on this park bench in Lafayette Park and, perhaps, will be able to draw some inspiration for your plans and dreams, remember that a distinguished heritage surrounds this very location—a heritage rich in our American traditions of individual dignity, democracy, personal responsibility, and love of country.

I know you all join with me in saying to this great American, as he reaches the age of fourscore years and ten: God bless you and keep you for the inspiring example you have set for your fellow men. As each of us draws inspiration from your life and from the symbolism of this "park bench office" of yours, Mr. Baruch, we wish from the bottom of our hearts that you may enjoy many more happy, healthy, and meaningful years as our beloved "park bench statesman."

MR. BARUCH'S PHILOSOPHY

There always have been those who would make government an instrument of enforcing submission on the people. At the other extreme have been those who would tear down government in angry rebellion and who, if they succeed, usually try to force the people to submit to them. To me the greatness of America rests mainly in the fact that we have a form of government in which the people have the means of effecting all necessary changes without enslaving one another.

No form of government—whether it be socialism, communism, fascism or some "ism" not yet heard of—in itself can solve man's problems. Government is only an instrument for regulating society. A limited democracy—the political form we live under—is bound to have its faults since none of us who make up this democracy is perfect. But this democracy has given each of us the opportunity to better his own condition by his own striving—and more than that no government can give us.

In all our history we have never stopped trying to improve ourselves. We have only to continue in that quest to remain a free and self-respecting people, a sanctuary of strength to the weak and a model of hope for all.

And if we are to continue to govern ourselves we must indeed do just that. We must understand that the extent of freedom which can be permitted us as individuals will depend on the extent to which each of us as individuals does more for himself or herself. We must further understand that to the extent that we do turn to government, instead of doing things for ourselves, we increase the necessity for regulations imposed by the government.

Government by its very nature is discipline. To paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, that government is best which governs the least because its people discipline themselves.

Finally, may I leave with you, as a bit of advice to each of you personally, three rules which in the years ahead you can apply to any problem that may arise:

Rule 1: Get the facts.

Approach each new problem not with a view of finding what you hope will be there but to get the truth, the realities that must be grappled with. You may not like what you find. In that case you are entitled to try to change it. But do not deceive yourself as to what you do find to be the facts of the situation.

Rule 2: Get to know yourself.

Only as you do know yourself can your brain serve you as a sharp and efficient tool. Know your own failings, passions, and prejudices so you can separate them from what you see. Know also when you actually have thought through to the nature of the thing with which you are dealing and when you are not thinking at all. Nowadays, unfortunately, the prevailing habit seems to be to fasten upon some symbol or word—like liberalism, McCarthyism, or appeasement or the new look in this or that, or the New Deal, Fair Deal or other deals—and then to argue fiercely over this label without looking at which lies underneath.

Rule 3: Try to have the wit—but if not, have the discipline—to match up the first two rules.

Knowing yourself and knowing the facts, you can judge whether you can change the situation so it is more to your liking. If you cannot—or if you do not know how to improve on things—then discipline yourself to the adjustments that will be necessary.

I hope these few observations will help start you, to whom the future belongs, upon the course of disciplined reason which draws from man's experience in the past to solve man's present problems.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1960]

PLAQUE IS UNVEILED AT BARUCH'S BENCH

The bench in Lafayette Square on which America's "park bench statesman," Bernard M. Baruch, thought out the production problems of two world wars was marked with a bronze plaque yesterday, 3 days before his 90th birthday.

Donated by the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts and the Boy Scouts of America, the plaque stands on a granite base near the bench located just northwest of the statue of Andrew Jackson facing the White House.

Baruch, tired from a recent trip to Europe, was unable to come from New York City for the ceremony, but participants heard a message recorded yesterday at his home.

The plaque names the bench "The Bernard Baruch Bench of Inspiration" and bears the Boy Scouts' motto "Be Prepared," one which Baruch said "has always appealed to me."

That motto, continued the man who has been an adviser to seven Presidents, is one "our Nation might well adopt in these dangerous times."

District Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin read a proclamation of "Bernard Baruch Day" which included the hope that many others will receive inspiration from sitting on the bench.

Philip Larner Gore, president of the National Capital Area Council, and Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., chief Scout executive, unveiled the plaque with the aid of a trio of local Scouts.

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 16, 1960]

BARUCH PLAQUE ON PARK BENCH UNVEILED HERE

Bernard M. Baruch couldn't make it to Lafayette Park today for the unveiling of a bronze plaque on his favorite bench facing the White House.

But the white-haired elder statesman's rich bass voice, by way of tape recording, dominated the noontime ceremony.

The plaque, on a stone base next to the weathered old wooden bench, included the Boy Scout motto "Be Prepared," which has been Mr. Baruch's personal philosophy during his long years as adviser to seven Presidents.

"This is a motto that our Nation might well adopt in these dangerous times," Mr. Baruch said on the tape recording. The elder statesman, who will be 90 Friday, was advised by his doctors not to attempt the trip here.

He also told the 200 Boy Scouts, Government, and civic leaders at the ceremony that America's greatness lies in the fact that democracy has given us all an opportunity to improve ourselves.

He gave the audience a three-point plan for self-improvement: "Get the facts, even though the truth of the facts may not be what you want to know; get to know yourself—your faults, passions, and prejudices; and try to have the wit, if not then the discipline, to make up to the first two rules."

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., chief Scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America; Philip L. Gore, president of the National Capital Area Council, and three Scouts unveiled the plaque. It cites Mr. Baruch for his inspiring devotion to country and distinguished service to boyhood.

The three Scouts are Gregory L. Davis, 9, Cub Pack 542; John M. Normyle, 14, Troop 100, and Richard J. Blumberg, 14, Explorer Troop 381.

PROCLAMATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

BERNARD BARUCH DAY

Whereas the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America and the Scouts' national headquarters have selected Tuesday, August 16, 1960, to honor Elder Statesman Bernard M. Baruch; and

Whereas the 90th birthday of this distinguished American occurs later that week, on Friday, August 19—during the 50th anniversary year of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America; and

Whereas Mr. Baruch's favorite Lafayette Park bench will be dedicated as "The Bernard Baruch Bench of Inspiration" and will be commemorated with a bronze plaque which cites Mr. Baruch "for his inspiring devotion to country and distinguished service to boyhood," and which points out that both the Boy Scout motto and Mr. Baruch's oft-repeated philosophy are "Be prepared"; and

Whereas it is hoped that young people, in particular, will receive inspiration from sitting on this bench in the future, as Mr. Baruch has over the years; and

Whereas this ceremony honoring Mr. Baruch is one to which we heartily lend our full support; and

Whereas we also wish to salute the Boy Scouts of America in their golden anniversary year for the matchless contribution which Scouting has lent to the development of our Nation's boyhood, the future citizens and leaders of our country—a cause to which our senior citizen, Mr. Baruch, has been deeply devoted: Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, do take this means of extending a warm welcome to Mr. Bernard M. Baruch by declaring Tuesday, August 16, 1960, "Bernard Baruch Day" in the Nation's Capital. In offering sincere congratulations on his forthcoming 90th birthday, we wish Mr. Baruch many more years of happy, meaningful life, and we hope that the country he loves so dearly may continue to benefit from his dedicated, selfless service

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
F. J. CLARKE,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

EXCERPTS FROM SOME OF THE TYPICAL LETTERS RECEIVED ABOUT THE DEDICATION OF "THE BERNARD BARUCH BENCH OF INSPIRATION" BY THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Winston S. Churchill: "I am glad to pay tribute to my old friend Mr. Bernard Baruch. I have always held his wisdom and character in the highest regard, and we have worked together in war and in peace. It is fitting that this bench on which he has so often meditated and talked should now be dedicated to him."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt: "It would give me pleasure if I could tell you that I would join in the celebrations for Mr. Baruch. Unfortunately, however, I must be at Yale University on August 16.

"With my good wishes to Mr. Baruch and many regrets that I cannot be present to pay tribute to him on this happy occasion."

Harry S. Truman: "I appreciated most highly the invitation of the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America and I certainly wish I could be with them, but it just is not possible. My commitments are way above the normal and there is nothing I can do about it."

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American National Red Cross: "I think the idea is an excellent one, and I know that the ceremony will be well received by the public. It will do a great deal to help the Boy Scout cause."

J. Edgar Hoover: "I would very much like to join you at this affair; however, a prior engagement precludes my acceptance. I know that this will be a most enjoyable and inspiring occasion."

Donald S. Bittinger, president of the Washington Gas Light Co.: "Mr. Baruch's example of taking time for thoughtful contemplation is a good example to hold before our youngsters in our hurly-burly world of today."

Howard W. Kacy, president of the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.: "'The Bernard Baruch Bench of Inspiration' will add a unique landmark to our Nation's Capital."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise at this time to take this opportunity to state, even though briefly, my profound respect for the revered Bernard M. Baruch, who is celebrating his 90th birthday. On such a happy and auspicious occasion, I believe that the least we can do is convey to him our most sincere wishes that he will have a very happy birthday.

For years I have honored and highly respected Mr. Baruch, who is one of the outstanding citizens of our country. Certainly the least we can do at this time, in connection with his 90th birthday, is to note this important event, and to extend our sincere best wishes to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ninety Useful Years," which was published today in the New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1960]

NINETY USEFUL YEARS

Reaching the age of 90 in reasonably good health and spirits is an achievement all by itself. We doubt, however, that Bernard M. Baruch, whose 90th birthday falls today, ever gave much thought to living to a grand old age. His ambition, we suspect, was to be active in mind and body and to get useful work done. In this he has succeeded.

Mr. Baruch did well enough in his private business in his earlier years to enable him to give most of his later years to the service of his country. He would be remembered for his achievements as head of the War Industries Board during the First World War, but he did countless useful things between the two World Wars and after the Second World War and down to this very day.

Whether or not he likes to be associated with the old tradition of the bench on which he sat and to which eminent persons came to seek his advice we are not sure. We do know that his advice was always based on intelligence, experience, and good will. When he disagreed with anybody he said so and when he agreed he said so. He went part of the way but not all of the way with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as with other Presidents before and since.

We wish this were Mr. Baruch's 50th or 60th birthday rather than his 90th. But we hope the physical constitution he inherited from his good physician father, Simon B. Baruch, will permit him to be with us and to give us good advice in years to come.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, it is indeed rare that a man becomes a legend in his lifetime, that his name awakens an instant and warm response in the minds and hearts of an entire nation. Such a man is the distinguished and beloved American, Bernard M. Baruch, who this day celebrates his 90th birthday.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am delighted to congratulate the Senator from New York on what he is now saying with respect to Mr. Baruch. Mr. Baruch occupies a unique place in the affections of all Americans, and I am happy that the Senator from New York is bringing his birthday anniversary to the attention of the Senate. I join him in his commendation of Mr. Baruch's service to the country.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend from Massachusetts very much. I am happy that the Senator from Massa-

chusetts has given voice to those very gracious words, which I know will warm the heart of this fine and great man.

Mr. Baruch has spent his four score and 10 years in bringing to full flower his extraordinary gifts of intellect, of heart, and of spirit, in the cause of his Nation, in the cause of all humanity. Few men can look back upon a life career marked by so many accomplishments and embellished by so many distinctions. Mr. Baruch is perhaps most widely known as the confidant and counselor of Presidents, the park bench sage whose words of advice have been a shaping force in the momentous historic decisions of certain of our Chief Executives.

In this regard, a most touching and significant ceremony took place earlier this week here in Washington when an official delegation of the Boy Scouts of America memorialized the favorite park bench of Mr. Baruch in Lafayette Park. This signal mark of honor took the form of the unveiling of a bronze plaque mounted on a granite block beside the wood-and-metal park bench that has been the scene of so many historic colloquies.

The genius and dedication and energies of Bernard Baruch have ranged many fields of human endeavor, and in each of them he has left the enduring mark of his achievements. He has stood as a towering figure in the world of finance, he is famed as a philanthropist and sportsman. And, in the service of his Nation in World War I, Bernard Baruch was one of the outstanding architects of our victory in his role as Chief of the War Industries Board.

Life has enriched Bernard Baruch, but he, too, has enriched life. He has spent the gold of his talents freely in the interest of his Nation, in the interest of his fellowman.

Here is a great man who wears his greatness lightly. Here is a man to whom the years have been good, because he has filled his years with the full measure of his gifts and his energies. That is why all America attends in spirit today the celebration of Bernard Baruch's 90th birthday. Our hearts wish an old friend well, and may the candles keep lighting his way into the still fruitful and happy years to be.

The high esteem and affection in which Mr. Baruch is held is amply demonstrated by editorials in this morning's New York Times and New York Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that they 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 Times, Aug. 19, 1960]

NINETY USEFUL YEARS

Reaching the age of 90 in reasonably good health and spirits is an achievement all by itself. We doubt, however, that Bernard M. Baruch, whose 90th birthday falls today, ever gave much thought to living to a grand old age. His ambition, we suspect, was to be active in mind and body and to get useful work done. In this he has succeeded.

Mr. Baruch did well enough in his private business in his earlier years to enable him to give most of his later years to the service of his country. He would be remembered for his achievements as head of the War Industries Board during the First World War, but he did countless useful things between the two World Wars and after the Second World War and down to this very day.

Whether or not he likes to be associated with the old tradition of the bench on which he sat and to which eminent persons came to seek his advice we are not sure. We do know that his advice was always based on intelligence, experience and good will. When he disagreed with anybody he said so and when he agreed he said so. He went part of the way but not all of the way with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as with other Presidents before and since.

We wish this were Mr. Baruch's 50th or 60th birthday rather than his 90th. But we hope the physical constitution he inherited from his good physician father, Simon B. Baruch, will permit him to be with us and to give us good advice in years to come.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 19, 1960]

BARUCH AT 90: A VALUED VOICE

This is not the first birthday salute the Herald Tribune has published to Bernard Baruch, and we devoutly hope it will not be the last.

But there is something special about it, for it marks Mr. Baruch's passage from the ranks of the world's great octogenarians to those of its great nonagenarians. Mr. Baruch is 90 years old today, and the testimonials of respect and affection that have been greeting him annually for decades past will surely reach a new climax.

Even more remarkable than the length of his life is its usefulness. Longevity is an accident; public service a matter of choice. And Bernard Baruch's life has been devoted to the service of his country and his countrymen.

Whether as an adviser to Presidents or a park-bench philosopher he has invariably spoken his mind candidly, openly, and pungently. Today no less than a half-century ago, his remains a voice to be heard and heeded. We are sure it will continue so as he sails briskly past the 90 mark and heads for 100.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, it is certainly a pleasure for me to join the millions of other Americans who extend congratulations to Bernard M. Baruch on his 90th birthday. Mr. Baruch is one of our Nation's elder statesmen who has devoted more than his share of time, energy, and money to public service in the interest of our entire Nation. I am especially proud that he is a native son of South Carolina and I know I speak for all the people of my State when I offer congratulations to Mr. Baruch at this time. I am honored to claim him as a friend and I sincerely wish for him many more healthy, productive years for as each year goes by our Nation has always benefited from the wise counselings of this patriot.

The call of the calendar was resumed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2652) to strengthen the internal security of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

The bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is the pending business. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Calendar No. 1883, H.R. 8860, if the Senator from Ohio is present, and if I may have the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma and the minority leader, I wonder if it would be agreeable for us to have a unanimous-consent agreement for 30 minutes debate on the bill and 15 minutes on each side on amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have a few comments to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have arranged for that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not think 30 minutes would be adequate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would 1 hour be agreeable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was going to suggest 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we consider the bill we have not to exceed 1 hour on the bill and 30 minutes on amendments, to be equally divided between the opponents and proponents, in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a few remarks, but I am willing to do it after consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2151) relative to the distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3324) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 12483) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8665) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3625) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure follows the pattern of the several study groups that have been formed, and I ask permission to insert at this point in the RECORD a brief statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, is this Calendar No. 1907?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. KEATING. Over, by request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I give notice that we expect to call the bill up by motion, because we have taken such action as is proposed in the case of every State that is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3855) to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS TO HOLDERS OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR

The bill (H.R. 270) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pensions payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) subsection (b) of section 560 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting "sixty-two."

(b) Any person who, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), first becomes eligible to apply for special pension under section 562 of title 38, United States Code, shall, if he files application for such special pension within such one-year period, be paid such pension beginning September 1, 1960, or the date he attains age sixty-two, whichever is later; but no person shall become entitled to payment of special pension by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) for any month prior to September 1960.

SEC. 2. Section 562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Administrator shall pay monthly to each person whose name has been entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor roll a special pension at the rate of $10, beginning as of the date of application therefor under section 560 of this title.

"(b) Any person entitled to special pension under subsection (a) may, upon written application to the Administrator, or to the Secretary concerned in the case of an initial application, elect to receive in lieu thereof special pension at the rate of $100 per month, reduced (but not below the rate of $10 per month) by any pension payable to such person under subchapter II of this chapter. If such application is filed with the Administrator within one year after September 1, 1960, payment of special pension at such rate shall begin on such date, or on the date the person filing such application first became entitled to special pension under subsection (a), whichever is later; otherwise payment of special pension at such rate shall begin with the month in which application therefor is filed with the Administrator, or the Secretary concerned, as the case may be.

"(c) The receipt of special pension shall not deprive any person of any other pension or other benefit, right or privilege to which he is or may hereafter be entitled under any existing or subsequent law. Except as provided in subsection (b), special pension shall be paid in addition to all other payments under the laws of the United States.

"(d) Special pension shall not be subject to any attachment, execution, levy, tax lien, or detention under any process whatever.

"(e) If any person has been awarded more than one Medal of Honor he shall not receive more than one special pension."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on September 1, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND RECONSTRUCTION OF CHILE—BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3861) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we will call that bill up by motion later in the day.

I am informed there are reasons for not considering on a call of the calendar all order numbers from 1911 through the remainder of the calendar, and that will complete the call, because I will ask that they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will go over.

The bills ordered to be passed over are as follows:

S. 3524, a bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space.

H.R. 900, an act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability thereon.

H.R. 2178, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at the Whites Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.

H.R. 9377, an act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

H.R. 12530, an act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N.C.

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

H.R. 10346, an act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act so as to increase the rate of tax imposed on gross receipts from certain sales, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12563, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

S. 3681, a bill authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the west passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Chair to lay the unfinished business before the Senate, but I shall withhold the request, because we want to have tributes now.

I ask unanimous consent that the Chair not lay before the Senate the lead and zinc bill and that the unanimous-consent agreement not begin to operate until after we have completed the tributes to the minority secretary.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for 1 minute, for a brief insertion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to put into the RECORD a statement given this morning to the press by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House:

The Republicans prate of civil rights. The leitmotif is politics. The music is false and off key. Civil rights legislation cannot

be brought to any successful conclusion in the remaining few days of this short session—a session called to conclude business unfinished during the regular session, including minimum wage, Federal aid to education, medical aid to aged. The legislation will be time consuming. Any attempt at civil rights would get us involved in Republican intrigue and conservative Republican obstacles that would make the Congress just a political Donnybrook Fair. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I would not entertain any civil rights legislation this session.

That statement is from the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, making it perfectly obvious that any attempt to bring up civil rights will only stall the Senate and it will be impossible for this Congress to act on the matters for which we were called back.

EQUALITY VERSUS LIBERTY: THE ETERNAL CONFLICT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 1960 issue of the American Bar Association Journal carries a very important article entitled "Equality Versus Liberty: The Eternal Conflict," which was ably written by a very distinguished member of the Georgia Bar Association, Mr. R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga. In this article, Mr. Pittman has exploded the myth of human equality and pointed out that, far from being a part of the American creed, it is "the creed of Marxism and the come-on of communism." Mr. Pittman points out that there is no mention of human equality in the U.S. Constitution and, by very diligent research, he also casts new light upon the 18th century meaning of the statement from the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal." He further makes the point that men can be equal only in the sight of God and in their right to freedom and independence under law.

I have been so impressed, Mr. President, with the importance of having this article distributed as widely as possible throughout our Nation that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

EQUALITY VERSUS LIBERTY: THE ETERNAL CONFLICT

(By R. Carter Pittman, of the Georgia bar, Dalton)

(NOTE.—Mr. Pittman believes that the current emphasis upon "equality" is misconceived, in spite of many statements by responsible men that equality is a basic tenet of American Government. He argues that, by its very nature, equality is inimical to liberty and his research casts new light upon the 18th-century meaning of the Declaration of Independence's statement that "all men are created equal.")

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself," Alexander Hamilton.

During recent years many articles have appeared in learned journals in which it is stated in one way or another as a fundamental principle that America was founded upon the proposition or conceived in the philosophy that "all men are created equal." For a convenient text we quote from an article by Charles H. Davis, justice of the Illinois supreme court, appearing in the March 1959 issue of the American Bar Association Journal entitled "Constitutional Law: The States and the Supreme Court." While discussing various proposals to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, on page 311, he said:

"The worth of such proposals should be viewed in the light of a recurrence to the fundamental principles of our civil government. America was conceived in the philosophy 'That all men are created equal'."

Similar statements are to be found in speeches made or read by Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Members of the Congress. The doctrine of human equality has found its way into judicial decisions of our highest courts.

In its official report of September 9, 1959, the Civil Rights Commission asserted on page 3:

"The Declaration of 1776 recognized as the first principle of our independence that all men are created equal."

Vice Chairman Robert G. Storey and Commissioners John S. Battle and Doyle E. Carlton dissented, because "such assertions ignore historical fact" but, nevertheless, this assertion and others of like content were officially embodied in the report by vote of three to three and the dissent merely footnoted.

Many of the so-called civil rights bills introduced in the Congress in recent years recite as the basis and foundation for their provisions the doctrine that all men are equal.[1] Human equality was the doctrinal basis for *Brown* v. *Board of Education* of May 17, 1954, and subsequent integration decisions.[2]

American high school and college textbooks are loaded with equalitarian propaganda, all pointing to the Declaration of Independence equality clause as the American dream or the American ideal or the American creed. For example in "Democracy versus Communism" (1957) by Kenneth Colegrove and others, prepared under the auspices of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, as a high school text to explain the differences between democracy and communism (now widely used in American public schools) it is stated on page 31:

"The fathers of our Nation accepted as a basis for the Constitution the Declaration of Independence."

And on page 43:

"The Declaration of Independence states that 'all men are created equal,' and it means exactly what it says."

To appropriate the words of Justice Davis, the equalitarian doctrine itself "should be viewed in the light of a recurrence to the fundamental principles of our civil government." Given a little patience and an open mind the truth may be seen in such a light.

No one questions the right of all men to equal justice under law, but propagandists have carried the doctrine beyond equality of rights to equality of things, and men are heard to proclaim human equality who would revolt at the suggestion that all birds, all fish, all cattle, all dogs, or all racehorses are equal. Of course, all men are not created equal any more so than are all other members of the animal kingdom. Even if they are created equal, creation ends, when life begins, and life is always unequal. Nevertheless, we are told over and over again and again that all men are equal and the Declaration of Independence is cited as final authority.

THE DECLARATION IS NOT THE LAW

The Declaration of Independence never became living law in America, and no provision of the Federal Constitution or Bill of Rights can be traced to it and, as this article will demonstrate, its influence on State constitutions and bills of rights has been insignificant. It was written to serve the temporary purposes of a sanguinary conflict. It was and perhaps will ever be history's most effective piece of propaganda, but it neither grants nor protects human rights.

The first paragraph of the Declaration speaks of the necessity "for one people * * * to assume * * * the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature * * * entitle them," thus reaffirming the separate and equal station doctrine established by nature under which all great people have progressed throughout history. Then follows, "* * * all men are created equal," equating "one people" with "all men" and "created" with "laws of nature." No one who helped to write it or who voted to adopt it ever asserted the doctrine of human equality either before or after July 4, 1776, but the Declaration of Independence, like the Constitution, has "taken on new meaning" by the application of "new philosophy" and "modern authority."

At about the time when Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Robert Livingston, and Robert Sherman were named as a committee to write the Declaration of Independence, to accord with instructions from the Virginia Convention, which met in May 1776, George Mason's original draft of the Virginia declaration of rights was a popular subject of conversation in Philadelphia and all over America. A draft of 10 paragraphs of Mason's original was mailed to Richard Henry Lee by T. L. Lee from Williamsburg on May 25. It is among the "Mason Papers" in the Library of Congress at this time. The original was extended by Mason into the committee draft in 18 paragraphs and was reported on May 27 and published in Dixon's Virginia Gazette of June 1. It was published in Philadelphia newspapers on June 6, June 8, and June 12 of 1776.[3] It was published and republished in newspapers and magazines all over America and in England.[4]

Jefferson, to whom was assigned the task of writing the preamble to the Declaration

[1] For example, House Resolution 627 introduced by Mr. CELLER, a Member of Congress from Brooklyn, in 84th Cong., recited as its basis "the American principle of equality."

[2] "An American Dilemma" (1944) by Karl Gunnar Myrdal, cited by the Supreme Court as modern authority for its decision in the *Brown* case at 347 U.S. 494, defines the doctrine of human equality as "the highest law of the land" on p. 9, and on p. 14 "the philosophy that all men are created equal" is "the American creed."

In *New York State Commission Against Discrimination* v. *Pelham Hall Apartments, Inc.*, (10 Misc. 2d 334, 341; 170 N.Y.S. 2d 750, 757 (1958)), Justice Eager also treated the philosophy of human equality as the highest law of the land and upheld a clearly unconstitutional law banning discrimination in publicly assisted housing, saying:

"The private ownership of private property free of unreasonable restriction upon the control thereof, is truly a part of our way of life, but, on the other hand, we, as a people do hold firmly to the philosophy that all men are created equal."

For a critical discussion of the New York case see "Anti-Discrimination Legislation as an Infringement of Freedom of Choice," by Alfred Avins, 6 New York Law Forum, January 1960, 13, 16.

[3] Pennsylvania Evening Post, June 6; Pennsylvania Ledger, June 8; Pennsylvania Gazette, June 12.

[4] See, as examples: Maryland Journal, June 12; Maryland Gazette, June 13; New York Gazette, June 17. Among English publications it appeared in was the Remembrancer.

of Independence, took the first three paragraphs of Mason's original draft of the Virginia declaration of rights and rearranged and rephrased them to make a preamble for the Declaration of Independence.

The preamble for the proposed Virginia declaration of rights as published stated that it was the basis and foundation of government in Virginia. Its first paragraph was: "that all men are born equally free and independent and have certain inherent natural rights, of which they cannot, by any compact, deprive, or divest their posterity; among which are the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The Virginia convention, before officially adopting Mason's original or the committee draft, changed the first paragraph to read: [5]

"That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights of which when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Jefferson never saw that version until he returned to Virginia long after the Declaration of Independence was adopted. Jefferson's rendition from the Mason original was "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

EQUALITY ENDS AT BIRTH

So the basis and foundation of the first free government in America was equality of freedom and independence, while the Jefferson perversion was equality at creation. The Declaration of Independence does not say that all men are equal. It says that they were created equal. There equality ends.

All Americans thought alike on the subject in 1776. Benjamin Franklin, a few days after the Declaration was promulgated, helped to write a declaration of rights for the State of Pennsylvania. He copied Mason's original Virginia declaration of rights almost verbatim. His first paragraph was "that all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inalienable rights, amongst which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

So the basis and foundation of Franklin's government was the same as that of Mason's Virginia. It was equality of freedom and independence.

The Massachusetts declaration of rights contains the phrase "all men are born free and equal." The "Writings of John Adams" (vol. 4, p. 220) reveal that the original draft prepared by the committee of which John Adams was chairman, in 1779, exactly copied George Mason's original with the words "That all men are born equally free and independent."

Before the Massachusetts declaration was officially adopted John Adams embarked for France and on the 29th day of September 1779,[6] the convention struck out the word "equally" and the word "independent" and substituted for the word "independent" the word "equal" making the clause read as it now reads: "All men are born free and equal." John Adams was embittered by the change and, as we shall later see, had he been present it would not have occurred.[7] No other State adopted a human equality clause of any character until after 1835.

New Hampshire and North Carolina also copied Mason's original while not 1 of the 13 copied from the Declaration of Independence.

When the U.S. Constitution was under discussion at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in 1787 not 1 delegate from any of the 12 States represented suggested that "all men are equal" either at creation or in life. On June 26, 1787, on the floor of the Convention Alexander Hamilton, the patron saint of the Republican Party, said:

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself."

Apparently every mind in the Convention assented, because not a word may be found in all the "Notes of Debates" to indicate that any delegate believed in the doctrine of human equality in 1787.

So far as we have found, the doctrine of human equality was not suggested by any one in the battle that raged over ratification and a bill of rights. In the South Carolina Ratifying Convention of 1788, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, explained that one of the reasons why no bill of rights was adopted in Philadelphia which "* * * weighed particularly, with the members from this State" was that "such bills generally begin by declaring that all men are by nature born free. Now, we should make that declaration with a very bad grace, when a large part of our property consists in men who are actually born slaves." [8] If "born free" was rejected in Philadelphia, what chance would one expect for "created equal"?

The Constitution proclaims in its preamble that it was established "to * * * insure domestic tranquillity * * * and secure the blessings of liberty." Nowhere does it hint a purpose to insure or impose equality of men or things. The due process clause of the 5th and 14th amendments which render life, liberty and property immune from attack except by the orderly processes fixed by law, insure that American governments may not impose equality.

The bills of rights of 18 of the 48 contiguous States now use the Mason phrase, "equally free and independent" as set forth in Mason's original draft and that of Virginia's convention of June 12, 1776. Eight prefaced the phrase with the word "born," as Mason originally wrote it.[9] Ten use the exact words of the official Virginia convention draft, prefacing the phrase with the words "by nature," instead of the word "born." [10]

Arkansas uses the phrase "are created equally free and independent." Sixteen States have no equality clause whatever.[11]

The bills of rights of Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, and Nevada contain the clause: "all men are by nature free and equal," revealing the influence of both Mason's draft, the official draft, and the Declaration of Independence.

Connecticut and Oregon put it this way: "That all men when they form a social compact, are equal in rights."

Texas says the same thing except it substituted "have equal rights" for "are equal in rights."

Florida uses Aristotle's phrase, "equal before the law." [12]

Kansas guarantees "equal * * * rights," and Wyoming "equality of * * * rights."

Of the constitutions and bills of rights of the 48 States as of 1917 (the last available printing) only 2 use the equality clause of the Declaration of Independence. Those two are Indiana and North Carolina. It first appears in section 1 or article I of Indiana's bill of rights, adopted in 1851,[13] as follows:

"We declare that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Indiana, without deeming it necessary to change the equality clause of her bill of rights, amended her constitution in 1881 so as to prevent further migration of Negroes into the State and so as to deny suffrage to Negroes already in the State.[14]

The contrast between inequality necessarily implicit in the amendments, and the doctrine of equality at creation in the Bill of Rights did not seem to bother the people of Indiana at a time so recent as to be remembered by some now living.

The other State is North Carolina whose bill of rights of 1868, and now, recites in its first clause, "that we hold it to be self-evident that all men are created equal."

For decades after 1776 North Carolina's bill of rights proclaimed "that all men are born equally free and independent". There must surely be some explanation as to why people who had lived under maxims of George Mason since 1776 should suddenly change in 1868. The Constitution of 1868 was framed in a convention called under the reconstruction acts of Congress, by Major General Canby. It assembled at Raleigh January 14, 1868. Federal soldiers stood guard over the deliberations. The same equality clause was inserted in the bills of rights of many Southern States while the natural leaders of the white people were held at bay by Federal bayonets. See for examples, the Alabama bill of rights of 1867, the Louisiana bill of rights of 1868, South Carolina's of 1868 and Florida's of 1868.[15]

As is well known by those the least familiar with American history, shortly after the Federal troops were withdrawn, the white people of the South quickly expelled the carpetbaggers and subdued the scalawags and re-

---

[5] NOTE.—All quotations from State bills of rights and constitutions in this article may be found in "Thorpe's Charters and Constitutions" (1882), or "The State Constitutions," by Kettleborough. Thorpe contains all fundamental documents back of 1880 and Kettleborough those in force in 1917. Both are arranged alphabetically as to States and Thorpe is arranged chronologically as to each State.

[6] Journal of Massachusetts Constitutional Convention 1779, p. 37.

[7] NOTE.—Both John Adams and Thomas Jefferson died on the exact date of the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. A few days before his death a citizens committee of Quincy, Mass., requested Mr. Adams, then more than 90 years of age, to appear at a ceremony celebrating the Fourth and honoring him. He declined attendance because of feebleness, but when urged to do so he gave a toast to be presented on the Fourth and it was presented almost within his hearing, had he been able to hear, but he was in the articles of death. The toast was: "Independence forever." He refused to add another word.

In "I Works of John Adams," 635, his grandson, Charles Francis Adams, had this to say:

"In that brief sentiment Mr. Adams infused the essence of his whole character, and of his lifelong labors for his country."

[8] 4 Elliot's Debates, 316.

[9] Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin. See Kettleborough, supra.

[10] Alabama, California, Illinois, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey (Const.), North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia and West Virginia. (Nebraska, Nevada and New Jersey left out the word "equally"). Ibid.

[11] Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Indiana. (Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Washington.) Ibid.

[12] "Aristotle's Politics," V.

[13] 2 Thorpe, supra, 1073.

[14] Thorpe, supra.

[15] Ibid.

captured the State governments. Every one of those States, with one exception, promptly called a constitutional convention and adopted its constitution according to its own wishes in place of those imposed upon it by military might. All struck the doctrine of human equality from their constitutions, except North Carolina. Why North Carolina should have retained that doctrine in her bill of rights is a mystery. There it stands on parchment as a horrid fragment of feudal despotism imposed upon a proud and helpless people by superior force.

LINCOLN ON EQUALITY

In his famous Gettysburg Address in 1863, Lincoln recited from the Declaration of Independence in this context:

"Four-score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

At the hour when Lincoln made that speech the declaration of rights of his home State of Illinois proclaimed in the words of George Mason:

"That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, and of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness."

Lincoln's task in 1863 was much like Jefferson's in 1776. Equally they needed a phrase that would arrest the imagination and stir emotions. When Lincoln recited from the Declaration few remembered the phrase. For near a century before 1863 it was seldom mentioned. In 1863 as in 1776 it kindled a flame that spread. It aroused emotions of sympathy. That is the primary reason for and the most powerful result of propaganda. The maxim "all is fair in love and war" is not alone for Machiavelli.

Only a year before, on August 14, 1862, President Lincoln demonstrated that he was not an equalitarian. Speaking to a large group of Negro delegates in Washington, he said: [16]

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races.

"Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think. * * *

"Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated best, and the ban is still upon you. I cannot alter it if I would. * * * See our present condition—the country engaged in war, our white men cutting one another's throats, and then consider what we know to be the truth. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

The declaration of rights of California, home State of Chief Justice Warren, of the Supreme Court, is almost a verbatim copy of the official Virginia declaration of rights. It proclaims:

"All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing and protecting property; and pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."

No member of the Supreme Court can find support for equalitarianism in the fundamental laws of his home State.

The constitutions of the various republics of the world to be found in three volumes of Peaslee's "Constitutions of Nations," reveal that the doctrine of human equality has been universally rejected in the constitutions of the non-Communist world. The constitutions of a few Communist countries proclaim the doctrine of human equality but none of the living constitutions of free republics, so far as we have found, now proclaim or perpetuate that doctrine. As an interesting illustration, the Constitution of the Negro Republic of Liberia, adopted July 26, 1847, and still of force, which forbids the ownership of land by members of the white race, has as the first paragraph of its Bill of Rights almost the exact words of the George Mason original: [17]

"All men are born equally free and independent and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, among which are the rights of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."

Thirty-one of the constitutions of the nations of the world contain Aristotle's equality clause, as does Florida, to wit: [18]

"Equal before the law."

For all men to be "equally free and independent" they must be "equal before the law." There is no such thing as freedom and independence under men. It exists under law or not at all. The 14th amendment guarantee that no State shall deprive any citizen of "equal protection of the law," is but another way of expressing man's inherent right to equality of freedom and independence under law.

THE COMMUNIST KIND OF "EQUALITY"

The same concept of equality before the law is expressed, sometimes in the words of Mason, and sometimes in the words of Aristotle, and protected by safeguards in more than 70 of the 83 constitutions edited by Peaslee in 1950. Only four contain the concept of cultural, economic, or social equality that Myrdal found to be the "American creed." Those four are Guatemala,[19] the Mongol Peoples Republic,[20] the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,[21] and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[22]

Mongolia puts it this way: "Equal rights in all spheres of the state, economic, cultural, and sociopolitical."

Russia puts it this way: "Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R. irrespective of their nationality or race; in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political, and other public activity."

While Russia has partially succeeded in reducing most of her people to the level of degradation approaching cultural "equality," she has been careful not to interfere with the segregation practices and racial mores of her people. Even Russian despots have more sense than to atempt a thing like that.

In the summer of 1955 Justice Douglas and Robert F. Kennedy, an attorney for a Senate committee, toured Russia. Mr. Justice Douglas found something he didn't fully tell.[23] Mr. Kennedy spilled it in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, April 3, 1956. Here is a part:

"In every city that we visited there were two different school systems. There was one set of schools for the local children—those of a different color and race from the European Russian children. State and collective farms were operated by one group or the other, rarely by a mixture of both.

"Although work is supposedly being done to minimize the differences, many of the cities we visited were still split into two sections, with the finer residential areas being reserved for the European Russians. European Russians coming into the area receive a 30-percent wage preferential over local inhabitants doing the same jobs. The whole pattern of segregation and discrimination was as pronounced in this area as virtually anywhere else in the world."

A distinguishing feature of communism is that it never practices what it preaches. It always says one thing to distract attention as it does another.

Karl Gunnar Myrdal, whose book, "American Dilemma," is now corpus-juris-tertius and "modern authority" in the Supreme Court's pseudo-socio-law, defined the "American creed," on page 4 of his book, as the "fundamental equality of all men." On pages 4 and 9 he unwittingly copied Hamilton to admit that liberty and equality cannot coexist because, as he insists, there is an "inherent conflict" between them and "equality is slowing winning." After defining the "American creed" as "the fundamental equality of all men" he says that its "tenets were written into the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and into the constitutions of the several States. The ideals of the American creed have thus become the highest law of the land."

He must have known that the Federal Constitution and Bill of Rights and those of the States were written "to secure the blessings of liberty" and that neither says a word about securing human equality.

Myrdal is not the only one to try to make an equalitarian Marxist out of Jefferson. On one of the huge marble panels on the left as one enters the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C., is a fragment of one of Jefferson's sentences. As inscribed upon the panel the words are: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free."

As written by Jefferson there was no period, but there was a semicolon and the sentence continued: "nor is it less certain, that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government (the Jefferson Cyclopedia, p. 816).

---

[16] 8 "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln" (1905).

NOTE.—The predominance of persistent propaganda over seldom-told facts is illustrated by the popular and prevalent view of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of Jan. 1, 1863. But few know that the Proclamation applied only and expressly to "* * * persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof * * * [are] * * * in rebellion against the United States."

See U.S. Statutes at Large, vol. XII, 1268, 1269.

[17] 2 Peaslee, supra, 364.

[18] Albania, art. 12; Argentina, art. 28; Belgium, art 6; Brazil, art. 141; Bulgaria, art. 71: Burma, art. 13; China, art. 7; Costa Rica, art. 25; Cuba, art. 20; Czechoslovakia, sec. 1; Egypt, art. 3; El Salvador, art. 23; Finland, art. 15; Haiti, art. 11; Ireland, art. 40(12); Italy, art. 3; Japan, art. 14; Korea, art. 8; Lebanon, art. 7; Lichtenstein, art. 31; Luxembourg, art. 11; Monaco, art. 5; Nicaragua, art. 109; Panama, art. 21; Paraguay, art. 33; Rumania, art. 16; Switzerland, art. 4; Thailand, sec. 27; Turkey, art. 69; Uruguay, art. 8; Yugoslavia, art. 21.

See Peaslee, supra.

[19] Art. 23.

[20] Art. 79.

[21] Art. 103.

[22] Art. 123. (See "Constitutions of Nations," alphabetically arranged, by Peaslee (1950).

[23] In justice to Justice Douglas let it be said that whatever his racial views as between whites and blacks, he approves and justifies laws discriminating between whites and yellows and whites and reds, based on "racial traits."

See Douglas, "We the Judges" (1956), pp. 398–399.

That clause was deliberately left off that panel by some modern equalitarian.

On pages 12 and 13 Myrdal said:

"The worship of the Constitution * * * is a most flagrant violation of the American creed which is strongly opposed to stiff formulas."

On page 18 Myrdal finds judges and lawyers to be anathema to those indoctrinated with the American creed, saying:

"The judicial order is in many respects contrary to all their inclinations."

Naturally so, because liberty may not exist without a Constitution sustained, as written, by an emancipated judiciary selected for learning and honor. Equality may be established only where the judiciary is so prostituted that it will undermine that which its members take an oath to support.

WHY THE DECLARATION SAYS "CREATED EQUAL"

Why did Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams, the subcommittee that drafted the Declaration of Independence, use a phrase so susceptible to misuse and misconstruction as "all men are created equal"? The answer to that question is partially explained in the "Writings of John Adams." Prior to 1776 two half-demented philosophers of France, named Helvetius and Rousseau,[24] had maintained that "all men are equal," and had preached "the brotherhood of man." France was saturated with it. That philosophy had caught on with the simple-minded peasants and philosophers of France. Nothing appealed so powerfully to the ignorant French peasants as the doctrine that "all men are equal" or are brothers. To the peasant that meant that all men are kings. The slogan was echoed all over France: "Every man a king." The thought didn't occur to them that if all men are kings, then all might be peasants or slaves.

The Declaration of Independence recites that its purpose was "to enable the States to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." Those who wrote it and those who signed it knew that it was written for the principal purpose of bringing France into the Revolution on the side of America.[25] The war had been going on for a full year. America was in an unequal struggle for life over death. Washington had been at the head of America's armies a year before July 4, 1776. Washington's task looked hopeless. Jefferson's task was to win the case for America by writing a powerful preamble that would appeal to the hearts—not the minds of the French people. Since the doctrine of human equality had become a popular creed in France and since Helvetius and Rousseau were the prophets of that creed, Jefferson directed the Declaration at the hearts of the French people by declaring that "all men are created equal."

In their old age Thomas Jefferson and John Adams progresed from political rivals to bosom friends. On the 13th day of July 1813, Adams' mind went back to July 4, 1776, when he and Jefferson labored together in Philadelphia. He wrote to Jefferson that day: [26]

"Inequalities of mind and body are so established by God Almighty in his constitution of human nature, that no art or policy can ever plane them down to a level. I have never read reasoning more absurd, sophistry more gross, in proof of the Athanasian creed, or transsubstantiation, than the subtle labors of Helvetius and Rousseau to demonstrate the natural equality of mankind. Jus cuique, the Golden Rule, do as you would be done by, is all the equality that can be supported or defended by reason or common sense."

About a year later, on the 15th day of April, 1814, John Adams wrote to John Taylor of Virginia.[27]

"Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man. I believe that none but Helvetius will affirm, that all children are born with equal genius.

"That all men are born to equal rights is true. Every being has a right to his own, as clear, as moral, as sacred, as any other being has. This is as indubitable as a moral government in the universe. But to teach that all men are born with equal powers and faculties, to equal influence in society, to equal property and advantages through life, is as gross a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of the people, as ever was practiced * * * by the self-styled philosophers of the French Revolution. For honor's sake, Mr. Taylor, for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it."

Much has been falsely written and more has been mistakenly said about the influence of the human equality doctrine of the Declaration of Independence on France. We may not complete the story about America without telling the story of France.

In 1783 Benjamin Franklin translated and prepared for publication a French edition of the Declaration of Independence and all American State bills of rights and constitutions adopted up to that time, including the committee draft of Virginia's declaration of rights and constitution, both written by George Mason—but not the official draft of the Virginia declaration which Franklin did not have because it was not published in any form for distribution outside of Virginia until well into the 1800's. As is well known, that book greatly influenced the French Revolution.[28] In August 1789 France adopted the celebrated French Declaration of Rights which copied much from those published by Franklin.

Since Helvetius and Rousseau had been the prophets of the creed of equalitarianism one would expect the French Declaration of 1789 to have asserted the doctrine that "all men are created equal," as did the Declaration of Independence. But, instead of following Helvetius, Rousseau or the Declaration of Independence, France rephrased George Mason's original and asserted as the first paragraph of her Declaration language which, when translated back into English, comes out: "Men are born and always continue free and equal in respect of their rights." Her Declaration then defines "the natural and imprescriptible rights of man" as "liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression." [29]

The French Revolution teaches that liberty does not reside in the power of the majority to run the state but it lies rather in the security of a minority from the arbitrary exertion of the majority exercising the powers of the state. In that bath of blood equality finally became the revolutionary creed. The nobility was leveled to the middle class and finally the middle class was leveled to the proletarian. The attempt to create a classless society resulted in the complete suppression of liberty. Power now moved smoothly over a level plateau. The promised liberty and freedom of the French people vanished in the dead sea of equality.

THE FRENCH DECLARATION A PERVERTED DOCTRINE

The French Declaration of August 1789 was superseded by the French Declaration of June 1793. The latter repealed and annulled the doctrine of George Mason and turned back to the perverted doctrine of Helvetius and Rousseau to recite that "all men are equal by nature." It defined the "natural and inalienable" rights of men as "equality, liberty, security, and property." [30] At last France was ready for the motto of state originally proposed by Antoine François Momoro: "Liberté, Egalite, Fraternité."

It was not until the year 1940 that that cluster of inconsistencies was stricken from the tricolor of France. It was not until September 28, 1946, that France abandoned the Declaration of Rights of 1793 and went back to that of 1789. The French National Constituent Assembly in 1946 returned to George Mason and sanity in government, with this grand statement: [31]

"On the morrow of the victory of the free peoples over the regimes that attempted to enslave and degrade the human person, the French people * * * solemnly reaffirms the rights and freedoms of man and of the citizen consecrated by the declaration of rights of 1789 and of the fundamental principles recognized by the laws of the Republic."

The only revolutions that better the lot of man are those that revolve back to fundamental principles and proved maxims under which man has enjoyed equality of freedom and independence. Those are the mellowed fruits of historic experience gathered in her Gardens of Gethsemane. At last France "turned back the clock" from a despotism tempered with epigrams to a government in which powers are limited.

In his "Essays on Freedom and Power" (1943 edition), page 154, Lord Acton had this to say about the effects of the doctrine of equality in the French Revolution:

"The deepest cause which made the French Revolution so disastrous to liberty was its theory of equality * * * With this theory of equality, liberty was quenched in blood and Frenchmen became ready to sacrifice all other things to save life and fortune."

Speaking on Charter Day at the University of California on March 23, 1907, Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, had this to say: [32]

"The political and social anarchy which Lord Acton described must be the inevitable result whenever the passion for economic equality overcomes the love of liberty in men's breasts. For the state is founded upon justice, and justice involves liberty, and liberty denies economic equality; because equality of ability, of efficiency, and even of physical force are unknown among men."

The American Revolution was kept under control by constitutions that limited power in order to preserve liberty. Virginia's bill of rights and constitution were both written before the Declaration of Independence. All of the 13 States immediately followed the example and adopted new governments.

---

[24] See: 1 Thomas E. Watson's "Story of France" (1918), vol. I, p. 680 et seq.; vol. II, p. 18 et seq., for examples of mental derangements. As fast as his wife gave birth to children, Rousseau packed them off to foundling hospitals. He would not be bothered in his zeal to preach "equality, love, brotherhood, and happiness." Helvetius, the great leveler, employed 24 men with guns and dogs to pull down the wretched hovels of peasants along the borders of his forested estate to guard against intrusions and to guard his hated person.

[25] 2 "Writings of John Adams," p. 486. Becker, "The Declaration of Independence" (1940), p. 129.

[26] 10 "Writings of John Adams," 53.

[27] Ibid., vol. VI, p. 453.

[28] See 8 "Wigmore on Evidence" (3d ed.) 303, quoting from the writer's "History of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination," 21 Virginia Law Review (1935) 763.

[29] Peaslee, "Constitutions of Nations" (1950), vol. II, p. 21.

[30] Lieber "Civil Liberty" (1880), p. 532.

[31] Peaslee, supra, vol. II, p. 8.

[32] 8 "Modern Eloquence" (1928) 54.

The French Revolution went out of control when it subordinated the liberties of men to the power of a government immediately responsive to equalitarian mobs. Unbridled power and liberty are in eternal enmity. As Lord Acton said, "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely" and again, "A nation can never abandon its fate to an authority it cannot control."

When equality displaced liberty as the creed of the French Revolution, the libertarians, Turgot and Necker and Lafayette were replaced by the more radical Barnave, Condorcet, and Mirabeau. In due course these were turned out by the more radical Girondins. They in their turn fell—with heads off—before the ruthless Jacobins. When the egalitarian Jacobins became supreme, the more violent devoured the others. As Camille Desmoulins, who had whipped the Paris mobs into a frenzy at the Palais Royale and the Bastille, rode trussed in a cart on his journey to lay his brilliant head under the fatal knife, he cried out to the mob:

"Don't you remember me? Won't you save me? I am Camille. It was I who started this. It was I who plucked from the tree in the garden of the Palais Royale the first green badge of revolution."

Vain was his plea in a limitless government of equalitarian flesh. He and Danton, who had helped send the moderates to the scaffold, suffered the same fate and were in turn replaced by Marat, Robespierre, Billaud, and other extreme radicals. In his turn Robespierre too was passed on the road—the road to execution.

In "Camille Desmoulins and His Wife," Jules Claretie [translated by Mrs. Cashel Hoey, London, 1876] at page 377, writes the epitaph of Camille—and the liberty he thought might coexist with equality:

"The liberty of which Camille dreamed, that liberty which was the daughter of Athens reared under the sky of Gaul, liberty alike elegant and affable, is still far off. Until now we have preferred equality to liberty. We have let fall the substance for the shadow. What matters it to me that I am the equal of him who is not free? What matters it to me that I share the rights of one whose right it is to grovel? But equality fascinates, like a chimera, while liberty requires a loftier worship. This is the easy seduction of the one and the eternal charm of the other.

"Let us then love and prefer, above all, the liberty which makes men honest and nations great. Let us love her, despite her excesses, and in order to hinder her excesses. A free people knows not the fury of nations that break their fetters and are but unchained from time to time. Slaves only flock to the Saturnalia."

When the storm of equalitarian terror passed over the horizon of French history, there were those in America interested to know what had become of those many French devotees of liberty who had fought in the American Revolution. Here is a part of what they learned: The Duc de Lauzun went to the scaffold and so did Victor de Broglie. Barbé-Marbois, a friend of Jefferson, found safety in obscurity. Alexandre de Beauharnais was beheaded. Ethis de Corny, the friend of Washington and Hamilton, lost his mind over the excesses of the Revolution before dying mad. Custine, who distinguished himself at Yorktown was sent to the scaffold. Arthur Dillon went to his death with these words on his lips: "Vive le Roi." D'Estaing, the great French admiral, whose life story was told by Alexander Lawrence in "Storm Over Savannah" (University of Georgia Press, 1951) was guillotined. Lafayette, shocked and heartbroken by the excesses of the Revolution, left France to be cast as a prisoner of state into a dungeon at Olmutz. Charles de Lameth, who was wounded at Yorktown, fled the country. So did Alexandre and Theodore de Lameth. Montesquieu, the grandson of the great political philosopher, was forced to flee for safety. The Comte de Rochambeau was saved from the guillotine only by the fact that his son was an outstanding leader in the French Army. This is only a part of the story as to a part of those who helped America win its freedom. It is briefly told by Lewis Rosenthal in "America and France" (1882), page 271 et seq. It is more fully told in the "General and Universal Biographies of France."

John Adams was in France during her Revolution and knew this story firsthand when he wrote to John Taylor in 1814 about the doctrine of equality:

"For honor's sake, Mr. Taylor, for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it."

It is no wonder that he described that doctrine as a "gross fraud" and a "glaring imposition." James Madison, Charles W. Eliot, Henry James, Edmund Burke, John Morley, and hundreds of others have exposed the specious thing, but it lives on.

SOCIAL EQUALITY: A COMMUNIST TOOL

At the Eighth Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow in 1928, methods to be used to destroy true representative government by free people were fully discussed. It has been revealed over and over again [33] that advocacy of "social equality" among diverse races was there agreed upon as the surest method for the destruction of free governments in America and elsewhere. Since class hatred is the sure-fire Communist weapon to bring about internal strife and finally revolution, Moscow adopted the slogan, "all men are equal" for the contest that has already done more harm to America than can ever be repaired.

The sheer weight and effectiveness of the Communist propaganda is appalling. It is in full swing in Africa. The January 1960, issue of the South African Observer, published in Cape Town, South Africa, has an editorial entitled "The Heresy of Human Equality." The first paragraph tells a story that is old in America:

"The most mischievous falsehood in Communist propaganda released in Africa is that all men are born equal."

It is equality of freedom and independence that gives unto man his opportunity to be rich or poor or to be good or bad. Equality of men leaves no choice, because if all men are equal by nature or inherently there can can be no differences and no distinctions. All have an equal right to stand at the judgment bars of God and man but all are not entitled to the same judgment. Virtue and depravity are not entitled to the same rewards on earth or in Heaven.

It is inequality that gives enlargement to religion, to intellect, to energy, to virtue, to love, and to wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes all men poor. Equality of religion destroys all creeds. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of virtue suspends all men without the gates of Heaven. Equality of love stultifies every manly passion, destroys every family altar, and mongrelizes the races of men. Equality homogenizes so that cream does not rise to the top. It puts the eagle in the henhouse so that he may no longer soar. It subverts civilization by encouraging the Hottentot to claim equal footing with the cultured and intellectual in any scheme of social administration.

[33] As an example, the March 1956, issue of the National Republic magazine carries an excellent article on the subject.

Equality of freedom cannot exist without inequality in the rewards and earned fruits of that freedom. There can be no equality of freedom, without leaving to all men a free and lawful choice of the "means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness" as Mason had it when Jefferson, like the gypsy, first defaced and then claimed as his own.

It is inequality that makes "the pursuit of happiness" something more than a dry run or a futile chase. It is inequality that makes the race. It is the father of every joy and the giver of every good gift. More than 2,000 years ago Aristotle said: "Equality may exist only among slaves." Slavery is the end result of leveling. In the fruitless effort to achieve equality short of slavery the peaks must be bulldozed into the valleys to make a level plain. Such may be done only through the process now called "social engineering" which holds that the end justifies the means. Those means must ever be force, restriction, terror, and a complete loss of liberty.

Equality may be imposed only in a despotism. Equality beyond the range of legal rights is despotic restraint. It is nowhere sought to be imposed except in the communistic sewers of Slavic slavery. As Francis Lieber pointed out in his great work on "Civil Liberty" (p. 334) 100 years ago: "Equality absolutely carried out leads to communism."

The prophecy is now being realized in America. It is not the "American creed." It is the creed of Marxism and the come-on of communism.

TRIBUTES TO MARK TRICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if my estimate of time is correct, it was 44 years ago that a youngster showed up in this Chamber in knee pants. Certainly, if the custom prevailed here that prevailed out home, so far as juvenile apparel is concerned, he must have been in knee pants. His name was Mark Trice, and he came here as a page to the U.S. Senate.

I said yesterday, in a little ceremony in the course of which we honored him, that I have always been entranced with his name. On the Mississippi River, when the old steamboats went up and down, and there was danger of lodging on a sand bar, a man was stationed in front with a sounding line. One could hear him call in the day and in the night, "Mark one," or "Mark two," or "Mark trice."

But, instead of "two" he said "twain." That is how Samuel Langhorne Clemens, the great humorist, got his name. Mark Twain was a pilot on the Mississippi; so nobody really knows him by the name of Clemens; they know him by the name of Mark Twain. So I think of that trilogy and of the time when Mark Trice came here in knee pants 44 years ago. About him there has been such a record of fixity and stability in a rather feverish and accelerated age. Today people want to go in all directions, find new employment, find greener pastures. Once in the railroad station in Cincinnati I went up to the ticket clerk. The place was packed. Everybody was full of fever and excitement. I said to the ticket agent, "Where are all these people going?" He looked at me with a cynical smile and said, "Anywhere from here." That was characteristic.

When examples of fixity, stability, devotion, and dedication to purpose come along I like to make note of it.

Mark Trice showed up here 44 years ago, and except for a hiatus he has been serving the Senate of the United States ever since that time. Senators may come and Senators may go, but, like Tennyson's brook, Mark Trice stays on forever. Somehow he does not get to look any older. I do not know what is his secret. If he sneaks away occasionally to drink at that famous fount in Florida allegedly discovered by Ponce de Leon, I wish to know about it, and I would like to give him a jug, to bring back some for me, to maintain a youthful appearance.

With his youth there has been a vigor, an agility, a dexterity of mind, a touch and a capacity for service which is unexcelled in anyone I ever knew. I wonder what we would do without folks like Mark Trice. I can call him up and ask him a question, and he always has the answer. We who are the window dressing, by virtue of what the electors back home said when they sent us here, would find our efforts pretty much enfeebled if it were not for people like Mark Trice, who stand in the shadow and who serve, who have a sense of dedication and a sense of mission.

I said yesterday that Mark came here in the 64th Congress, and I urged him to write a book. I wanted the title of the book to be, "Senators Who Have Known Me." That would be a great title. Think of all the Senators who would be listed. Henry Cabot Lodge, the grandfather of the present nominee for the Vice Presidency on the Republican ticket. Oscar Underwood, of Alabama. George Norris, of Nebraska. Robert Marion La Follette, whose plaque we dedicated earlier in the session. Bob Taft, peerless leader from Ohio. There would be ever so many in that galaxy, going back to the 64th Congress.

Mark, this is personal with me. I give you a salute and a tribute for your devotion to duty, for devoting yourself to the affairs of the Senate and the Senators. What you have been doing has been to serve your country nobly, faithfully, and well. Deep is our affection, high is our esteem, wide is our admiration for the work you have done and for the service you have rendered. It is so fitting, so proper, and so merited that the Members of this body should acclaim you and pay tribute to you for your long service.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to join with the distinguished minority leader in paying tribute to our good friend and able coworker, Mark Trice. The fine salute which the minority leader has given to him, which I know is echoed by all of the Members on our side, and indeed by all on the other side of the aisle, demonstrates the high regard in which he is held by every Member of this body.

I can speak with particular affection about Mark, because he has been extremely helpful to me, as a very pea green freshman Member of the Senate, in pointing out to me the "whys" and "wherefores," the "do's" and "don'ts," of this august body. He has gone out of his way to inform me about what goes on. I only hope I can prove to be an apt pupil in the days ahead.

Mr. President, one of the fine things about Mark, who is called upon from time to time to know how we are likely to vote on a measure, is that he asks the question and stops there. As is known, there are occasions when the Republicans on this side of the aisle do not vote as a unit. The distinguished minority leader, our dear friend from Illinois, might ask how a Member is going to vote, and he might put just the tiniest bit of what might be called pressure on that Member to endeavor to persuade him that he should vote a certain way, and that is perfectly proper. It is part of the process of government. Mark is extremely considerate in this regard. He knows we come from different parts of the country. We have our own problems. We all have issues which are of particular interest in our own States. He is one of the most considerate men I have ever encountered during my service either in the Senate or in the other body.

Mr. President, people often overlook the vital role in government played by those who work behind the scenes in the U.S. Senate. Actually, few people have a greater impact on the course of events than persons situated as Mark Trice is situated in this body. Naturally, he has a greater impact when the Republicans have a majority in the Senate, but he at all times has a firm grasp of what is going on and a very determinative voice in what is done.

Mr. President, Mark has performed his duties as secretary to the minority with the distinction and diligence which is born of 44 dedicated years of service in the Senate. I am delighted, honored, and pleased to join with our distinguished minority leader in paying this so well deserved tribute to Mark. As we look at him and observe his eternally youthful expression, we realize he will be here, and we will be happy to have him here, for many years to come. I wish for him, for his lovely wife and family, every pleasure, happiness, and satisfaction in the years ahead.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I take great pride in being a Member of the U.S. Senate. One of the justifications for that pride is the caliber of the employees of the U.S. Senate. I do not speak of majority employees or minority employees—I speak of employees of the Senate.

It has been my pleasure and my profit to have worked for more than 12 years with Mark Trice. I know of no employee of this body who is more loyal to his party, more dedicated to serving it, and more efficient in doing so, than Mark Trice. On the other hand, Mr. President, I do not think there is any one of us who know him who does not recognize that his country always comes first. I think it is a great tribute to him that he realizes that this country, which belongs to all of us, has problems of such magnitude that they cannot be handled by any one party. We have enough problems for both parties, for the leadership of both parties, for the employees of both parties.

I find that I get great comfort and strength from the efficiency, the loyalty, and the friendship of members of the minority and of those who direct the destinies of the minority.

I think without their assistance, without their cooperation, and without their patriotism and love of country the wheels of the Senate would be brought to a standstill and the great democratic form of government in which we take such pride would be subject to unfavorable reflection throughout the world.

Mark Trice has made a great contribution to the Senate as an institution. I take great pride in calling him my friend. I think the Senate is better because of his service here.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I feel that, in a sense, I can speak of Mark Trice and his service from a little different viewpoint than can almost any other Senator, because I happen to be an alumnus of that school of service as a servant of the Senate. Thirty-eight years ago I came to this body as an assistant clerk of one of the Senate committees, and for 4 years I served as an attaché of this body. That was some years after Mark Trice had commenced his service. My acquaintance with him then was slight, but having served with him 38 years ago, and knowing from my own experience of some of the trials, tribulations, problems, and tasks of those who daily assist the Senate in the discharge of its functions, I feel a peculiar satisfaction in joining the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader and other Members of the Senate at this time in saying a word of appreciation of Mark Trice.

My next acquaintance with Mark Trice was when I came here as a freshman Senator. As has been stated, it was one of his duties to assist in breaking in, guiding, and teaching some of the fundamentals to new Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. There were seven of us freshmen Senators when I came, and we met with Mark Trice regularly to be coached on some of the things that were useful and necessary for us to know regarding the rules and procedures.

In the years in which my friendship and admiration for Mark Trice have deepened and ripened I have observed two or three things about him which in my opinion make him an invaluable member of the staff of the Senate—invaluable to all Senators, not merely Republican Senators.

In the first place, Mark possesses knowledge. Beginning as a page and working up through long years of service, he is almost a walking encyclopedia, not only of knowledge of the rules of the Senate and its procedures, but of how its business is and should be conducted, of the necessary courtesies and the necessary methods to be pursued by Senators.

That knowledge has been shared with generations of freshman Senators throughout the years. Words cannot express that contribution.

In the second place, and even more important, Mark has complete loyalty. Senators are only human, and while we should not advertise our own defects, it is useless to try to conceal all of them. There come periods in the conduct of Senate affairs when Senators are tired and exhausted and times when it is hard for Senators to retain their completely calm approach to their tasks. Complications arise as between Senators. While it has been my observation that on the other side of the aisle there is complete harmony at all times and never any conflict of personalities, on the Republican side of the aisle, we being individualists, there are at times certain inevitable conflicts of personalities.

Mark Trice is the confidant of every Senator on this side of the aisle. I assure the Senate that not once in all the years of his service has the confidence of a Senator been violated, nor has he by word or sign transmitted to anyone else anything he may have heard from a Senator who had spoken under stress of emotion.

He is the soul of honor in dealing with Senators. When he comes to one of us and inquires as to how we intend to vote, we know he will not transmit that knowledge to anyone against our wishes. That is important. He could not have continued all these years without that characteristic.

Moreover, he is armed with an unusual degree of tact. I think he must carry a bottle of soothing syrup in his pocket at all times, because when we are working under pressure, at times the conflict of personalities mentioned is bound to occur, and the influence of Mark Trice has always been a steadying influence.

He is unobtrusive. I suspect the proceedings today are most painful to him. I say that sincerely. He is unobtrusive, but quietly, efficiently, and effectively he works to keep the Senators as a team working in harmony and in mutual understanding.

Mr. President, of my friend these many years, on this occasion I wish to paraphrase the couplet of Fielding and say:

God bless you, Mark Trice, may you live
a thousand years—
To guide us on our pathway through this
weary vale of tears,
And may we live a thousand, too, a thousand less one day,
For we would not want to be on earth the
day you passed away.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished majority leader, and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in congratulating and commending Mark Trice on 44 years of faithful service in the Senate of the United States.

To think that a man like Mark could rise from a page boy to his present position is a mark of his devotion to this body, to the institution which he represents so well, and for which he works so capably and energetically. I was unfortunate in not being able to know him during the first 36 years of his service, but I consider myself extremely fortunate to have that honor during the past 8 years of my service in this body. Mark has been good to Democrats as well as to Republicans, because he has been fair, he has been responsible, he has been tolerant, and he has been understanding. So I deem it a great honor to have this opportunity to pay my respects to a great man and to commend him for the devotion to duty and the responsibility that he has always shown and the tolerance and understanding which are hallmarks of his character.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Republican policy committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a good friend and a great public servant. Mark Trice was one of the men I met 24 years ago when I first came to the Senate. He has been performing his functions efficiently ever since. He has maintained a friendship not only with me but with every Republican Senator who has come to this body. I can say that because I am the oldest Republican in point of service in the Senate. As a matter of fact, I am one of the oldest Senators in point of service.

We have many fine officials in the Senate. But Mark Trice not only stands out, but ranks with any of his predecessors over the years.

Mark Trice came to the Senate as a page. He has been a part of the 20th century, having been born in 1902. Since coming here as a page he has held a great many responsible positions in the Senate. I have known him in various of these positions. Perhaps his greatest service was performed when he was Assistant Sergeant at Arms, in the position which he now holds as secretary to the minority, and the office he held for 2 years as Secretary of the Senate.

In Mark Trice we have found a willing and friendly counselor. In Mark Trice we have found a sterling public servant, a courageous man, who has helped make the Senate what it is today.

One of the reasons why the Senate is by tradition a great institution today in the way it carries on its functions is not only because of the character of the Senators who serve as Members, but because of the men who serve with the Senators in various capacities.

I pay my tribute to Mark Trice as a great friend, as a great public servant, as an asset to the U.S. Senate, and as a credit to the American Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as our country has grown in size and in people and in greatness, so, too, has the Government of our country grown in size and in complexity. Actually, the Federal Government is a tremendous political and governmental machine. Here in the Senate itself is an important and involved mechanism for the production of legislation in the interest of the people. Those who come here from all over the Nation to listen to the debate and proceedings in the Senate do not see the machinery as it works. One great American President, some years ago, said about career people in Government, devoted to public service, as having "a passion for anonymity."

We honor today one who for over 40 years has helped make the machinery of the U.S. Senate function and function well.

Last night the Republican Senators were happy to participate in a reception for the secretary to the minority. All of us thoroughly enjoyed the comments of our friend, the able minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, as he paid tribute to Mark Trice, his wife and their daughter, and recalled the 40 years during which Mark Trice has served the people of America. He recalled the names of some great Senators who sat in this Chamber, and whose needs were ministered to by Mark in one capacity or another, as he proceeded from his original tasks as a page through various other posts, and finally became Secretary of the Senate, when the Republicans had a majority here a few years ago.

Those were pleasant recollections for our leader to recall, and surely we all thrilled to the enriching experience he has enjoyed, and the high public service he has rendered all these years.

Once I heard the President say that he saluted the esprit de corps among the members of the minority in this session of Congress. We have had, indeed, an esprit de corps, which has made us on this side of the aisle endeavor as best we can to be devoted to the public interest. In our endeavors, it has been this kind of fellow who has helped us achieve whatever success we have had in this Congress, and in all the years before.

So, officially as a Member of the Senate, to our very able secretary of the minority, and personally as one friend to another, I am glad to join with my Republican colleagues and with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who likewise hold Mark Trice in high esteem, and say to you, Mark, dedicated, forthright, able, industrious public servant and friend, Godspeed on this great anniversary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it gives me more than the usual amount of pleasure to have an opportunity to say a good word for a good friend and able associate. It gives me more than the usual amount of pleasure to participate in the felicitations to Mark Trice. It is a source of never ceasing wonder to me that in this supercharged political atmosphere known as the U.S. Senate—and for that matter we can bicamerally embrace the other body as well—we are constantly surprised and always gratified by the fact that we have really established some records of longevity in public service which are hard to duplicate anyplace else in any other government in this world.

I first had it brought to my attention as a Member of the House in talking one time to a great American, William Tyler Page, the author of the American's Creed. He told me that he had come here, I believe, like Mark Trice, as a

page. At any rate, he came here as a very young man. If I recall, he served continuously in Congress for 58 years.

In 58 years, or in 40 years, in the pendulumatic movement of American politics, there are many shifts of majorities and many shifts of ideological approaches. I think it is fine that we have here, in this tradition, a man of capacity, character, and stature like Mark Trice, like William Tyler Page continuing to serve the institution, regardless of which political party may be in charge of the institution temporarily, because the institution of Congress and of the Senate goes on and on and on. Sometimes it is led by one party, sometimes by the other party. Sometimes it is divided almost evenly. But it is good to know that we have people like Mark Trice who serve the institution, and the people who make it up, and who fulfill their obligation to the party which, after all, is, in a sense, their employer, in such a manner that they maintain and hold the respect of the other half—or, in this case, unfortunately, the other two-thirds—of the United States Senate who happen to belong to a different party.

Our Parliamentarian, Charlie Watkins, has been here 56 years. He is catching up with William Tyler Page.

Mark Trice sits here with something of an expanding forehead and a receding hairline, but is still young in spirit and vigorous in body. Certainly if he continues his meticulous habits, as he has in the past, perhaps he can exceed the record of William Tyler Page. I hope Charlie Watkins does the same.

Mark Trice combines capacity and courage with a sense of gracious thoughtfulness which one likes to attach to public servants generally. Normally we have them in the United States Senate. We have them on both sides of the aisle.

I think it was quite appropriate, and I know he was entirely sincere, when the distinguished assistant majority leader spoke up, as Senator Mansfield did, to share in the tributes which we who are Republicans are paying now to Mark Trice, because Mark Trice has that thoughtfulness and that consideration for others which tends to mark superior public service, whether it is as an employee of the Senate or as a Member of the Senate, or whether it happens to be as a member of an executive commission or some executive board.

We expect, in America, to have high capacity and great ability and efficiency on the part of public servants. When we get all of those attributes, plus a smile, plus thoughtful consideration, plus the warmth of friendship, then we have obtained the optimum in public service in this country. We have that in the person of Mark Trice.

I should like to reciprocate what the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said by saying that we have it not only in Mark Trice and Bill Brownrigg and Charlie Watkins, not only among the political appointees of the Senate who serve a party, but we have it in those who serve the Senate generally.

So, speaking as a Republican, I think we are fortunate in our choice, for example, of Sergeant at Arms. Joe Duke has the same capacity as Mark Trice to deliver the goods with a smile; to be considerate of the other fellow; to move efficiently along the line of his duties, while, at the same time, dealing equitably with those who are members of his party or who are not.

I think that perhaps Mark Trice, who has been here so long, should receive some credit for the fact that by his example he has inspired other employees of the Senate who have been here not quite so long to give that kind of service. Perhaps, in turn, Mark Trice owes a debt of gratitude to Charlie Watkins, who manifests the same kind of generous service. Perhaps Charlie Watkins learned something from William Tyler Page. So it goes. Nevertheless, the tradition is here, and we are paying tribute today to Mark Trice who exemplifies the fine qualities which are demonstrated by the attachés of the Senate so completely and so thoroughly.

I value Mark Trice not only for his solicitude, his friendship, and his efficient service, but because he is a good guy. He is a great human being. He is the kind of fellow you like to have around. He is a warmhearted friend.

I value him because of his choice of a wife. I think Margaret is one of the most admirable ladies in Washington. She gets around and makes friends, because she is a friendly person. She is a good holder of a checkrein on Mark, when a checkrein becomes necessary. Mark and Margaret and their charming daughter are popular people in the Nation's Capital. They deserve that popularity because of the kind of folks they are.

So, Mark, if you do not quite make the thousand years which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] suggests you might reach, I hope that at least you make half as long as that and will still be here when you reach that ripe old age.

Congratulations and felicitations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I came to the Senate in January 1955 and have had the pleasure of knowing Mark Trice since that time. I did not enjoy the pleasure of knowing him prior to that.

He has impressed me as being a public servant of the highest standard. The contacts I have had with Mark Trice have always been of a friendly nature. He has impressed me as being a man dedicated and devoted to his duties, a man who is interested in the welfare of the country, a man of high character and integrity, a man full of energy and interest, one who has the zeal and enthusiasm to do good and efficient work for his Government, his country, and his fellow man.

It is a pleasure for me today to join in these tributes to my friend, a friend of the Nation, and a friend of the Senate—Mark Trice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate a little more than 15 years ago, one of the first persons I met was Mark Trice. Through all the years since then, he has been of tremendous help to me. Day after day, when the going gets rough, when we want to consult with someone, Mark is most helpful. I have never known a public servant who has been more honest, conscientious, and devoted to his work than Mark Trice.

It is a bit unusual for one to serve in a body such as this for more than 40 years. It is an accomplishment of which anyone can be proud. I do not know of anyone who has ever served in this body who has had more friends than he.

One day, when I shall leave the Senate, voluntarily or otherwise, I shall always remember him as one of the most unforgettable characters I have ever known, and there have been many outstanding people serving in the Senate during this time.

I hope Mark will have many more years of good health and happiness, and that he will be able to serve the Senate many years more. I never had a better and more loyal friend.

In paying tribute to Mark, I wish to pay my respects, also, to his very lovely wife, Margaret, and his daughter, Linda.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been sitting here happily listening to the statements of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in tribute to Mark Trice. I think all the words of praise and appreciation which any of us could have used have been employed in the last half hour. I wish I could put the same words together so as to indicate and to paint an adequate word picture of Mark Trice with them. I had the opportunity to express myself last night in a different way.

It seems to me that the essence of the character and attitude of Mark Trice is gentleness. It is a kind of unobtrusive service which, in itself, is completely sincere.

In a body where there is much attempted flamboyance, the use of pressure, and the development of an image power, we have in Mark Trice a man who goes about his tasks quietly, simply, and with great responsibility; who has a constant attitude of friendship for those with whom he works; and a warmth which all of us feel and appreciate.

My tribute today is paid to this man, who is kindly and gentle, who has an attitude of service in the true sense of the word, and who desires to help everyone else without any first consideration of what he will get out of it. That is the Mark Trice whom I have come to know and to appreciate in many official and unofficial relationships.

I am glad Mark Trice has been here for 40 years. I hope he will be with us a good many more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a man who has served in this grist mill, from page to secretary of the minority, for 40 years, and has kept his good humor, his sense of balance, and his health, and has lost only his hair, certainly is a real fellow. That is Mark Trice.

He is always pleasant. I have known him for 21 years. He is always ready to be of service.

Of course, as is true of all of us, much of the credit is due—as has been suggested—to his using such good judgment in selecting his wife and having his beautiful daughter. They are lovely people.

One thing about Mark, as everyone calls him, is that he is always on the job. That is a wonderful attribute in Washington. Furthermore, he is always efficient. I wish there were more like him in that respect. No matter what may be the problem, he is always helpful, cooperative, and pleasant.

Someone said of him, "He is always there with a helpful hand when he is needed." I do not know of any better compliment than that.

All of us wish for him continued good health and continued joy that comes from service and the giving of self. May he and his good wife and daughter find in the years ahead what they deserve; and I am sure that in their case it will be a happy, healthful, wonderful life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the chairman of the Republican conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, although perhaps I cannot compete in oratorical ability with some of the Senators who already have addressed the Senate, certainly I can compete very favorably as regards the strong feeling of friendship I have for the gentleman who assists all of us on this side of the aisle and is the friend of every Member of this body.

I have known Mark Trice during 14 years of his service in this body. He is always helpful and objective; yet he never attempts to impose his point of view on the one who requests his advice.

I know Mark Trice also as a pleasant golfing companion. I also know him and his wife and daughter socially. We are always happy to have them with us at all times—either in our home or at social functions.

I congratulate him on his 40 years of service and on his outstanding record. I wish for him many more years of happiness and health.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, when I was first elected to the Congress, a former Member of Congress said to me, "The most important man you can meet when you reach Congress will be the secretary for the party with which you are affiliated."

So when I went to the House of Representatives, I became acquainted—in accordance with that advice—with William Tyler Page, then the secretary to the Republican Members of the House of Representatives. I found that the advice I had been given was excellent, for I think he was the most helpful person I could have met at that time. When I came to Congress, I was quite unacquainted with the processes of legislative bodies; and William Tyler Page was a great mentor.

When I came to the Senate, I still remembered that advice; and I found that probably the most important person with whom I could become acquainted was Mark Trice. Nothing that has happened since that time has changed my opinion of the correctness and the importance of the advice which was given to me.

Certainly, if there is anyone in the Senate, insofar as the Republican Members are concerned, who has the answers, it is Mark Trice. If I am away from Washington, and if I wish to know how things are moving in the Senate, or what are the prospects for progress or action in connection with a particular measure, perhaps one that is on the calendar, I can ask those in my office to get in touch with Mark, and he has the answers.

Mark also has a remarkable understanding of the problems faced by Senators. Senators come from different States and, although they are Senators of the United States, they also have definite responsibilities to their constituents. Mark understands that; and the information we get from him is given by him in full realization of the particular problems which face us and the type or kind of information we need.

Another quality that Mark has is that of being absolutely fair and square and honest. Those are attributes which anyone would prize, and Mark has them in complete degree. If we get an answer from Mark, we can bank on it; we can be absolutely certain that it is "square" and correct. That is what one needs from a person who is in his position.

I do not suppose I saw Mark when I first visited Congress; yet there is a possibility that I saw him during the first year he worked in Congress as a page, in 1916, for in that year I made my first visit to Washington, and on that occasion I did visit the Congress. I do not claim that I saw him then; I merely claim that little bit of kinship—that my first view of Congress was in May 1916, when I came east in connection with some college activities.

I am delighted that now we have come full circle, and that Mark and I are here on the floor of the Senate and work together.

I hope he will have as many more years here as he and his good family desire him to have.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am lacking in the talent to praise Mark Trice and his wonderful family in song, such as was done not many hours ago by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr BUSH] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Furthermore, I am without the ability to equal our modern-day Webster, the distinguished Republican leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in reciting the praises so justly merited by Mark Trice.

So, Mr. President, what I wish to have the RECORD show is that I am a cosponsor with all those expressions of affection and appreciation and good wishes, and also those that have not been expressed, in regard to Mark Trice and Mrs. Trice and Linda.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it has been my privilege and good fortune to count as a dear friend and a confidante for the 10 years that I have been in the Senate, the worthy secretary of the minority, the Honorable J. Mark Trice.

He carries his years lightly, but he discharges his responsibilities efficiently. Over the past 40 years, he has known some of the most brilliant and spectacular Members of the U.S. Senate, men like Borah, La Follette, Taft, and many, many others. He has known them, and they have known him to be a man they could trust and depend upon.

Mr. President, he has not had an easy job. Although it may not be freely admitted, the distinguished Members of this body are prone to some human failings, among them an occasional disinclination to be where they are supposed to be when they should be. With infinite tact and patience, Mark Trice and his assistants produce a majority of the minority or the majority, as the case may be.

There are, of course, many other things that the secretary of the minority must do. In fact, Mr. President, whenever someone does not want to be bothered with a particular task, the cry goes up, "Let Mark do it."

It is proof of the man, Mr. President, that after 40 years of service he remains dedicated to his job and to the Senate. On this day, when so many noble sentiments have been expressed so eloquently, my one overriding wish is that before too many more years pass, we shall be able to refer to Mark Trice as the secretary of the majority. He and this Nation deserve no less.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in order that he may introduce a very distinguished visitor in the Senate Chamber, and ask that the proceedings in connection with the introduction appear at the end of the tributes to our distinguished minority secretary.

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

(Mr. WILEY's remarks in introducing Sir K. Sinha, Member of the Upper House of the Indian Parliament, appear elsewhere.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each and every Member of this body, without exception, has one experience in common, and that is to serve his first day in the U.S. Senate. It is followed by a greater or lesser period of getting acquainted with the many procedures, rules, traditions, customs, and usages which have been accumulating for the past 175 years. It is in those early days when a Senator tries to find his way about with facility and get somewhat

acquainted with the many procedures, rules, traditions, and customs, that he finds and truly appreciates assistance, help, suggestions, aid, and counsel at the hands of a man like Mark Trice.

It was my good fortune to be a member of the class of seven to which the Senator from New Hampshire referred a few minutes ago. That time is not too many years ago. At that time, the help, assistance, and counsel was extended with great generosity and patience by Mr. Trice; and I am sure he still gives that same assistance, counsel, and suggestion as occasion requires; and I am sure that he always will.

From time to time, Mr. President, there is a suggestion that in our coordinate branch of Government, the judicial system of the United States, there is perhaps a disproportionate influence of law clerks on the judges of our Federal judiciary. I doubt that there is such a disproportionate influence, or an undue influence, if one wants to put it that way, in that branch of the Government. But in addition to the many tributes and qualities which have been made and ascribed to Mr. Trice, I want to say that there has never been a suggestion that he has transgressed the proper offices of his post as secretary to the minority or as Secretary of the Senate.

He has had much patience. His vast store of knowledge and lore about the Senate has been made available to all Members on this side and, whenever requested, even to Members on the other side, without stint and without partiality.

Yesterday we from this side of the aisle had a very fine reception for Mark Trice. Members of the Republican Party of the Senate presented him with a memento fashioned of silver, which bore the signatures of the present Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. I am sure that each signatory has engraved on his heart a very generous place for the many kind deeds which J. Mark Trice has executed for him. I am sure that Mark Trice has engraved in his own memory the many personalities who have been served by him. I know that silver piece will form one of the finest possessions for the J. Mark Trice family in the years to come.

Each Senator who has served during Mark's tenure here has been a better Senator because of J. Mark Trice. The Senate has been a better Senate because of him. We are grateful to him. We congratulate and commend him and his lovely wife, Margaret, and their very beautiful daughter, Linda; and we wish them well; good health, and happiness for many years ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the very many fine words that have been spoken about a very fine person.

Just a moment ago a member of the Parliament of India was introduced. Really, I think that this person, about whom so many fine words have been spoken, should get up, because of our visitors in the galleries. I know they want to know this man, whom so many of the Members of his party, and I believe of the opposite party, too, hold in such high esteem and regard.

Mark, even though you are labeled as a Republican, you show no difference when a Member of the opposition approaches you for assistance and aid.

Even though I was not permitted to sign that silver plaque, I believe you have written on my mind an indelible impression which I shall carry. Certainly the respect of the Republican Party has been lifted by your presence and your energies expended on behalf of the Members of the U.S. Senate.

I could not understand that you had served 44 years. I really thought it was your 44th birthday. However, congratulations and may there be many more.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I share with my colleagues this afternoon the feelings which have been expressed toward Mark Trice. It is something for a man to start at the bottom in this great institution of our Government, the Senate of the United States, as a page boy, and to come up through the various steps into the position which he occupies as the secretary to the minority. He spans 44 years in this body, and obviously and factually he has seen men come and go. I am sure he has seen the good points of many Senators who have spoken in this Chamber. Obviously he has seen the weaknesses and some of the other characteristics appear as to men who have departed from this sphere of activity.

I know of no man who has been more helpful or more considerate, as testified to today, than my friend Mark Trice. It was only a little short of 12 years ago that I had the privilege of coming into this body as a Senator from Kansas. A distinguished departed Senator of this body, whom I revered and respected and always shall, was the late departed Robert Taft from Ohio. On one occasion I had the opportunity of discussing some matters with Bob Taft about the procedures of the Senate, what I should find out and how I should do some things. He answered me in his short, clipped phraseology, which I shall remember as long as I live, "Well, Andy, I suggest you go over to talk to Mark Trice. What he does not know about it nobody knows."

I thought that was one of the finest tributes which could be paid to a man in this position, with respect to confidence in him, the respect in which he was held, and the good judgment he had. Mark, I do not know of a man on either side of the aisle who has been here for long who is not indebted to you. You have kept confidences. You have been fair. You have been helpful. You have made one of the finest contributions to public service on the part of the highest member of a staff of the Senate any man could make. I congratulate you and I wish for you and the members of your family the very best in the years ahead in any respect.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I merely wish to express gratitude to Mark Trice, because the goodness of his life made it possible for me today to listen to words of tribute paid to him which produced in me warmth and joy. Sitting as humbly as he does to the left of the chair of the President of the Senate today, I can witness in him the humility he possesses. I can almost hear him say, "I ask you not for tributes nor wreaths of laurel, but I tell you that it lightens the heaviness of the burdens which one has to carry."

From this series of tributes today there is awakened in me the thought of how wonderful it is when, during one's lifetime we give to a man a word of praise. Words of criticism fall upon all of us; words of laudation infrequently.

Mark, I thank you for making it possible for me to have this very enjoyable experience of hearing the words of your colleagues expressed to you.

Mr. PROUTY rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our able and esteemed secretary to the minority, Mark Trice, on the occasion of his completion of 40 years of service in the Nation's Capitol. He has witnessed and has been a part of the greatest events and controversies of our times, from the League of Nations dispute to yesterday's battle on the minimum wage. He has had the ear and the confidence of men who have made imperishable marks on the pages of American history.

Mr. President, one does not make such a record without great ability. One does not share the hopes and fears of the political leaders of our country unless he has proved himself deserving of such a trust.

Those of us who are new in the Senate have been grateful not only for the friendship of Mark Trice but also for the guidance he has given us on legislative procedure and the historical precedents of this body. He has helped us come to realize what a vital constitutional organism the Senate is and what it can mean in terms of the public welfare.

Mark, I congratulate you on 40 years of distinguished public service. I hope you and your charming wife will enjoy many, many years of happiness together in the future.

Mr. JAVITS rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like my other colleagues, I join in this tribute which is extremely well deserved to our friend Mark Trice, about whom we feel so warmly.

Mark, if I had to epitomize your function on this side of the aisle, I would say that you are the handyman's guide to the Senate, especially for the uninitiated. Though I served 8 years in the House of Representatives, I was really a stranger in this august body. Your

helping hand was indispensable. This is no idle conversation, for I have called you at night, on Sundays and holidays, at odd hours, for a word of guidance or for some practical deed which has been indispensable in my conduct in the Senate.

Mark, you are a man of surprises. I did not know you are a lawyer. Now everything is clear. I find that in your biography. You not only have been admitted to the bar, but also you have actually practiced law. Of course, this is a great thing to me, because I think you know how deeply I cherish the traditions of the law, its concepts and its role in our society.

This leads me to one other thought about you, Mark Trice, which is of great interest to me and I hope will be to my colleagues. You are a man who obviously has ideas and feelings of your own, but only your Maker knows how you would vote on issues A, B, or C if you were sitting in our places. This is a remarkable gift. I have never by word, by deed, by so much as a drop of an eye gotten a condemnation or approbation, except for a speech or something of which we would all approve.

In terms of action or policy Mark is a sphynx. This is remarkable, because it does make him able to help us all with a dispassionate graciousness, tolerance, and understanding of all our diverse positions. It makes him an imperishable member of the staff and of our lives.

Finally, Mark—and I hope you will forgive me for so saying—you are really at your best in those genial moments when the whole history of 40 years comes freely from your lips, when we sit around in what is colloquially called a "bull session" and really enjoy each other as men.

For all these blessings that you have conferred upon us, I thank you and wish you and your beautiful and lovely wife and daughter long life and well deserved happiness.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I share in the expressions of appreciation and the many tributes which have overwhelmed Mark Trice today. I know that he is worthy of this commendation, at the culmination of 40 years of dedicated service in this body.

I first met Mark 20 years ago, when he supervised the Borah funeral train, which took the body of the late Senator to the capital of our State. Down through the years I have had many opportunities to work with Mark intimately in various capacities, in many ways, and to have an opportunity to observe his judicial temperament, his sympathetic and understanding attitude, and his sincere desire to be helpful in every way to Senators and to his other friends.

He has given me very trustworthy advice and wise counsel. He has been a very considerate friend. Whether serving in the capacity of Secretary of the Senate or as secretary of the Republican minority, he has demonstrated that he fully appreciates the responsibilities of the position he holds. In that demonstration of loyalty and faithfulness he has upheld the highest traditions of the Senate, and has devotedly served his party.

I join my colleagues in extending congratulations to Mark Trice upon completing 40 years of service. I also extend sincere wishes to Mark, his wife, and daughter. I hope that they may enjoy many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not feel that I had done my duty as a Member of the minority of the Senate if I did not pay tribute to a very personal friend of mine and a very able servant of the Senate and our Government. He is a model public servant. As I heard the commendations by other Senators, I was impressed with the fact that one word characterizes his record and that word is service.

That is one of the fine attributes of Mark Trice. He gives us service, not grudgingly, but with love. I know from personal experiences of the many things he has done that I regard as personal favors. They are not always easy tasks for him to perform. He goes out of his way to do things for all of us. There is a very beautiful story in the Scriptures about service. It is the story of Mary and Martha, in which service was rendered in a menial way, after which the Master made the statement that a reward should be given to those who serve not grudgingly, but with love. It was that thought that impressed me today, which I could not fail to note. Mark renders that fine service to every Member of the Senate, whether a Member of the minority or the majority party. He gives it to the staff of the Senate; and the Senate is a better place because Mark Trice has served here for 40 years.

I wish to say to Mark, Mrs. Trice, and his daughter Linda that we are delighted that you are with us. We hope you will remain with us for many, many years to come.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could possibly add luster to the many laudatory remarks that have been made concerning our very able secretary to the minority. After listening to the praises that have been so well expressed by my colleagues, I hesitate in all humility to attempt to surpass them or to add to them, because almost everything has been said.

I do wish to join my colleagues in their remarks, and I would like to voice the thought that within the Government we have a very able public servant whose name is not spread in the headlines, who receives no plaudits of the multitude, and whose only real and lasting reward is the knowledge in his own heart that he has somehow made life a little easier for others, and performed services not merely for the minority, but for the entire membership of the Senate. In that way he has contributed to the overall effectiveness of this great body.

I express my gratitude for the important help he has given me. The information which he has given to me from time to time constitutes a fund of knowledge which a Senator can accumulate only by serving in the Senate for many years. His vast experience for 40 years provides an unending source of reminiscences, experiences, advice, and counsel, which, I am sure, have benefited almost every Member of the Senate, particularly members of the minority.

So on this 40th anniversary of his service, I pay tribute to him and wish him many more years of happiness. I express the hope that he and his lovely wife and daughter may continue to enjoy their association, and he his association with the Senate, which has meant so much to all of us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems incredible that Mark Trice has been connected with this body twice as long as I have and still retains unusual youth and vigor. But I am very glad that he has the faculty of remaining young and disregarding the years. I think all of us envy him in this respect.

I came to the Senate only 20 years ago. During the past 20 years I have had occasion to observe the manner in which Mark Trice has helped not only all Senators who were here when I came, but those who have come during the time since.

I wish to express my appreciation for all that he has done for me personally. Mark Trice probably knows more about every Member of the Senate, past and present, than any other living person. I disagree emphatically, with those including the minority leader, who say he ought to write a book, unless, of course, I could help censor that book. Of course it would be an interesting book. It would probably be the best seller if Mark wrote a book. At the same time I hope he does not do it.

I like to think of Mark as a farmer, too. I have been out to his farm in Westmoreland Hills. He raises different things out there. He raises figs and fig leaves. He has a fig tree out there from which he takes bushels of figs. He probably raises more of them than any other person in town. So I regard him as a farmer as well as a very patient servant of Congress and of his country.

I join with those who have taken this occasion to wish him another 40 or 140 more years of service to those who will come after us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say, apropos of the agricultural achievements of our distinguished friend, that I think he does pretty well in the field of asters and chrysanthemums, but I cannot give him too much credit when it comes to marigolds.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I merely wish to underwrite what my colleagues have said in paying their respects to Mark Trice. I have never met a man who better represents what I would call a good public servant, and a loyal member of our party.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, wholeheartedly I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Mark Trice, who has served the U.S. Senate and the people of our country so excellently for 40 years.

I think he has earned the title of Senator himself, for he certainly outranks all of us in seniority, with the exception of the senior Senator from Arizona.

He epitomizes and symbolizes the very best of the legislature staff upon whom the Senators rely so heavily, and without whose faithful, loyal, and amazing performances we would not be able to accomplish anything.

There are so many things that he does to facilitate the work of the Senate that I would not even attempt to begin to enumerate them. I will mention only one personal matter.

Last night it was my good fortune to cast my 900th consecutive rollcall vote without a miss. I am told that this is an alltime record in the history of the Senate.

Well, if it is a record, then I think that Mark Trice is surely a coholder of that record with me in some respects, for without his alert assistance I never would have been able to be present at 900 consecutive rollcall votes. And in stating this, I want to also say that other coholders with me on that record are Bill Brownrigg and Bobby Baker, who, like Mark Trice, have so faithfully helped me to be able to be present and avoid missing a vote through that stretch.

I want to take this opportunity in praising Mark Trice to praise all legislative employees and to state how deeply I appreciate the many, many wonderful kindnesses and many invaluable assistances that they have given to me through the years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with these tributes, I should like to submit for the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of our distinguished friend and colaborer. So with this we conclude these tributes to a great man and dedicated spirit with a high sense of mission, J. Mark Trice.

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

Mr. Mark Trice, secretary for the minority of the Senate, (5017 Worthington Drive, Westmoreland Hills, Md. Telephone Oliver 2-2777.) Born October 22, 1902; educated in the District public schools and Emerson Institute; graduated from Georgetown University School of Law in 1928, LL.B. degree; admitted to the bar of Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and the U.S. Supreme Court; served as page in the Senate from 1916 to 1919; appointed secretary to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate in 1919 and served until 1929; practiced law from 1929 to 1932 with Hanson, Lovett and Dale; appointed Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the Senate in 1932 and served in that capacity until 1946 when elected secretary for the majority of the Senate for the 80th Congress; became secretary for the minority of the Senate in the 81st and 82d Congress; elected Secretary of the Senate January 3, 1953, and served in that capacity until January 5, 1955, when elected secretary for the minority; served in various capacities at Republican National Conventions; executive secretary of the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee in 1952 and 1956; recipient of Georgetown Alumni Award for 1954; married Margaret Ann Linkins; one child, Linda Jean Trice, born February 3, 1945; a Methodist; member of Congressional Country Club, Inc., and Delta Theta Phi legal fraternity.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF DARBHANGA, SIR K. SINHA, MEMBER OF THE RAJYA SABHA, UPPER HOUSE OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was to have had the distinction and pleasure of doing what it is now my pleasure to do.

From one of the great countries of the earth—India—a country steeped in history and in great accomplishments of the past, and now living in the present with a dynamic spirit of going places, for the first time the Senate has had such an experience, we have the privilege of welcoming to the Senate not only a member of the Upper House of the Indian Parliament, but a Maharaja.

So I present to the Senate His Highness the Maharaja of Darbhanga, Sir K. Sinha, member of the Rajya Sabha, the Upper House of the Indian Parliament.

He is one of the most senior independent members, and is very active. He has been closely associated with the Indian independence movement.

He is on his first personal visit to the United States. It is with pleasure I welcome him to the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC ON PUBLIC, INDIAN, AND OTHER LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 8860.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask that the time be not charged to either side.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may not reserve the right to object to the discontinuance of a quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be recognized for 1 minute, in the time allotted on the bill?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Either a Senator must object to the request that the quorum call be rescinded, or the clerk must continue with the call of the roll.

Mr. KEATING. I object temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

All time is under control. One hour has been allotted for the debate on the bill, and one-half hour on any amendment, the time to be controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective when taken up, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc, etc., debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, which comes from the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was ordered reported by the full committee in the absence of the chairman.

The matter of providing relief for lead and zinc mine operators and the need for an improvement in their condition has been constantly before Congress at least for the last 12 years. Domestic lead production is in very serious condition. Device after device has been sought to improve it. We have repeatedly worked to obtain a quota system. We have tried to find some method to subsidize the lead and zinc industry. There have been all sorts of programs for extended payments. Thus far, very little real help has come to the industry. Thus far, very little help has come to the industry.

My interest in the bill arises from the fact that a few years ago many of the large lead and zinc producers were located in my State. I think I am correct when I say that today, however, not a single lead or zinc producer is operating there. It has become extremely difficult for them to operate.

I can recall that nearly 40 years ago a newspaper with which I was then connected always published in the corner of the front page the prices of lead and zinc, because whenever either lead or zinc brought a nickel a pound, the price was satisfactory and the mines could remain open. But that is no longer true.

Unless the price of lead is 17 cents a pound and unless the price of zinc is 14 cents a pound, there is little opportunity to operate a mine.

Therefore the committee spent a long time in its consideration of the bill.

The bill was reported by the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has spent a lifetime in the mining business and in the mining areas, and has watched at firsthand the developments, and thoroughly understands the need for the development of some sort of program.

House bill 8860 would stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small producers. This bill is not designed to help the large mining concerns; somehow or other they find other ways of securing help. For instance, they locate a profitable mine in the Belgian Congo or in Chile or elsewhere, and by combining their operations in this country with their operations in other countries, they are able to produce and to operate satisfactorily. Or else, as is the case in my State, a large company may also be engaged in mining some other mineral, and will thus be able, by combining that operation with its lead or zinc operations, to continue to operate.

But the small operator who gets out a few tons of ore, with the help of one or two other workers, is not able to operate in that way; and therefore he finds present conditions such that it is virtually impossible for him to continue his operation.

I am sorry to have to say that the bill does not do all that we wish it would do or all that we would like to see done. But the bill does provide that one who has 2,000 tons of lead or one who has 2,000 tons of zinc will be able to mine them under the provisions set forth in the bill.

The question is whether a small operator who has a mine in each of two States can receive these subsidies. The answer is that he can. If he has a small lead mine in one State and if he has a small zinc mine in another State, he can receive the benefits called for by the bill in connection with both his lead mining and his zinc mining operations.

Mr. President, we have tried practically everything else. A few years ago I joined in sponsoring a bill which provided that if the price of lead in the United States went down—as I now recall—to 13½ cents, 2½ cents extra premium would be paid to the producers; and if the price of zinc went down to a certain level, 2 or 3 cents premium would be paid to the producers of zinc. We have tried such measures, and we have tried quotas. But the administration's policy has been to obstruct such measures by means of Presidential vetoes.

We hope this bill will be successful. If the bill is enacted into law, we hope the small lead and zinc producers will be able to remain in business, and will be able to maintain some sort of skeleton forces, and will be able to preserve their properties.

Some years ago the attention of those of us who serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was called to a situation in a State close to the State from which the present Presiding Officer [Mr. PROXMIRE] comes. In that State a very fine copper-mining property had been in operation for several generations. At one time it was felt that the property had to be closed for economic reasons; and it was felt that although there was water in the mine, it would later be possible to reopen the mine as occasion might require. The mine did fill up with water; but it has never been reopened, and it has never been found possible to salvage any of the large investment which was made in the mine.

Those of us who are familiar with the requirements in wartimes and in other times of emergency do not want to see the mines covered by the pending bill operated on an extravagant basis; but this bill will make it possible for those who mine 2,000 tons of lead or 2,000 tons of zinc to continue their operations, and I believe the bill will provide a satisfactory solution of their problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The time yielded the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say that the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is very familiar with the mine-operation situations in other States, and I am sure he will be able to state his understanding of the bill. Somehow, Mr. President, when the good Lord laid down these deposits of lead and zinc and copper, He did not know exactly where the State lines would run; and therefore these problems are not confined within certain State lines. I am sure the Senator from Colorado feels the importance of these problems as keenly as I do.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall close my presentation—for I must go now to one of the committee rooms—by saying that the bill as reported by the committee provides for only a temporary solution, but I believe it is a very necessary one to a very pressing problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana, so that he may ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has just now explained the bill, whether I am correct when I say that this measure is the so-called Edmondson-Metcalf measure which was passed in the House of Representatives, and that the bill would, on a small scale, attempt to give a direct subsidy to marginal producers of lead and zinc; but the bill does not in any way contemplate quotas on shipments of these metals from other countries.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly the case. The bill provides for the making of payments by the Department to small lead and zinc producers, at a rate which will provide them a return equivalent to the one they would receive if the market price for zinc were 14½ cents a pound and if the market price for lead were 17 cents a pound. In other words, the payments which thus will be made will amount to a few cents per pound—2 or 3 or 4 cents. Those amounts will be paid from the Treasury.

Of course, if we were to get into the question of quotas, there would immediately be opposition by the State Department. On the other hand, if we were to get into the question of tariffs, there would immediately be opposition by the Tariff Commission.

Therefore, we have used the other system; and we provide that whatever difference there may be between the selling price and the prices stated in the bill—and we believe the latter to be the absolute minimum—shall be made up by means of payments from the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, the problem is a domestic one, and requires a solution; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The bill does not involve in any way our relationships with Canada or Mexico, where a great deal of lead and zinc are produced, or with any other South American country.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico, to enable him to complete his response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have tried to explain that a report is about to be made in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the trip made by the Commissioner to Europe, and I am now due in the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as I understand, only the small, marginal producers who are producing not more than 2,000 tons of lead or 2,000 tons of zinc will receive the benefits provided by the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill will make it possible to maintain those small business enterprises in some condition or other, rather than waste their mineral resources, inasmuch as if the mines were forced to close, those mineral sources would become lost forever to posterity, as the result of the flooding of the mines by water or as the result of other destructive processes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say that I am not quite as optimistic on that score as are some of those who sponsor the bill. I think more help than the amount provided by the bill is needed by those who produce 2,000 tons of these minerals. But I am sure that the bill provides for all that can be provided for at this time, although I am sure that it would be better if the bill provided for

more assistance. However, certainly this bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree. Unfortunately, it seems impossible at this time to provide for more than the bill now would affect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New Mexico, so that the Senator from Ohio may ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that there is a glut of lead and zinc on the world markets, and also a glut of lead on the markets in the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, but not because of the mine operations in the United States. As I said a moment ago, at one time operations were being conducted in my State by four or five of the largest producers of lead or zinc. But not one lead mine in it is in operation today.

The purpose of this measure is to provide a little help, in order to permit the small lead and zinc mines to remain open. The bill does not impose quotas. It does not permit them to operate at anything like their former capacity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I try to make is that, from the world standpoint, the disposition of lead and zinc, especially for a number of South American countries like Peru, is a very vital question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it is; but the bill is so drawn that it does not bother the quotas of these other countries.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct that, under the bill, based upon the present price of lead and zinc per pound in the market as it was on June 30, the U.S. Government would be paying to one of these small operators $260,000 by way of subsidy? That is, the subsidy on zinc would be——

Mr. ANDERSON. About 3 cents.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two and one-half cents.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; 2½ cents.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The report shows zinc would be subsidized at 14½ cents, and its current price is 12 cents. So it would be 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. Fifty dollars a ton.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On 2,000 tons that would be $100,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The market price for lead is 13 cents. It is subsidized at 17 cents. We would be paying a subsidy of 4 cents a pound. Two thousand times 4 cents equals $80. For 2,000 tons it would be $160,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Since the Senator has asked the question, in my own individual judgment, the price of lead is now abnormally low. From the experience with the other programs, passage of the bill would result in a rise in the lead price; but the Senator is correct with respect to the current levels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On an average, how many people work in these mines?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Ground Hog Mine in New Mexico employed 400 people. That number was reduced to 200, then to 100, then to 50. These are small mines. I would say they would run from 10 to 25 people.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico.

It is my hope that favorable action will be taken on H.R. 8860 by the Senate body. The domestic mining industry has been neglected by this administration and considered as a stepchild for far too long. As a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have sat through many long sessions, listening to testimony by industry leaders pointing to the perilous conditions existent in the industry.

Nevada, but a few years past, was one of the leading producers of tungsten, a mineral of known importance to our defense needs. In recent years, every single mine has been shut down and this highly important mineral is now being imported into our country to meet our Nation's needs. This has been the story, time and time again, until now the domestic mining industry has been relegated to a second class position.

The same situation now faces the lead-zinc industry. Prices are currently so low that the domestic industry cannot meet the costs of production. H.R. 8860 is not a costly bill. It is a bill which will keep the small mines in operation. Producers in Nevada of lead and zinc numbered 51 in 1956. Of this number only one mine produced more than 4,000 tons of ore per year, and with the exception of three mines, production was confined to under 3,000 tons. Yet these are the small producers which traditionally have fought the battle and in some cases eventually emerged into large producers. At the present market prices of lead and zinc, it is impossbile for even these small producers to operate their mines.

It is my firm belief this Nation needs a strong minerals industry. We cannot afford the luxury of being dependent upon foreign sources. It must be clear to all that conditions in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world, where many large mines are now exporting minerals to the United States, are such that we cannot close our eyes to reality. We can upon a moment's notice be completely out of business, with our sources of supply cut off at the whim of these foreign countries which are now enjoying a profitable export business in copper, lead, and zinc, and other essential minerals, by selling their production to the United States.

The lead-zinc industry has appealed to the Tariff Commission, and yet the appeals have not brought results. This industry has been patient far too long. It is time that Congress takes effective steps to keep the lead-zinc industry on an operating basis. It is my hope that this legislation will pass the Senate, and that this body will become more cognizant of the need for effective legislation along similar lines, not only to keep the domestic lead-zinc mines operating, but to give full consideration to the entire minerals industry. I can assure the Senate this rugged industry does not want charity from our Government. It does, however, desire fair treatment and to be put on an equal basis with the foreign mining interests which are given advantages through the trade agreements programs of our Nation.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe a little background and history should be given in the consideration of this bill. The production of lead and zinc in this country has been steadily deteriorating since 1946. This has not been due to one set of factors; it has been due to many. One of the most important is the great differential between the cost of production in other countries and our own country, particularly when we consider that we pay a miner in this country $20 a day, and in foreign countries miners are paid $1, $1.50, or even less a day.

The background of the depressed state of these mines is that twice in the last 3 years the lead industry has gone to the Tariff Commission to get relief. The Tariff Commission did recommend partial relief, and the President approved quotas on the importation of lead and zinc.

Because these quotas have had only nominal effect, on August 21, 1959, the Senate adopted a resolution directing the Tariff Commission to hold a hearing and submit a report to Congress not later than March 31, 1960.

There is contained on page 4 of the report a brief summary of the findings and conclusions of the Tariff Commission's report, and I ask unanimous consent that the summary may be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

Imports of lead and zinc have increased markedly in the postwar period, especially since 1951. (From 19 percent of U.S. production of lead in 1946 to 75 percent in 1951, and 91 percent in 1958. From 37 percent of U.S. production of zinc in 1946 to 72 percent in 1952 and 119 percent in 1958.)

Foreign mine output of lead and zinc has increased in nearly every year since 1952; whereas domestic mine output of lead declined 35 percent and of zinc declined 37 percent in the same period.

Since World War II, the lead and zinc industries in the United States and in foreign countries have been greatly affected by a variety of U.S. Government programs, including purchases, barter, exploration aid, losses, and tax incentives.

Mines producing lead and zinc dropped from 696 in 1956 to 447 in 1958. Of the 447 mines, the 38 largest mines (operated by 25 producers) produced 87 percent of the total U.S. output.

U.S. mine output of lead in 1958 was the lowest on record since 1899. U.S. mine output of zinc in 1958 was the lowest since 1933, a depression year. U.S. mine output of zinc increased in the 4 months through January

1960, but U.S. mine output of lead has not shown an upward trend and was lower than in the corresponding months of 1959.

While domestic supplies of ores and concentrates have declined, consumption of refined lead and zinc has been maintained at high levels. Consequently, domestic smelters have had to rely on foreign sources for an increasing proportion of raw materials.

As the lead and zinc industry adapted itself to operation under the quotas, there developed a practice of accumulating stocks of ores and concentrates in bond. The greatest difficulties, in obtaining adequate supplies of ores and concentrates to permit sufficient operation of smelters, have been encountered by zinc smelting companies depending upon independent sources of supply. One domestic company without a mine of its own, Athletic Mining & Smelting Co., Fort Smith, Ark., closed in December 1959 after more than 40 years of operation, discharging 271 persons.

In summary, import quotas affecting such large and complex industry as lead and zinc have not proved a satisfactory means of curtailing imports of these metals.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, because the quotas have been largely ineffective, we have developed this legislation. One of the questions that will be asked about this matter is the cost involved. The cost is going to be less than $4,840,000 a year.

There are other approaches that could have been utilized. Personally, I would have preferred the bill that the Senate considered and passed in 1958, the so-called Seaton stabilization plan, which was recommended by the administration and passed the Senate. Under the conditions in which we find ourselves today, from the standpoint of time, it is impossible to consider such a bill. So we have before us H.R. 8860.

I believe fully that this bill is the only bill that has an opportunity of passing at this session of the Congress. Therefore, I support it.

It is an adaptation of the so-called Allott formula, which was adopted as a part of the 1958 bill. It will help only the small mines. It is a reasonable bill. I support it.

I think it is also appropriate to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in 1957, the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred Seaton, sent to Congress a plan for an import excise tax on lead and zinc. That also died in Congress. In 1958 he came up with the stabilization plan, which was modified subsequently to include the Allott small-mine formula of which I have spoken.

With all of this, and with the unsuccessful applications of the lead and zinc people to the Tariff Commission, it is very obvious that there can be no meaningful results from further applications. As a matter of fact, the prices have risen only about 1 cent since the quotas were instituted. Domestic lead production has reached its lowest point in 60 years, which was 253,360 tons in 1959. In zinc, the situation is somewhat better, but domestic mine production in 1959 of 416,965 tons was still far below the 1957 level of 533,733 tons.

Mr. President, why are we here today? Why are those of us who are interested in natural resources of this country here today? We are here for just one real reason. It is not merely to provide a little relief for these mines and miners that are going out of business or are already out of business. That is only part of the reason why we are here. The real reason why we are here is that the mining resources of this country cannot be turned on and off like a water faucet. We—no one party has been solely responsible for it. But we have vacillated from the philosophy of the Paley report, by which we would import everything, to the philosophy, which was espoused by Senator Malone, of Nevada, of high protection. Nobody knows what the policy of this country is with respect to mining.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I say to my colleagues, and I say to the people of the country, unless we take affirmative steps—and this is a beginning—to establish a clear policy of fostering the development of our own resources, we are going to find ourselves in serious trouble. Unless we develop a situation that allows for our miners a stable, economic course, we are going to sell our mining industry down the river. If we have an emergency, we shall not be able to bring those mines into production in 3 months, or 6 months, or 1 year, or 3 years. That is the emergency we face today. That is the reason, Mr. President, why I support this measure, not merely in the interest of the well-being of our mines and miners, but because I consider it a necessary part of our national preparedness and accordingly the well-being of this Nation. It is my sincere hope the Senate will adopt the bill as it is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain tables and statements printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IMPACT OF H.R. 8860 ON DOMESTIC LEAD-ZINC PRODUCTION

I. ANALYSIS OF BUREAU OF MINES DATA

The Department of the Interior submitted estimates of domestic mine production of lead and zinc combined for small mines as follows:

Size tons	1958 (actual) tons	Production estimate under H.R. 8860 (14½ and 17 cents and 4,000 tons)
0 to 499	19,377	28,000
500 to 999	12,097	15,000
1,000 to 1,999	23,441	33,000
2,000 to 2,999	7,820	14,000
3,000 to 3,999	14,466	15,000
Total	77,201	105,000

The combined E. & M. J. market price for lead and zinc in 1958 was 22.4 cents per pound. Thus, based on the Interior Department assumptions, their rough estimate is that an increase of only 28,000 tons of lead-zinc would be forthcoming under H.R. 8860 as compared to the actual 1958 situation. This possible increase could hardly be termed significant in comparison to total U.S. lead-zinc mine production in 1958 of 679,000 and is practically nil in comparison to total world mine production of 5,477,000 tons for 1958.

II. LIMITATIONS

Another view may be taken by "overstating" the maximum effect of H.R. 8860 and presuming (incorrectly) that the incentives will produce entirely "new" or "additional" tons which were not produced in 1958 or 1959. In this instance, the maximum of $4.4 million funds available divided by $43.25 per ton incentive (Department of the Interior figure) would yield 101,000 tons, presuming all incentives yielded only additional tons. Obviously, this is greatly exaggerating the case, for the actual 1958 tons tabulated in I above would in the most part be eligible under the provision of H.R. 8860, and the possible net increase of about 28,000 tons is a far more realistic estimate. However, even if this were not true, the limitations of total incentive funds available places a fixed ceiling on the amount of increased eligible production which could be forthcoming.

III. COMPARISON WITH PRODUCTION OF PRIOR YEARS

Historically, the production of mines in the 0–4,000 tons lead-plus-zinc range will provide another method of evaluating possible production.

	Production for 0 to 4,000 ton mines [1]	Total U.S. lead-zinc production [2]	Percentage of production by small mines	Average E. & M.J. price (cents)		
				Lead	Zinc	Combined
1954	147,660	798,890	18	14.0	10.7	24.7
1955	153,462	852,696	18	15.1	12.3	27.4
1956	196,133	895,166	22	16.0	13.5	29.5
1958	[3] 77,201	679,000	11	12.1	10.3	22.4

[1] U.S. Tariff Commission Report (table 32), April 1958.
[2] American Bureau of Metal Statistics.
[3] Rept. 1597, House of Representatives, May 10, 1960

It is interesting to note that the 1956 combined market price was 7.1 cents above the 1958 market and the domestic lead-zinc production was approximately 216,000 tons more than in 1958. The proposed prices of H.R. 8860 are 8.1 cents per pound above the 1958 market, and increased production is estimated by the Bureau of Mines at only 28,000 tons. Again, the estimates of the impact of the subsidy program are insignificant compared to past experience of actual market conditions.

IV. DEFINITIONS

In a letter of June 6, 1960, to Mr. Tom Kiser, Mr. Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary of the Interior indicated that "the data supplied to the subcommittee by the Department with respect to the number of mines operating in 1958 was on a reporting mine, not on ownership, basis." We know that some small mines are controlled by large companies with operations in the same district or State, and these small properties would not be eligible for the subsidy. It is quite possible that the 28,000 tons is an excessive estimate.

V. ESTIMATED PRODUCTION

The recent high in production from 0–4,000 ton mines was in 1956 with market prices of 29.5 cents combined for lead and zinc. The chart indicates that as the market price decreases the small mines take the big percentage of the total production cut. From the chart it might be argued that 31.5 cents combined (H.R. 8860 rates) would produce 200,000 tons of lead and zinc, but this is not the case. Payments at present market prices are limited to 101,000 tons, and a large part of this is already being produced.

There is no near future possibility of lead-zinc prices increasing beyond the present market, based on present supply and consumption, so the eligible tonnage cannot be expected to increase. When and if the markets and prices improve, the eligible tonnage under subsidy can increase; but the small mines are deserving of this increased tonnage, based on the historical record, and under improving conditions the market could take this relatively small tonnage.

Since the Department of the Interior figures were submitted the provisions of the bill have been further limited to (1) mines producing 2,000 tons of lead and/or 2,000 tons of zinc during a 12-month period rather than 4,000 tons combined as originally provided, (2) to mines with a production record during the past 7 years, (3) to mines that have produced not more than the qualifying tonnage of (1) in the past 12 months. These qualifications particularly on tonnage will probably further reduce the eligible production estimate of 28,000 tons.

VI. Historic U.S. Production

Lead

Year	Mine production (short tons)	General imports			Average price			Year	Mine production (short tons)	General imports			Average price		
		Ores and concentrates (short tons)	Metal (short tons)	Total (short tons)	New York (cents per pound)	St. Louis (cents per pound)	London [1] (cents per pound)			Ores and concentrates (short tons)	Metal (short tons)	Total (short tons)	New York (cents per pound)	St. Louis (cents per pound)	London [1] (cents per pound)
1915	542,098	9,093	42,413	51,506	4.67	4.57	4.85	1939	413,979	30,842	56,041	86,883	5.05	4.90	3.09
1916	601,392	17,543	17,786	35,329	6.83	6.80	6.58	1940	457,392	111,300	171,172	282,472	5.18	5.03	4.49
1917	628,464	20,646	57,625	78,271	8.71	8.92	6.37	1941	461,426	82,115	298,893	381,008	5.79	5.64	4.49
1918	562,402	18,535	80,072	98,607	7.46	7.25	6.40	1942	496,239	79,362	410,352	489,714	6.14	6.33	4.49
1919	429,589	9,787	61,119	70,906	5.81	5.55	5.57	1943	453,313	69,945	248,616	318,561	6.50	6.35	4.49
1920	496,814	14,744	83,771	98,515	8.08	7.93	6.25	1944	416,861	93,570	222,816	316,386	6.50	6.35	4.49
1921	414,491	7,117	67,168	74,285	4.55	4.39	3.90	1945	590,831	70,005	227,477	297,482	6.50	6.35	4.49
1922	477,633	12,237	65,588	77,825	5.71	5.52	4.69	1946	335,475	44,286	115,628	159,914	8.11	7.96	8.63
1923	547,217	33,442	101,847	135,289	7.25	7.35	5.48	1947	384,221	50,572	161,093	211,665	14.67	13.26	15.27
1924	596,068	47,660	89,998	137,658	8.08	8.10	6.64	1948	390,476	63,907	254,302	318,209	18.04	17.87	17.16
1925	684,439	44,481	77,648	122,129	9.02	8.92	7.73	1949	409,908	107,279	277,613	384,892	15.36	15.18	16.96
1926	683,917	58,116	89,806	147,922	8.42	8.25	6.74	1950	430,827	76,520	445,276	521,796	13.30	13.10	13.29
1927	665,489	40,638	120,751	161,389	6.75	6.52	5.25	1951	388,164	67,484	181,313	248,797	17.49	17.29	20.25
1928	632,977	25,915	129,129	155,044	6.31	6.14	4.58	1952	390,162	104,661	511,109	615,770	16.47	16.27	16.82
1929	654,331	31,331	84,728	116,059	6.83	6.66	5.04	1953	342,644	160,899	385,940	546,839	13.48	13.28	11.48
1930	558,313	39,377	38,839	78,216	5.52	5.38	3.92	1954	325,419	161,261	276,327	437,588	14.05	13.85	12.08
1931	404,622	20,888	32,330	53,218	4.24	4.05	2.64	1955	338,025	177,479	264,149	441,628	15.14	14.94	13.19
1932	292,968	21,001	13,506	34,507	3.18	3.04	1.86	1956	352,826	196,452	262,685	459,137	16.01	15.81	14.52
1933	272,677	5,958	1,606	7,654	3.87	3.74	2.21	1957	338,216	198,479	324,363	522,842	14.66	14.46	12.05
1934	287,339	10,611	2,733	13,344	3.86	3.73	2.46	1958	267,377	201,628	368,912	570,540	12.11	11.91	9.13
1935	331,103	20,025	4,014	24,039	4.06	3.91	3.12	1959 (preliminary)	253,260	139,178	263,497	402,675	12.21	12.01	8.88
1936	372,919	20,713	2,902	23,615	4.71	4.56	3.91								
1937	464,892	34,103	6,703	40,806	6.01	5.86	5.15								
1938	369,726	45,370	18,531	63,901	4.74	4.59	3.33								

[1] Conversions made in accordance with changing value of British pound sterling.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Zinc

Year	Mine production (short tons)	General imports			Average prices			Year	Mine production (short tons)	General imports			Average prices		
		Ores and concentrates (short tons)	Slab zinc [1] (short tons)	Total (short tons)	East St. Louis (cents per pound)	New York (cents per pound)	London [2 3] (cents per pound)			Ores and concentrates (short tons)	Slab zinc [1] (short tons)	Total (short tons)	East St. Louis (cents per pound)	New York (cents per pound)	London [2 3] (cents per pound)
1915	587,595	57,669	63	57,732	14.16	14.44	14.04	1938	516,703	18,583	7,230	25,813	4.61	4.99	3.05
1916	703,317	148,147	21	148,168	13.57	13.75	14.42	1939	583,807	36,100	30,898	66,998	5.12	5.51	2.89
1917	713,359	72,474	18	72,492	8.93	9.11	11.00	1940	665,068	180,320	16,468	196,788	6.34	6.73	4.64
1918	636,091	24,809	11	24,820	8.04	8.31	11.02	1941	749,125	289,213	34,554	323,767	7.48	7.87	4.63
1919	548,846	17,009	32	17,041	7.04	7.39	8.29	1942	768,025	368,408	36,352	404,760	8.25	8.66	4.63
1920	587,524	22,487	(4)	22,487	7.77	8.13	7.40	1943	744,196	539,094	56,155	595,249	8.25	8.66	4.63
1921	256,640	2,705	6,598	9,303	4.67	5.15	4.50	1944	718,642	413,696	63,626	477,322	8.25	8.65	4.63
1922	472,032	1,929	40	1,969	5.74	6.09	5.88	1945	614,358	381,719	97,116	478,835	8.25	8.65	5.18
1923	610,690	3,223	1	3,224	6.66	7.01	6.51	1946	574,833	272,056	104,743	376,799	8.73	9.15	7.75
1924	637,977	4,649	11	4,660	6.35	6.70	6.63	1947	637,608	297,959	72,312	370,271	10.50	11.01	12.58
1925	710,847	13,536	(4)	13,536	7.66	8.01	7.80	1948	629,977	264,203	93,232	357,435	13.58	14.21	14.38
1926	774,563	14,567	(4)	14,567	7.37	7.72	7.40	1949	593,203	241,179	126,925	368,104	12.15	12.86	14.41
1927	718,541	9,513	39	9,552	6.25	6.60	6.19	1950	623,375	278,573	155,974	434,547	13.88	14.60	14.89
1928	695,170	1,667	(4)	1,667	6.03	6.38	5.50	1951	681,189	302,777	88,043	390,820	17.99	18.75	21.46
1929	724,478	14,411	226	14,637	6.49	6.84	5.40	1952	666,001	449,636	115,705	565,341	16.21	17.03	18.53
1930	595,425	25,839	281	26,120	4.56	4.91	3.60	1953	547,430	513,724	234,576	748,300	10.86	11.53	9.47
1931	410,318	780	274	1,054	3.64	3.99	2.52	1954	473,471	455,427	156,858	612,285	10.69	11.19	9.78
1932	285,231	1,904	310	2,214	2.88	3.25	2.12	1955	514,671	478,044	195,696	673,740	12.30	12.80	11.30
1933	384,280	2,133	1,890	4,023	4.03	4.40	2.96	1956	542,340	525,350	244,978	770,328	13.49	13.00	12.19
1934	438,726	14,277	1,725	16,002	4.16	4.51	3.07	1957	531,735	526,014	269,007	795,021	11.40	11.90	10.18
1935	517,903	10,277	4,444	14,721	4.33	4.70	3.08	1958	412,005	462,008	195,199	657,207	10.31	10.81	8.24
1936	575,574	172	11,660	11,832	4.90	5.28	3.31	1959	416,965	496,258	156,860	653,118	11.45	11.95	10.27
1937	626,362	8,812	37,208	46,020	6.52	6.87	4.91								

[1] Imports for consumption for 1915-38.

[2] Source: Various sources, including Engineering and Mining Journal, Metal Statistics and Metallgesellschaft Aktiengesellschaft.

[3] Conversions made in accordance with changing value of British pound sterling.

[4] Less than 1 ton.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Mines.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield if I have any time remaining. I wonder if the Senator from Delaware will yield me some time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that if the Government enters into this new field providing subsidies, it will establish a precedent which will cause other mining industries to ask for similar subsidies? I mention fluorspar, manganese, tungsten, and mercury, as to which economic difficulties likewise exist in the operations. If the Senator answers "no," I wish he would explain how we will stop the other industries from coming in with such a request.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have a very good way of answering the Senator's question. I shall not try to mislead the Senator by

saying that the troubles in this country are confined to lead and zinc. They are not. The troubles spread to many other minerals. I would disagree as to the effect, or the extent of the effect, with regard to some of the minerals the Senator has named.

There is a way out of the problem. There is presently in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill passed by the U.S. Senate last year, sponsored by the senior Senator from Colorado, which would establish a National Minerals Policy Act. If we could adopt such a piece of proposed legislation, then we could go forward upon the basis of establishing a national minerals policy. Frankly, I would rather see us go forward on other bases than this, but we cannot allow these mines to close down, as a result of which we will lose the mines, lose the machinery which is operating, and lose the people whom it takes years to train to operate the mines.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Colorado undoubtedly is familiar with these operations. How many persons are usually employed in an operation which produces 2,000 tons?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be a relatively small operation. I would say six or eight people.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Six or eight people for a 2,000-ton operation?

Mr. ALLOTT. This would not include the mill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many would be in the mill?

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot answer that question. The milling facilities are usually combined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the matter of 2,000 tons of lead, we would be giving the operator $160,000. The Senator says there would be about a dozen people employed, does he?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not willing to approach it upon that basis. I do not know where the Senator gets his figures. The present-day market on lead is about 12 cents.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The present-day market on zinc is 13½ cents.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I got the figure from the committee report.

Mr. ALLOTT. It varies from day to day.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand. I gave the June 30 figure.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator stated the figures backward a few minutes ago. Zinc at the present time is in a rather unusual situation. It is higher than lead at the present time. The present price on lead is about 12 cents and on zinc it is about 13½ cents. The subsidy would be between 12 and 17 cents for lead and between 13½ and 14½ cents for zinc.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For what is lead selling now—12 cents?

Mr. ALLOTT. Twelve cents, in round figures.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are going to subsidize at 17 cents. That means we shall be paying 5 cents a pound.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me invite these facts to the attention of the Senator: first of all, this would be limited particularly to individual mines. One person can get a subsidy for only one unit in one mining district of one State.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me more time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of 12 cents a pound for lead, we would be paying one operator $200,000 a year, and he would have eight people employed, as mentioned by the Senator from Colorado. If there are more people employed I should like to know how many more there are. I have been told the figure is 40.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sorry. I do not know where I got the figure of eight. That figure just came into my head. I should like to correct the statement. It is about 40.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Forty. Then we would be paying $5,000 a man as subsidy?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator chooses to look at it that way he can. It is not a question of men. It is a question of what we are going to do to preserve the industry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So we would be paying $5,000 a man to keep one of these impoverished industries operating. Can the Senator justify that amount of money being taken from the taxpayers to keep these mines operating?

Mr. ALLOTT. The difference is that most of these mines do not produce 2,000 tons. They produce a lesser amount.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If they produced less they would have fewer people working.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator wishes to put this upon that basis, would he also wish to justify the ship subsidies, the construction of wharves, the construction of docking facilities, the construction of flood control projects on the basis of the number of people who are interested? I do not think so. What I am trying to say is that this may benefit a relatively small number of people, as such, but what we would be doing is preserving the lead and zinc industry of this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 1 minute yielded has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 more minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I fought the subsidies for the merchant marine. I fought the subsidies for the drydock people a year ago. I fought the subsidies for the fishing industry. Each industry claimed it could not survive unless the taxpayers' money was given to it.

I am today fighting this subsidy, because when we get through granting this, perhaps Ohio may come before the Senate to ask that ceramics be subsidized on the same basis. I am wondering where the end will come.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. May I answer the Senator's question?

Personally I would prefer to do this by an international agreement. If the bill which passed the Senate last year were to be passed in the House, I think we could do what is right and get all of us out of trouble. We could help the mining industry in that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate the Senator's general philosophy of this subject, but my fear is rooted in the proposition that next we will have a plea from the railroads. They will be before us next year. We are preparing the way for them. That is why I do not think we ought to enter into this field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island to ask a question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PASTORE. I have only one question to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado. Is the preservation of this industry tied in at all with the national security?

Mr. ALLOTT. In my opinion, it is vitally necessary to preserve the industry. It is tied into the national security. It is no secret that the Russians have some 400 or 500 submarines. If we should ever get into a national emergency which did not involve the whole earth going up, there is no question that we could be shut off from roughly two-thirds of our lead and roughly two-thirds of our zinc each year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, did the Senator say that we need this for national security purposes?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. I do say that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are perhaps four or five departments which have sent in letters in this regard. Each one has said that we have more zinc and lead than we need, and they all oppose the proposal.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will say to the Senator that we do have more lead and zinc than we need, simply because we are being flooded in this country by foreign imports. There is no question about where the excess comes from. It is not coming from the United States.

Let me give the Senator some actual figures on lead for 1959.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have seen them in the report. I am familiar with them. The Senator may state them for the benefit of other Senators.

Mr. ALLOTT. In 1959 production in the United States was 256,000 tons, and we imported a total of 531,000 tons. It is very easy to see why under those circumstances we are gradually debilitating our lead and zinc industry, as well as all of our other mining industry, to the detriment of our own country. We are not helping foreign countries, because the benefit from the cheap lead and zinc we are buying from abroad goes either to large companies or to the Government. It does not go to the workers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Colorado agree with me that the entrance of plastics into the market has removed a great deal of the demand that was formerly supplied with lead?

Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, August 15.

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

BLOCK THAT SUBSIDY

The domestic lead and zinc mining interests seem to be the object of more "helpful" attention in Congress than almost any other segment of the economy, a fact more striking because of the extremely limited importance of this small industry from an economic standpoint. For 2 years the domestic mines have benefited from import quotas. These the Tariff Commission will review, and ought to abolish, this fall in light of the considerable improvement in world marketing procedures and the voluntary restraints worked out through the United Nations. Now the industry wants great increases in tariffs, which have already been approved by House and Senate committees. Some producers also want Federal subsidies, a bill which has cleared the House.

We have already stated our opposition to the tariff increases which, in many ways, would be the most objectionable of all the protectionist measures proposed. We have equal objections, however, to the Edmondson subsidy bill, which would add to the tax and other benefits already granted the extracting industries a Government price support pegged well above the present market. The result would be to perpetuate—in some case to reopen—high-cost uneconomic mines with no prospect of ever being really self-supporting.

Some sympathy is warranted for the individual victims of unemployment in such situations and perhaps some Federal help in resettlement would be justified. But the Edmondson bill envisages no permanent cure looking toward the reinvestment of capital or the retraining of workers for more productive enterprises. The only possible excuse for lead-zinc subsidies would be as political bulwark against congressional reinvasion of the tariff-writing field. This would indeed be merely an excuse, however, and not a valid reason for enactment of the Edmondson bill.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I shall support this measure—H.R. 8860—which is designed to give much needed relief to the small lead and zinc producers and the workers who depend upon this industry for their livelihood.

This bill differs from other measures that have been presented in the past in that it applies only to those producers whose annual output does not exceed 2,000 tons. It takes 40 to 45 men to so produce.

Although the lead and zinc industry in my State is comparatively small, to those who look to it for their bread and butter, it is the most important industry in the world. I care not how small it may be, it is a part of the economic life of my State—a vital part and I rise today to see to it that it receives fair and equitable treatment.

Statistics will show that in 1947–49, the tristate area which includes my State, produced 14.8 percent of the total annual production of zinc in the United States. In 1958, this area produced only 2.1 percent and today its production is practically nil.

The producers of these metals in my State are no longer waging a struggle for a profit but a struggle for their very existence and to protect the mining industry for tomorrow.

On three different occasions, the Tariff Commission has tried to give relief to this depressed industry. In 1953, the Commission instituted its first escape clause investigation. In 1954, the Commission unanimously recommended increased duties. But what did we do? Instead of following the Commission's recommendations, we instituted a stockpile purchasing program. Again in 1958, the Commission entertained an industry petition for an escape clause action and on April 28, 1958, again the Commission unanimously found that unmanufactured lead and zinc were being imported in such quantities as to seriously injure the domestic industries producing like and competitive products. On that very day, I wired the President and I quote:

In view of the Tariff Commission's recommendations today that unmanufactured lead and zinc are being imported into the United States in such quantities as to injure domestic industries and in view of the widespread unemployment in the southeast area of my State due to mines and smelting plants being closed, I respectfully urge you to take immediate action in line with the recommendations of Commissioners Brossard, Talbot, and Schreiber.

The administration deemed it advisable to proclaim import quotas effective October 1, 1958. These quotas restricted imports to 80 percent of the average annual competitive imports of the period 1953–57. This did not solve the problem for the producers in my State.

In 1958, Secretary Seaton then submitted a plan to stabilize prices. This proposal was acceptable to the small producers. We in the Senate passed the Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act—S. 4036—which would have made the Seaton proposal operative but the House failed to pass the legislation.

In March 1959, I with a number of other Senators joined Senator MURRAY in cosponsoring S. 1566 to stabilize the domestic market price of lead and zinc. On August 12, 1959, I joined with a number of Senators in cosponsoring Senate Resolution 162 which directed the Tariff Commission to make a supplementary investigation and report as to the current conditions in the lead and zinc industry. The Senate on August 21, 1959, passed that resolution.

The minority report of the Commission again found that all import quotas should be removed and higher tariff duties applied.

The bill that is before us today is quite similar to the Seaton plan but is limited to small producers of lead and zinc only. Under this bill, I want to emphasize payments are made to small producers, who annually produce less than 2,000 tons, an amount equal to the amount they would receive if the market price of zinc were 14½ cents per pound and lead at 17 cents per pound. It would cost the Government around $25 million over a 5-year period.

Call it what you may, a subsidy or by the "highfalutin" name of compensatory payment. The fact remains that the producers of these ores have been driven to the wall not by any acts of their own, but by operation of the Reciprocal Trade Act which have lowered import duties and permitted the flow of ores into this country to the detriment of American workers.

Time and again I have said that I favored reciprocal trade. But reciprocal trade is a two-way street. When reciprocal trade means a full dinner pail in Shangri-La and Government relief to the miners in Galena, Baxter Springs, Columbus, and other areas of my State, I am against it. It is as simple as that.

I hope the Senate will pass this measure. If our State Department prefers playing "footsies" with the foreign producers by sidelining the American producers and permitting foreign producers to take our markets, then it is up to us as Members of Congress to see to it that our American workers are given a fair shake.

I urge my colleagues to take favorable action on H.R. 8860.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this bill gives Congress an opportunity to provide some relief for a segment of the lead-zinc industry. It is designed to fit conditions in a particular area, although it may offer some help elsewhere.

By limiting the stabilization payments to small domestic producers—those producing or selling up to 2,000 tons of lead and/or zinc a year—the bill excludes most of the lead-zinc operations in my State of Utah.

Even though most Utah producers will not be affected by it, however, I have given this legislation my strong support. I have done so because I believe it is a step in the right direction. I believe it may help to lead us to a truly adequate program for this depressed industry.

For more than 10 years a great decline has occurred in the number of tons of lead and zinc produced. In 1948, for example, about 3,000 men had jobs in

Utah lead-zinc mines. By 1952, the number had dropped to 2,200. By 1958 the total was only 1,096, and last October there were only 958.

Another evidence of the depression of this industry is the fact that, since the escape clause was written into the Trade Agreement Act of 1951, lead-zinc is the only U.S. industry which has received two unanimous findings of injury by the Tariff Commission.

The principal cause of this depression is cheaply mined imports. And I emphasize that this bill does not offer a solution to that overall problem.

Despite the import quotas imposed in 1958, foreign imports continue to dominate our market. While we expect about 30 percent of our industrial needs to be supplied by imports, today our consumption of foreign lead and zinc far exceeds our consumption of domestic.

As in the past, the principal opposition to a more adequate program is coming from the administration agencies, which contend that the import quotas are satisfactory.

We of the West are aware of the importance of maintaining friendly relations with other nations. We agree that the United States should be especially concerned about the welfare of other democracies. They have economic problems. They are helping us hold off Communist expansion. But we oppose putting the burden primarily on the backs of a few domestic industries.

Our lead-zinc industry is an irreplaceable natural resource. It is vital to our security. We must protect America's ability to produce these essential metals whenever they are needed.

It has taken years of work and millions of dollars of investment to bring our metal production capacity to its present level. It depends on numerous individual operations. No two of these are alike. They vary in size, in method, in location. Once closed, these operations decay rapidly, becoming very expensive, or even impossible, to reopen. And the force of workers with the skills to operate the mines must make new connections and move their families to new locations.

I urge the Senate to pass this bill. I do so with the hope that it is the forerunner of a more realistic program to come, with the hope that the Congress that convenes next January, and the new administration, may be farsighted enough to put this essential industry on a long-range stable basis.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise to oppose the bill. I point out to Senators that what is proposed here is the start of a so-called Brannan plan for the mining industry. The bill, if enacted, would authorize certain mines to sell their lead and zinc in the open market and to take any price that was available. There would be no object for the lead and zinc mines to try to get a good price, for if they were to get 10 cents or even 5 cents, it would make no difference, because the differential between what they would receive in the open market and the 14½ cents in the case of zinc, and 17 cents in the case of lead would be paid by the U.S. Government.

This same socialistic principle was advocated years ago for the agriculture program and was rejected.

Much has been said about whether we should or should not guarantee the price of agricultural products at 90 percent. But this bill goes far beyond anything that has ever been dreamed of or suggested so far as supporting agriculture is concerned, and it provides a subsidy for two segments of the mining industry only.

There is no question but that if the bill is passed, we shall be asked next year to add other minerals to the program, and if we add all the mining industry, what will we do with respect to textile mills and other industries that are in a similar position? There is not money enough in the Federal Treasury to underwrite such a program as is proposed for all industries in America.

Furthermore, I point out that the bill has been opposed by every agency of Government concerned. The Defense Department has written a letter to the committee and has emphasized the fact that we already have more zinc and lead on hand than we can conceivably use in the light of any type of possible emergency, and every interested agency of the Government has stated that the proposed legislation is unnecessary and should not be enacted.

As the bill was reported to us, it was estimated that the cost would be about $4½ million a year based upon an estimate furnished by the Department of the Interior. I call attention to the fact that the estimate of the Department of the Interior was furnished on the basis of the bill as it was originally introduced, and not on the bill as it was passed by the House and reported to the Senate.

I have before me a letter from the Department of Interior dated August 19, 1960, addressed to the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in which Mr. Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary, states: "The $4.4 million presently in the bill simply will not cover the anticipated output of the small mines under the amended language. Therefore, the result would be a proportioning of the funds to less than the full amount of their production, even though produced in anticipation of receiving full benefit.

If the Senate wishes that every participant in this program shall get his full share of the payment authorized, the total appropriation authorized in the bill will have to be substantially increased to an estimated $13½ million. If the bill is ever enacted, it will be only an opening wedge. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind as to the point, I only remind him that only a few years ago the first bill that was introduced along this line, and which was rejected by Congress, involved an estimated cost of $800 million. It proposed to support practically every segment of the mining industry. That bill was likewise opposed on the same basis and by the same agencies of government. The bill was defeated.

Another bill was introduced later and its estimated cost was between $50 million and $75 million. That bill was defeated.

Last year or the year before a bill was passed by Congress which provided for a cost of about $30 million, and the President vetoed it. This time the request has been lowered in an effort to get it passed. Apparently the idea now is get a foot in the door and establish this principle of subsidy payments, then work higher.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may obtain a little information?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware whether there is any precedent in laws now on the statute books for granting a subsidy to any segment of our economy for the difference between the market price of a product and a fixed sum?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To my knowledge there is not. That is the dangerous part of this whole bill, because once we establish a precedent, it will spread not alone to every segment of the mining industry, but into the textile industries and to other industries including agriculture. We cannot find enough money in the Treasury of this country to subsidize these industries under this Brannan type of a subsidy program. To pass this bill would establish a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly agree with the general sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I note that the price of lead on June 30 was 13 cents, and the bill would assure a guaranteed price of 17 cents. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. The price of zinc on that day was 12 cents. The bill would assure a price of 14½ cents; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. But it would apply only to certain lead and zinc companies, and not to all of them; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true with respect to the bill which is presently before us, although the original proposal some years ago was to apply it to practically all minerals. Once they get the nose of the camel under the tent, and this subsidy principle established, undoubtedly it will be expanded to all of the mining industry as well as to other industries.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, the bill would benefit only a small segment, in the first place, of our total economy, and would furthermore benefit only a segment of that small segment. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. As was pointed out earlier in the colloquy, this subsidy would amount to about $5,000 for each employee in the case of one mine. Certainly we are in favor of keeping men at work but we cannot subsidize marginal mines, at a cost of $5,000 for each employee. We cannot place such a burden on the taxpayers. If we adopt this plan with respect to a particular segment of the mining industry, it will soon be urged that we apply it to every segment of the mining industry, and then to all other industries as well.

I hope the Senate will defeat this bill and if they do not then I predict the President will veto it.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the conclusions reached by our distinguished friend from Delaware. It seems that this is fundamentally unsound legislation. It is not in accord with the tenets of the Republican Party to the effect that our economy must be free and competitive and that we must not and should not directly support industries which cannot otherwise make a go of it. It is not, furthermore, in accord with my own concepts of fairness as to other segments of our economy.

I do not want to see the day when we extend this principle of Federal subsidization to other segments of our economy. In a sense, I hope that this bill, rather than being a lead bill, will prove to be a lead balloon and will never get off the ground.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am in accord with the position of the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware on the pending bill. I compliment him for bringing to the attention of the country the important points he is bringing out about the bill, and the obnoxious provisions of it.

Mr. President, I must oppose the passage of H.R. 8860. The domestic lead and zinc producers deserve sympathetic treatment at the hands of Congress for they are unquestionably in a bad predicament. They are faced literally with extinction because of the imports of lead and zinc. In 1946 imports of lead equaled 19 percent of U.S. production; by 1951 imports were 75 percent of U.S. production; in 1958 they were 91 percent of U.S. production. Zinc imports have risen from 37 percent of U.S. production in 1946 to 119 percent of U.S. production in 1958. Since 1952 U.S. production of lead has declined 35 percent, and domestic production of zinc has declined 37 percent. There can be no other conclusion but that the imports of lead and zinc are resulting in the destruction of domestic production of these metals.

The lead and zinc industries have utilized every possible approach under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act to obtain relief. That relief has been denied by a split decision of the Tariff Commission.

My heart goes out to both the producers and the employees of these mining industries. They should be granted relief. Subsidies, however, Mr. President, are not the answer.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the lead and zinc industries are but two of many of the domestic industries which are suffering from the competition of imports, which have a competitive advantage stemming primarily from the low scale of wages in the country of origin of the imports. Although many of these industries have sought relief from the administration and the Congress in the form of wiser administration of the trade program and changes in the basic law itself by the Congress to insure a more realistic administration, both the Congress and the administration have repeatedly failed to take realistic action.

We have heard advocated on this floor on a number of occasions that the proper course is to subsidize with tax money the industries which are so depressed. This, to the best of my knowledge, is the first attempt to actually carry out such an unwise and unrealistic proposal. We must not adopt the approach of subsidies as a remedy for this situation for although this bill will incur an annual expense of only about $5 million, it will set the precedent for the same approach to the innumerable industries which are now suffering from identical causes. Subsidies are not the answer, Mr. President, and as much as my heart goes out to the lead and zinc industries, I cannot in good conscience support a bill which is so unwise in principle.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I am happy to yield to the very able and distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from South Carolina tell us whether the textile industry in South Carolina is in distress; and if subsidies are justified for the lead and zinc industry, would they not likewise be justified for the textile industry?

Mr. THURMOND. The textile industry is hit just about as hard as any industry in this Nation. Our Government ranks textile second only to steel in the matter of national defense. If conditions get worse, the textile industry will be closed, and in the event of war or emergency I do not know what we will do. It is urgent that the industry be kept open. The textile industry is seriously handicapped and seriously injured by the tremendous imports coming into the country, just as lead and zinc imports are coming into the country. I do not believe subsidies are the answer. The distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is chairman of the Textile Subcommittee which has done good work in this field. We have about reached the conclusion—at least I have—that if the administration does not take some action to protect the industry it will be necessary to come to Congress for legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not believe that subsidies are the answer. We will have to adopt quotas, or devise some other type of legislative means, but not give handouts to an industry when it is in trouble, in order to keep the industry going on and on by support of the Federal Government with grants. I do not believe that is the answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from South Carolina hear the statement that on the basis of the proposed subsidies, we would be giving $5,000 to every person in a lead and zinc mine? Did he hear of that development? In other words, we would give $200,000 for 1 year to a mine employing 40 people. I should like to hear the Senator's comment on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. My view is entirely in accord with his. I believe we would set a precedent which would later rise up to harass us.

If we set a precedent by passing this kind of proposed legislation, then in fairness and justice we shall have to help the bicycle industry, the watch industry, the textile industry, and before long the steel industry and every other industry in the country. That is a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Montana was about to ask me a question a few minutes ago. I shall be pleased to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I shall lend the Senator from Montana 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina said that if conditions in the textile industry become more distressed, the industry would have to ask Congress for help. That is exactly what the depressed zinc and lead industry is doing. I think we ought to take into consideration the fact that lead and zinc are domestic natural resources which we are trying to preserve.

As one who has worked in the copper mines in Coeur d'Alene, Butte, and Arizona for 10 years, I know what happens to mines when they are allowed to deteriorate. The roofs cave in, the walls fall down, and the sumps fill with water.

It is possible to transfer an industry from one location to another, but not a mine. For that reason, I think the lead and zinc mines need special consideration.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator concerning the importance of the lead and zinc industry, as I said a few minutes ago.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute.

Mr. THURMOND. However, I do not believe subsidies are the answer. When I said that the textile industry might have to ask Congress for relief, I did not mean that that industry would ask for subsidies. I meant that the textile industry needs legislation to restrict the tremendous amount of imports of textiles into this country. If the amount of imports were limited, the domestic textile industry could stand on its own feet; it would not want any subsidies. It does not want subsidies now.

I believe that if we were to restrict the quantities of lead and zinc which are being imported into the United States, those industries would not want subsidies either.

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I oppose the bill and support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The administration opposes the Edmondson bill, H.R. 8860, which would subsidize lead and zinc production.

Enactment of the bill would involve the President with a very difficult choice: to veto and suffer the domestic consequences or to sign and suffer adverse international effects, especially in Mexico, Peru, and Canada.

A possible amendment to the Edmondson bill is S. 1245 which provides production subsidies—"incentive payments"—for columbium-tantalum, beryl, and chromite. While Interior has supported S. 1245, it appears it could not be enacted alone. It might be attached to the Edmondson bill as an amendment.

Another possible addition could be the fluorspar amendment, since it has an approach generally similar to H.R. 8860.

Shortcomings of the Edmondson bill—H.R. 8860—are:

By providing a subsidy computed on the difference between market price and a target price, it would stimulate unneeded production in the less efficient mines regardless of market price. It would induce additional production estimated at 40,000 tons during the first year; 80,000 tons in the second year; and somewhat more thereafter.

Thus, it would depress market prices for lead and zinc and induce layoffs in some of the mines that are now producing.

Depressed market prices would further harm lead-zinc exporters to the United States who are already subject to our import quotas. This would be particularly serious to Mexico, Peru, and Canada. And this adverse reaction could very well be shared throughout Latin America.

It would establish an undesirable precedent.

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

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on another matter, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, during the consideration of the Kennedy-Morse minimum wage bill, I stated that Federal action in this field should be limited to establishing fair labor standards for employees who work for enterprises substantially engaged in interstate commerce, and that the respective States should establish such standards for the employees of intrastate businesses, including retail stores, hotels, restaurants, laundries, and other enterprises which are essentially local in nature.

These considerations prompted my vote for the Holland amendment, which would have eliminated from the Kennedy-Morse bill the language which permits extension of Federal regulation and control to every local business, and for the Dirksen substitute, which would have increased the minimum wage to $1.15 for those presently covered, and would have extended coverage to about 2 million workers who are employed by enterprises clearly in interstate commerce.

I supported the Monroney amendment, and voted against the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to table it. That amendment would have limited the application of the act to retail or service enterprises operating in two or more States.

I regret that the Monroney amendment was tabled by a vote of 50 to 48, but the closeness of the vote, and the Senate's subsequent adoption of the Anderson amendment exempting hotels, motels, restaurants, automobile, and farm equipment dealers—which I supported—leads me to hope that the bill will be substantially improved when it goes to a conference between the House and Senate.

The Democratic presidential candidate's insistence upon extending Federal regulation and control in this field to all businesses, even those engaged only in local activities, was demonstrated by his vote against the Monroney amendment. The political cynicism which motivated many Democratic Senators to support the Anderson amendment was demonstrated by candid admissions that they favored it only as a means of forestalling the adoption of the Monroney amendment, which it did.

Mr. President, I hope that from the House-Senate conference will emerge a bill which will extend protection under the act to many more workers employed by enterprises substantially engaged in interstate commerce, and which will provide for an adequate increase in the minimum wage. Such a bill would conform to the Republican platform, and if it is presented I shall vote for adoption of the conference report.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC ON PUBLIC, INDIAN, AND OTHER LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how stands the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 4 minutes remaining; the opponents have 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I recognize that the lead and zinc bill before us presents a very difficult problem, but I should like every Senator to place himself in the position in which we who come from areas having lead and zinc mines find ourselves.

In 1956, in Colorado, there were 95 lead and zinc mines operating whose production was less than 4,000 tons of lead and zinc combined. These are the mines that would qualify for stabilization payments under this bill. Today not a single one of those mines is operating. Why are they not operating? Because imports of lead and zinc have flooded into this country. What have we sought to do before we developed the concept in this bill? We have tried to exhaust our administrative remedy. We have gone before the Tariff Commission and have attempted to get action from the executive branch of the Government. But as of today, there has been no effective action. The Tariff Commission instituted a quota system, but the quota system has failed to work.

Let us remember two things: (1) the economic condition of the lead- and zinc-producing regions of the United States, and (2) the crisis we may be confronted with in the event the international situation continues to deteriorate. There is critical unemployment in the metal mining regions. Furthermore those very metal mines which may be needed if a defense crisis develops, will be destroyed by flooding and lost to the Nation unless we reactivate them through this program. For a relatively small investment, considering the great amount of money we are spending on foreign aid, the lead and zinc industry could be saved. It would be a very small subsidy to reactivate and strengthen only small producers.

I have always supported the reciprocal trade program. I have always supported appropriations for mutual security. We know that we must not build barriers around ourselves in the field of trade. Nevertheless, when we permit the destruction of local economies, I think a duty rests upon the Government to help restore those areas, whether they are in the New England States, the distressed Appalachian region, the Rocky Mountains, or elsewhere.

We have discussed this program before. I think this would be a good pilot test. We could try it out to see how effective it might be. This program does not require large appropriations, yet it will help save the small metal mining industry, reduce unemployment, and keep mines critically needed for national defense from flooding.

This is a sensible bill. As I have stated before, I believe it can be made to work.

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I shall yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. Before I yield to him, I should like to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has only 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it does not seem necessary to detail for this astute body the continuing critical plight of our domestic mining industry. You are all well aware of the depressed condition of the industry and the communities which support that industry. There have been layoffs and curtailment; mines have been shut down; organizations have been disrupted; entire communities have been turned into ghost towns.

What happens to the miners when this occurs? They are trained to recover those ores so vital to our economy and our defense. Where do they turn? There is little hope for them. The home in which they plan to rear their children has suddenly become a house in a dead town which cannot be sold because it has no value. There are no employment opportunities in other mining towns because virtually all such communities are facing the same distressing dilemma. Their only hope is down in the mine. And the hope of many others also looks there for fulfillment. The local merchant, the mechanic, the wholesaler, the schoolteacher, and all others who combine to give life to a community, must depend ultimately on a successful mining operation.

Beyond this, of course, is the welfare of the entire Nation. No one will deny that the final best hope of our Nation, both economically and defensively, is dependent on a healthy, producing mining capacity.

And now to the legislation before us. H.R. 8860 is designed to assist a segment of the mining industry which is basic to our whole economy.

May I just briefly point up what has happened to the lead-zinc industry during the last decade. In 1952 there were over 900 domestic mines producing ores or concentrates which were chiefly of value for their lead and zinc content. By 1956 this number had dropped to 544. By 1958 the number was less than 300. Although I do not have the exact figures, I know that additional mines ceased operations during 1959.

In Nevada, income from lead mining dropped from $2.34 million in 1953 to $971,000 in 1958. Income from zinc dropped from $4.8 million to $19,000. The effect of such a terrific reduction on the economy and the employment of the communities involved is not difficult to comprehend.

H.R. 8860 would provide sufficient assistance to this depressed industry to give it new life.

Just 2 weeks ago, the inspector of mines in my State told me that enactment of this legislation would make it possible for those lead and zinc mines in Nevada, which have been unable to operate these past years, to resume operation on a limited basis.

I have recently visited many of the communities which a few years ago were thriving and prosperous. Today they are decaying. The mines are filling with water except in those cases where the owners are continuing to spend money to maintain them. Houses and business establishments are boarded up. The technical knowledge required to operate our mines is being wasted.

Our young men hesitate to train for this field because of the bleak opportunities presently afforded there. Our Nation cannot afford to allow such a situation to continue.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the solemn fact that our national defense, and perhaps our very survival, are dependent upon a producing lead and zinc industry. To place unlimited faith in foreign imports could be disastrous. Reflect, if you will, on what could have happened recently to our sugar supply, except that a successful system of import quotas had kept the domestic sugar industry healthy. Similar circumstances could suddenly upset our foreign supply of lead and zinc. It is incumbent upon us to provide whatever assistance our lead-zinc industry needs to maintain operations. We cannot afford to allow our mines to fill with water; nor can we afford to lose the skills of those men who have the technical training necessary to successfully operate our mines.

Mr. President, H.R. 8860 will prevent a further deterioration of the lead-zinc industry. It is designed to provide enough assistance to small producers that they can maintain their mines. They can stay alive, as it were; and yet, this bill is not of such design that it would damage any good-neighbor country which now sells lead and zinc to this country.

Mr. President, H.R. 8860 deserves the support of all Senators. It is not a partisan issue. There are vigorous advocates of this legislation on both sides of the aisle.

Both of our great political parties, in their recently adopted platforms, have recognized the problem which this bill is designed to correct. Both have pledged themselves to find adequate programs of assistance. Both have recognized the need for full employment in a free and healthy society. This bill would certainly help to attain that goal.

Senators are repeatedly pointing up the need for wise utilization of our natural resources. This legislation provides a vehicle whereby they can implement their opinions. It can be done at a very modest cost. The program proposed here would require approximately $4.5 million per year for a 5-year period.

Mr. President, this bill involves more than my State; it involves the national interest. By enacting it, we provide for the continued operation of these mines; we keep hundreds of miner families on the job and off relief; we save small businessmen in mining towns; and we get mineral production the Nation can use.

In short, we reverse a ruinous trend.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill is the outgrowth of a realization on the part of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and the Senate of the necessity to make a substantial start in the direction of saving a great American industry, the lead and zinc mines.

It is a very modest program. The outside limit is less than $5,000 a year. Yet it represents the difference between life and death to hundreds of mines and, therefore, to dozens of communities in this country. With the bill in operation, there will be a chance for them to live and to survive. But if the bill is not enacted, they are doomed.

I earnestly seek the cooperation of all the fine Members of this body in voting for a measure that is so worthy.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty seconds.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield that time to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to endorse the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and to go on record as favoring the bill for the same reasons.

This measure is a very important one, and I sincerely hope it will be passed by the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 1 minute remaining under his control.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield that time to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not believe that it is possible for us to support this bill if we contemplate rendering service to the taxpayers and the citizens of the country.

I wish to leave with the Senate this thought: It has developed that by means of the bill, these mine operators will be paid $5,000 per person employed, to keep the mines open for 1 year. On the basis of the present difference between the market price of lead and the subsidy now proposed, this program, if placed into effect, will give $200,000 of the taxpayers' money to each mine operator, for the mine operator will be hiring 40 persons, at $5,000 per person. I do not think we are justified in adopting that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All available time has been used by both sides.

The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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.

The bill has been read the third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator is recorded.

Mr. ELLENDER. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the affirmative.

If the Chair may be allowed to make a statement, it is the understanding of the Chair that there has been a power shortage, and because of that, there will be a delay.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I inquire how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Am I recorded in the affirmative or the negative?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it in order, under the emergency circumstances, to ask for a 5-minute delay in the announcement of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that would not be in order, in spite of the unusual circumstances.

Mr. MORSE. I ask if the Senator from Oregon is recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recorded.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Presiding Officer mind advising me how I voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the Chair inform me how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, may I inquire as to whether or nor I am recorded on this rollcall?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recorded.

Mr. MOSS. Will the Chair inform me as to how I am recorded on this rollcall?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is it in order to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would depend upon what the parliamentary inquiry is about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to inquire of the Chair if there is any conceivable contingency which would permit a delay in the announcement of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that Senators who are late because of the power shortage be allowed to record their votes provided they are in the Senate Chamber in the next 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not in a position to entertain that request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Chair allow me to ask the Senator from Florida to repeat the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOLLAND. The question I addressed to the Presiding Officer was whether or not it was in order to ask unanimous consent that Senators who are delayed by reason of the power failure be allowed, within 10 minutes, to have their votes recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that cannot be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has announced it is not in a position to grant that request, and that such a request would be out of order.

Mr. ROBERTSON entered the Chamber and voted in the negative.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, due to the noise, it was not possible for me to hear the response of the Chair to the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the distinguished Senator from Florida. Will the Chair kindly repeat his ruling in that regard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answered in the negative.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 301]

YEAS—59

Allott	Hart	Mansfield
Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Holland	Moss
Bible	Humphrey	Mundt
Burdick	Jackson	Murray
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Carroll	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Lusk	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McClellan	Yarborough
Fulbright	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Magnuson	

NAYS—28

Bridges	Frear	Pastore
Bush	Goldwater	Prouty
Butler	Green	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Scott
Clark	Javits	Smith
Cotton	Keating	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morton	
Douglas	Muskie	

NOT VOTING—13

Aiken	Dodd	Martin
Beall	Engle	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hayden	Russell
Chavez	Hennings	
Cooper	Jordan	

So the bill (H.R. 8860) was passed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida voted for the passage of the bill which has just been passed, but since he almost invariably votes against subsidies, and since he does not wish to have this vote regarded as a precedent in cases which he thinks are not like this one, the Senator from Florida wishes to state briefly exactly why he voted for the bill.

First, the Senator from Florida is one of those who has voted against the depressed area bills in several sessions, always for the reason that, as presented, they covered much too great territory and, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, reached into many places where there was no real distress and no real need for assistance. In this instance it seemed to the Senator from Florida that the bill is confined to the exact areas and industries which are in distress and which are entitled to some aid.

The second point, Mr. President, is that the Senator from Florida felt, under the showing in regard to the bill, there was no doubt that the bill was confined in its action to an industry of national importance from the standpoint of the strategic minerals which it produces, and that it is no answer to simply say we have in the stockpile enough lead and zinc to carry us through any particular emergency.

The Senator from Florida thought these mines should be kept open rather than be flooded and the machinery and mines lost.

In the third place, the Senator from Florida, after studying the bill, felt that it was carefully limited to actual small mining operations that have been open and producing in the last short period of time, and would not open the door to the production of new and uneconomical mining units.

In the last place, it is limited in the number of years in which the subsidy would operate, and it calls for relatively small expenditures.

The Senator from Florida thought this was a useful experiment in a field in which the Nation could well make an effort, and which appealed to the Senator from Florida, particularly in view of the fact that only this morning, he was asked as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to pass upon a request, which was very generously acted upon by the Appropriations Committee, for us to send abroad about $4 billion in foreign aid, which helps other nations, which, at least in many instances the Senator from Florida thinks can be helped to our own definite advantage.

The Senator from Florida has made this statement, not only because the vote that he has cast for a subsidy in this case differs from his normal procedure and his almost uniform procedure, but because in earlier discussions today he may have led some of his friends, including the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], to conclude that his attitude was otherwise. The Senator from Florida has made a very careful study of this measure today, and wishes the RECORD to show the exact reasons why he has thus voted and why he does not regard this bill as a precedent for the support of subsidies generally.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I point out for purposes of the record that this year the Senate established two new forms of subsidy and expanded one other. It decided to subsidize the fishing industry because the fishing industry was unable to compete and was being outpriced. Today the Senate decided to subsidize the mineral mining industry dealing with lead and zinc. About 2 months ago we increased the subsidy to the merchant marine. I predict that in the next session this parade will grow faster and larger. Today we declared by our vote that we are willing to pay a subsidy of $5,000 per employee. It has not been disputed that the mining interests will receive $200,000 per firm on the basis of the present difference between what the market price is and what the subsidy calls for. To hire one person we propose to pay a subsidy of $5,000. I think it is shocking, and I think there will be some answering to do, if the story is told to the taxpayers of the Nation that the Congress of the United States today decided that for the purpose of keeping uneconomically unsound mines open it would authorize the payment of $5,000 to hire one person. No one will dispute the figure. The figures have been established and are irrevocable. That is the story. From the Senate today comes the message that we are prepared to subsidize in the sum of $5,000 per person. We are not taking our money. We are taking the taxpayers' money, and we are taking it under the pretense of helping the worker, when in fact we are intending to help only the men who own those mines.

PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL FOR MILK AND BUTTERFAT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1654, S. 2917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat.

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. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new sentence to be inserted immediately after the first sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, for the period beginning with the enactment of this sentence and ending March 31, 1961, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.22 per hundredweight and 59.6 cents per pound, respectively."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added as cosponsors to S. 2917.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a bill which has enthusiastic and bipartisan support. Among its cosponsors are the ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as well as the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], all of whom are Republican members of the Agricultural Committee, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], my senior colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

This is a very simple and moderate bill. The bill seeks to increase the floor of price supports for manufacturing milk from the present $3.06 to $3.22, and the floor under the price for supporting butterfat from 56.6 cents to 59.6 cents.

The proposed new floors would be effective only through the present marketing year, that is, until March 31, 1961. The principal effect of the bill would be simply to prevent dairy prices from going lower than the market. It would not mean an increase in the present income of dairy farmers as much as it would mean that dairy farmers would not suffer a further diminution in their income.

This is a moderate bill for a number of reasons. First, as I say, it would simply maintain the price which was the average price during the past marketing year.

In the second place, there would be very little, if any, Government cost. The testimony of representatives of the Department of Agriculture at the hearings on the bill indicated that the cost to the Government would be extremely slight. The fact is that we now have only a seasonal inventory of dried milk and of butter. There is no inventory at all of cheese. There is every prospect that within the next few months we shall have no inventory of dried milk or butter. In fact, we anticipate there will be no dairy products at all on the CCC inventory, so that we shall have a balance between supply and demand.

It is a moderate bill also because the savings which the farmers will enjoy will occur in the marketplace, and not result in any additional Government subsidy. It is a moderate bill, too, because $3.22 works out to 6¼ cents a quart, which is what the farmer will receive as the national market average. He may get less than that, because that is the national market average.

It still maintains a sliding scale. Many people confuse the bill by thinking that we are moving up from 75 percent to 90 percent in price supports. We are doing nothing of the kind.

It represents a moderate increase in the price support, but we still keep the sliding scale. As a matter of fact, on our own calculations, the present price support is below the legal price support, which is 75 percent of parity. On the basis of the parity equivalent which was maintained until 1954, we calculate the present $3.06 as less than 70 percent of parity, and the correction will make it 73.5 percent of parity. Even accepting the Benson modernized parity equivalent of 76.8, we would lift it to 80.9. This is a moderate bill in that sense, too.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not correct that, in the dairy products field, at the present time there are no substantial surpluses on which we are either paying storage or required to have any great disposal program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from South Dakota is eminently correct. That is true; there is no surplus whatever of cheese. There is about a 1-week surplus, in terms of the national consumption, so far as butter is concerned, and there is a small surplus of dried milk.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the Senator's assurance on that point. That was my impression. I wish to make it clear so that the situation will not be confused with some of the other commodities on which we do have substantial surpluses in storage, and in connection with which the people are properly concerned that we will have increased storage charges.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. He makes an excellent point. The dairy industry is not asking for special consideration. We are asking merely for an opportunity to have the Government cooperate with the dairy industry so that the dairy farmers will not suffer a sharp drop in income during flush parts of the year. We know from past experience that these sharp fluctuations mean the cheese producer will widen the margin, and the farmer will get less, but the consumer will pay the same. It will mean a stable price throughout the year for the farmer, rather than a fluctuation at his own expense.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in the program to provide an adequate return to the dairymen. I should like to ask whether the cheese and butter that may be acquired in this surplus program is used in supplying the school lunch program, which we have had for so many years and which has proved so useful in building up the health and bodies of our children of school age.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is indeed. It is used for that purpose. It is also used for Public Law 480 purposes. It is used for many constructive and helpful purposes. It is used in the school milk program.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do I understand correctly that fluid milk, as well as by-products, is also available for use in the school lunch program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Fluid milk is available in the school lunch program; yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore it would be an asset to the farmers, and it would also have a great deal to do with continuing a fine program, which has done so much for our country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. There is an urgent need for this program in this field. The prices which the dairy farmer receives are down 25 percent from what they were 8 years ago. The costs have been rising relentlessly and steadily. The fact is that in my State of Wisconsin—and I believe this is true also in the State of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—the Department of Agriculture shows that on the average—and this is not the marginal farmer—the farmer receives, if we allow him a 4-percent return on his invested capital, 66 cents an hour for the labor he puts in on his farm. This is the result of the drop in the prices and the rise in cost during the past 8 years.

In conclusion, let me say that the proposal was enthusiastically supported by all dairy organizations. There has been no difference of opinion among the dairy groups on the bill. There was pro forma opposition by the Department of Agriculture, and there was opposition by the Farm Bureau Federation. However, the producer organizations overwhelmingly support the bill.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the able presentation he has made of the bill today. I am one of the cosponsors of the bill. I know of no Senator who is more sympathetic and understanding and constructive with respect to the problems of the dairy farmers of this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who has been a real champion of all the farmers of America. In Wisconsin we look on him as a Senator who has been wonderful in the support of the dairy farmer, and we are very grateful for that support.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin. He has certainly been bulldogging this bill for several months. Thanks to his determination and obstinacy, he has brought the bill to the floor of the Senate. Great credit is due to him and his colleague who have worked on it so hard.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The majority whip and the majority leader of the Senate deserve great credit for bringing the bill before the Senate by motion. I deeply appreciate it, and the people of Wisconsin, I am sure, appreciate it also.

It is difficult, I know, with all the bills pending, and all the Senators who want their bills brought up by motion, to decide what bills to bring before the Senate. I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Montana, who is well known in my State and everywhere as a champion of the farmer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is a modest measure, through which Congress can take positive steps to improve the income of the dairy farmers of our Nation.

Under the present administration, dairy price supports have been slashed from 90 to 77 percent of parity. As a result, prices received by farmers for their milk have dropped almost 25 percent.

Under this bill, which I was privileged to cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from the great dairy State of Wisconsin, the price support for the remainder of this marketing year would be increased from $3.06 to $3.22—equal to 81.5 percent of parity.

Obviously this modest increase is not a complete solution to the problem facing our dairy farmers.

But, based on testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, it would increase dairy farmers' income by some $179 million per year.

This is particularly significant at this time, with farm income near a 20-year low.

This bill is of vital importance to Missouri's dairy farmers and the dairy farmers of our country.

Such an increase could well be the difference between forced bankruptcies or many efficient farm families being able to continue to live and work on their farms.

I hope the Senate will take prompt and favorable action on S. 2917, in the interest of the producers of the most perfectly balanced of all food products—milk.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Missouri, a cosponsor of the bill, and a real champion of the dairy farmer. It is a moderate bill. I had hoped that we could go much further. We hope to do so in the near future. In January, I hope we will begin to move ahead in the whole agricultural field. This is a moderate bill, and a conservative bill in every sense of the word. It will not cost the Federal Government money, or very little money, if any. It is a bill which permits the farmer to get what he can in the marketplace, with the cooperation of the Federal Government, so that the market will not fluctuate sharply and wipe out the opportunity for the dairy farmer to stay in business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I express my appreciation to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his leadership in this matter relating to S. 2917, to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat. I have been keenly interested in this type of legislation ever since my service in the Senate began.

In the 85th Congress, the Senate passed a bill similar to this. I regret that it did not receive favorable action by the other body. Due to a shortage of time in the session, we were unable to obtain the concurrence of the House. Nevertheless, that bill expressed the intent and will of the Senate. It was an expression of our sense of justice, or, at least, an expression of some consideration for dairy producers. Probably no segment of agriculture has been more unfairly treated during the past 8 years than the dairy farmers. We feel particularly that this is the case in the Midwest, where the dairy farmers are producers of milk for export. We have only to compare the prices which the dairy farmer was receiving for milk in 1952 with the prices received in 1958, 1959, and 1960 to see that the dairy farmers in the Midwest are facing a crisis which is forcing many of them out of business.

The average price received by farmers in the Midwest area—and that includes Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Iowa—for all milk marketed was slightly over $4 per hundredweight. In 1959, Minnesota dairy farmers received, on the average, approximately $3 per hundredweight for the same milk. Meantime their costs of operation had risen appreciably.

During the same period, the parity price for all milk sold by farmers—the price which represents the fair exchange value for 100 pounds of milk—rose from $4.75 to $5 per hundredweight. This simply means that in 1959 Minnesota dairy farmers were about $1.25 per hundredweight worse off in their price for milk than they were in 1952.

The total realized net farm income in Minnesota in 1959, which is the last year of complete statistics, was 19 percent lower than that of 1952. In 1959, Minnesota farmers received almost $98 million less income than they received in 1952.

In the period between 1952 and 1959, farm production expenses increased by 24 percent. One of the individual items which is a part of the total production expense is of particular concern. It is the interest on the farm mortgage debt, or the credit rate paid by farmers for their operations.

The interest on the mortgage debt, in Minnesota, was $25,700,000 in 1959. This was due to the tight money policies which have pushed up the cost of credit. Indeed, all the administration farm policies have pushed farmers into debt in order to enlarge their operations, and to produce more and more farm commodities at lower and lower farm prices.

The point has been well made in this discussion concerning the price support program for milk that at present the inventory of milk products in the Commodity Credit Corporation is very limited. In fact, the inventory of milk in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation is below what is a safe reserve for this country's present needs, for its future needs, or for its oversea operations.

There is no single factor of our foreign policy which is more important than the availability of food and fiber for the economic and humanitarian needs of our friends overseas.

Speaking in more detail and with greater concern in this matter, it seems to me that the administration's policy on milk support prices has actually prevented the purposes of the food-for-peace program, recently embraced by the administration, from being accomplished. I trust, however, that at the coming meeting, when Mr. Paarlberg will be meeting with voluntary agencies in September—some 100 or more—the whole matter of the availability of dairy products for our food-for-peace program will be fully discussed.

Last year, because of the sale of powdered milk for commercial purposes in the United States, the Government of the United States was compelled to step into the world market and pay an extra price for milk supplies in order to fulfill our oversea commitments. This was bad planning and bad programing. It does not result in the kind of efficient operations which the country is entitled to have.

Under title III of Public Law 480, America's abundance is distributed overseas, through nongovernmental agencies, as a gift—a gift from the American people to the hungry, the needy, and the unfortunate in other parts of the world. This is one of our greatest programs. Rather than to be limited, curtailed, or in any way jeopardized, the program ought to be expanded. There is nothing our country is doing today which makes a greater impact in the world than the use of our food overseas as an instrument of America's compassion, humanitarianism, and concern for our fellow human beings.

I point out that, for all the concentration on Africa—and I understand we are to have a measure before us shortly relating to aid for Africa—there has not been a single program, I believe, which has been more helpful to Africa than the use of American dairy products, particularly powdered milk, as a means of alleviating suffering, famine, and hunger. That program, at this very hour, is in jeopardy because of the restriction upon the production of dairy products through low prices, which are literally driving out of production thousands of dairy farmers who today could be saving country after country through a successful food-for-peace program in the dairy field.

In the past year, 61 million needy people, including more than 24 million children, in 92 different countries and territories, benefited from the title III program under Public Law 480. These donations are accomplished through the organization CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, UNICEF, and many other similar institutions. These fine organizations work with people in the recipient countries to establish distribution programs. One of the most valued of the commodities distributed is dried milk.

I have seen this program in operation myself. If ever an American citizen wants an emotional experience concerning what America means to people in the less privileged areas of the world, let him go to where American dried milk is being dispensed by a voluntary agency to hungry people. It will be an experience to tear his heart. If he does not have tears in his eyes after that, he is hardhearted, indeed. Those people are so grateful for the assistance we extend that they literally throw themselves at our feet in gratitude—gratitude for what? For a little food of which we have, and should have, an abundance.

Milk is a product which is in universal demand. It is essential to a health-giving diet. When the agencies establish their feeding programs, they plan on definite quantities of dry milk after consultations with Department of Agriculture officials. Imagine, therefore, the surprise when, on October 13, last year, the Department of Agriculture informed these agencies that no further supplies of dry milk would be available. There was no advance warning; no advance notice. The supplies were simply cut off. The Ambassadors of the United States to 92 countries protested. They said this was one of the most serious blows to American foreign policy which had ever taken place.

We are concerned about the U–2 spy plane incident. We are concerned about Cuba and Castro. Nevertheless, I submit that no single act brought such an outpouring of protests from American official representatives overseas as the cutting off of dairy supplies—dry milk—on October 13 of last year. In fact, the protest was so great that the Government of the United States was compelled to step into the free market—into the world market, if you please—and buy additional supplies.

I may add that they did not buy them from American producers—lest the price on the American market go up. They bought them on the foreign markets, rather than on our own market.

The Department did not resume donations from CCC stocks until April of this year.

If national food use goals were established, we would be able to plan far enough ahead to carry out true people-to-people and true food-for-peace programs.

Mr. President, this is what we need. Someday we shall reach the point where we shall establish a national food and fiber policy for this country. Then we will determine how much food and how much fiber we need for our own domestic purposes, and how much food and how much fiber we need for our foreign programs. Those amounts have never been ascertained. Instead, we have proceeded by guess and by accident; if we find we have a surplus on hand we decide to increase shipments; but if we find that we do not have a surplus on hand, we stop the shipments. I submit that one of the surest ways to make enemies is to help people on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, but to refuse to help them on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. That is what we have been doing with our hit-or-miss operations in connection with providing food supplies.

So I repeat that if we established national goals for all domestic and export needs, we would be able to plan ahead

and carry out a true people-to-people program and a true food-for-peace program.

I believe it should also be noted that the school milk program in the United States may be in trouble unless increased supplies of milk are made available.

If this bill will only help increase the supplies a little bit, it will tend to be of benefit to the programs we have established by public law.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that I have before me a table which shows the quantities of nonfat dry milk shipped for foreign relief through nonprofit voluntary and intergovernmental organizations. The table shows that in the period between January and June 1959, 297,600,000 pounds were shipped, at a cost of $51,300,000; in the period from July to December 1959, 159,500,000 pounds were shipped, at a cost of $23,900,000; and this year, in the period between January and June, 91,800,000 pounds were shipped, at a cost of $14,400,000.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show clearly that I submit that the shipment of dry powdered milk and other available food supplies to the countries of Africa and the countries of Latin America and the countries of Asia will do more good than can be done by all the economic and military assistance we have provided. However, now we find that cuts have been made in the very items we need to provide.

It is officially reported that in central Africa the milk supplies mean the difference between life and death for the children of those countries.

The dairy commodity inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of August 17, 1960, shows that there is now no cheese in its inventory. But cheese is a good protein food, and is desperately needed. Yet there is no cheese in the inventory at this time. By driving farmers in my State out of business—and hundreds of our dairy farmers have had to liquidate their businesses—the price of milk in Minnesota has gone down $1.25 a hundredweight in 7 years. Can any Senator name any other commodity that has dropped that much in price? Our people have been punished, at the very time when such products are desperately needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that there were no inventories of cheese in either February, March, April, May, June, or July?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So this is not a 1-month condition; this condition has existed a long time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

The Department will say that its pricing policies have stopped the production of cheese. In other words, insofar as cheese is concerned, by driving the farmers out of the production of milk—and today far fewer farmers are producing milk—a large amount of the production of cheese has been liquidated.

I wish to say that there is no food that our country can use in its domestic welfare programs and in its oversea programs that has better or more food value than cheese does. However, today the cheese program is null and void, over, out. So, Mr. President, today, countries that used to obtain our cheese as a donation or on sale under Public Law 480, are now looking for loans in hard currency, so as to be able to buy perishable products with which to feed their own people. I submit that is not good economics, particularly when this policy is driving American producers out of business.

Mr. President, in the dairy inventory as of August 17, we have 23 million pounds of butter available, and 67 million pounds allocated to the school lunch program. We have 303 million pounds of dry milk at the present time. That represents a reasonable supply of dry milk for at least the next few months.

Let us remember that dry milk is not only available for oversea use, but also is made available commercially in the United States.

The list I hold in my hand also shows the purchases in the period from April to August 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DAIRY INVENTORY AS OF AUGUST 17, 1960

Cheese: None.

Butter: 23 million pounds available, 67 million pounds allocated to school lunch.

Dry milk: 303 million pounds.

Purchases, April–August 1960

	Amount	Value
	(Pounds)	*(Dollars)*
Cheese	164,753	$59,690.00
Butter	81,917,948	48,159,562.00
Nonfat powder	415,791,132	56,506,105.00

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I point out that in Minnesota there are 43,225 dairy farms. However, almost two-thirds of all Minnesota farms produce and market milk. Therefore, milk production is of vital importance to our economy. Almost 21 percent—20.7 percent—of cash receipts from farm marketings in Minnesota come from dairy products.

Furthermore, as I have already indicated, the total realized net farm income in Minnesota in 1959 was 24 percent less than in 1958. Mr. President, when I travel throughout my State, as I have done this summer, and when I go from community to community, and find that the merchants tell me their sales are down 6 percent to 12 percent—as they are, also, through the Dakotas and Minnesota—in many of the smaller communities, there is no secret as to why that is so. When there is a 24-percent reduction of realized net farm income between 1958 and 1959, it is no wonder that sales are down.

So, as the Senator from Wisconsin has so frankly and, I think, so accurately stated, the pending bill represents a modest advance. It will not do what should be done, but it represents some modest advance.

The bill will not in any way jeopardize the Treasury or provide a glut of products. But the bill will at least provide a modicum of relief to a hard-pressed group of people. The bill will provide a little increase in the price of milk, in a market which today needs some help.

Mr. President, I am very privileged to have had this time to submit my views and to state why I have been glad to join in sponsoring the bill. Two years ago I was the main sponsor.

The Senators from Wisconsin and the Senators from Minnesota and many other Senators feel that the enactment of this proposed legislation is of vital importance to our economy, and represents at least a token step in connection with the commitment which both political parties have made to the American farmer. Both parties have promised action for the benefit of agriculture; and surely this bill can at least be interpreted as some fulfillment of a commitment which has been made in good faith, and we will keep that commitment in good faith.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table released by the Department of Agriculture. The table relates to activities carried on under Public Law 480. The title of the table is "Number of recipients of title III foreign donations under section 302 through participating agencies, fiscal year 1960."

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

TABLE XX.—*Number of recipients of title III foreign donations under sec. 302 through participating agencies, fiscal year 1960*

[Thousand persons]

	Catholic Relief Services	CARE	Church World Service	UNICEF	Lutheran World Relief	All other agencies	Total
Schools	7,721	8,184	1,788	3,887	1,166	230	22,976
Institutions	3,845	1,843	810	48	148	501	7,195
Families	16,526	2,252	4,626	----------	504	550	24,458
Refugees	959	242	455	----------	332	546	2,534
Summer camps	87	931	31	----------	(1)	44	1,093
Maternal and child health centers	222	85	55	1,778	----------	7	2,147
Miscellaneous centers	291	33	62	272	12	139	809
Total recipients	29,651	13,570	7,827	5,985	2,162	2,017	61,212

[1] Less than 1,000.

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

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me, so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; provided I do not lose the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further time for the consideration of the pending bill be limited to 20 minutes, or 10 minutes to a side, and that at the conclusion of that time the vote be taken on the question of final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President—although I shall not object—I ask the Senator from Montana to include in his request a provision that during that time I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that the Senator from New York can be privileged to yield to other Senators for questions.

Mr. KEATING. I would think the request should provide for the time limitation referred to, and also should provide that I may yield to any Senator who desires to speak during that period of time, and that at the end of the time thus allowed, the vote will be taken, but that during all those proceedings I may be allowed to yield to other Senators without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not participate actively in the debate on the bill. I just want the RECORD to show, however, that the Department of Agriculture opposes the bill and also that it is opposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation. They point out that by raising the parity level on milk, it will encourage increased production and destroy the progress we have already made in accordance with the law of supply and demand. They believe it will also result in larger amounts of dairy products being purchased by the Government and an increased cost to the consumers, without increasing the income of dairy farmers. That is the basis for the objection.

I leave it to members of the committee, however, to belabor other aspects of the question.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to be a cosponsor of this bill, because it is legislation which moves in the right direction in the area of a farm program in which we are beginning to make progress, as has been correctly pointed out by other proponents and cosponsors of the bill——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask how much time he wants?

Mr. MUNDT. About 3 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for the purpose of asking the Senator from South Dakota a question.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall conclude very briefly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will 3 minutes be sufficient?

Mr. MUNDT. It will be sufficient, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this bill is not going to impose a great cost upon the Treasury, at worst, and at best may not cost the Treasury anything. It is a very moderate bill. It provides that butterfat shall be supported at not less than 59.6 cents a pound and manufacturing milk at not less than $3.22 per hundredweight. The legislation terminates on March 31, 1961.

I am happy to report that some progress is being made in improvement of the dairy situation. Our farmers are grateful for that fact. This is the kind of legislation which is necessary, in my opinion, to protect the progress which has been made and to preserve these advances while giving our dairy producers some assurance that they will be able to continue to enjoy at least these minimum prices, which are reasonable in the extreme, and which, as the Department of Agriculture sets out in its report, have prevailed during 5 months of the last marketing year.

If the Government should have to purchase some products under this legislation, it is obvious this is an area where the Federal Government might well want to spend some money regardless in order to provide some more of these wonderful dairy products in our food for peace program.

We are spending big money in the area of international good will. We are spending money in trying to improve our relationships with friendly people with whom we are associated in this cold war. And if money needs to be spent in this area, this would be a legitimate place for it, in connection with the national defense of this country and in connection with the prosecution of the cold war.

We are making great advances in the dairy business in the State of South Dakota, but our dairy men and farmers need some assurance, as they plan and look ahead, that they can expect to receive these modest, but firm, minimum price levels while they are equipping their farms and getting ready for the future.

I regret the Department has opposed this bill, but I do not find myself in an unusual or unique position when I find myself in disagreement with the Secretary or the Department of Agriculture when it comes to the utilization of our price support mechanisms. He and I have frequently disagreed before on this aspect of our farm programs.

This proposed legislation has the wholehearted support of the association of farmers and producers most vitally connected with the industry, the National Milk Producers Federation, which throughout has maintained a reasonable and constructive approach to the solution of the problems in the dairy industry. The bill comes to us with their recommendation. It comes to us with the recommendation of many other organizations and groups.

I regret that the American Farm Bureau Federation is not listed among them, as was pointed out by the Senator from Illinois; but I emphasize the fact that we are moving forward in the direction of beginning to solve the problems which for too long have plagued the dairy producers of this country. This legislation will help.

I am gratified by the fact that for almost half of last year their prices in the marketplace have exceeded those which have been established by the price support mechanism, and have been at the level which we now seek to establish by legislation as a minimum between now and March 31, 1961.

I sincerely hope the measure can pass the Senate overwhelmingly, because it is a step in the right direction, a modest step, a reasonable step, but albeit an important forward step for a great segment of our agricultural economy, because increasingly in my State, and increasingly in other States, farmers are turning to the dairy industry as one of the types of agricultural enterprise which apparently is beginning to supply them with a brilliant future and an opportunity to enjoy the prosperity to which our farm population generally is entitled.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] such time as he may need.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 2917, I am delighted to have an opportunity to explain to the Senate why I believe its enactment would be in the interests of the farmers of Vermont and of the Nation.

The bill calls for an increase in the price support level from $3.06 per hundredweight to $3.22, for milk used for manufacturing purposes, and from 56.6 cents per pound for butterfat to 59.6 cents per pound.

The level of support proposed in the bill is entirely reasonable and will result in only a modest, if any, increase in the cost to the Government.

We are too prone, in the fast moving era of electronics and automation, to forget the contribution which the farmers of America are making to the country's needs. They have always demonstrated their willingness and ability to bring forth the food and fiber to fill the wants of our people. In war and in peace, the farmers have never let us down. They ask of us but one question, "May we have a fair and reasonable price for our commodities?"

We have not always answered this question in a manner which does merit to the producers of food and fiber. Many times we have urged the farmer to speed up production in times of national emergency, and then, when his operation has been geared to a higher production, we have penalized him for that production once the emergency is passed. In no field has this been more true than in the dairy interest. Dairy farmers have worked ceaselessly to make adjustments that had to be made as a result

of the high production demanded of them a few years ago. At the present time, milk production is in as good a balance with market outlets available as is the case in most major agricultural products.

While the strenuous effort has been continuing to bring supplies of dairy products within reasonable balance of market requirements, what has happened to farm prices of fluid milk and butterfat?

Since 1952 the average wholesale price received by farmers for all milk dropped more than 18 percent. The average price received for butterfat dropped about 22 percent. Yet, at the same time—and this is important—the retail price paid by consumers for milk has increased almost 10 percent.

What about the farmer's share of the retail price? Mr. President, I can tell you that his share has been on the decline. In 1952 the farmer's share of the retail price was 51 percent. In 1959 it was only 43 percent, a decrease of 8 percent during the 7-year period.

The Department of Agriculture only last year brought forth some evidence which brings sharply to focus the wide spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays for dairy products.

In 1959, a city worker's family of three paid $195 for the same quantity of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream, that it bought in 1952 for $191. But, Mr. President, farmers in 1952 received $100 for these dairy products, as compared with only $88 in 1959. Why has all this happened?

The answer is clear. Processors and distributors have increased their take for their services from $90 in 1952 to $107 in 1959.

Even with the increases in the price of retail dairy products, these products are still, dollar for dollar, the best buy for the housewives' shopping baskets.

In the past 30 years the real cost of milk to a factory worker, in terms of minutes of work required to purchase a quart of milk, has dropped more than 50 percent. In 1929 a factory worker had to work 15 minutes to earn the price of a quart of milk at retail. By 1947 the cost of a quart of milk had dropped to 10 minutes of factory labor, and in 1959 it took the earnings of less than 7 minutes factory labor to buy a quart of milk at retail. This speaks well for America and the American way of life, but there is one blot on the escutcheon, and that is the fact that consumers today are able to purchase milk at such relatively low prices partially because the farmers' share of the retail price has been shrinking.

In addition to facing the problem of a drop in his share of the retail price, the dairy farmer has had to face up to other severe obstacles. Farm production costs, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, are as high as ever.

Yesterday we approved a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for those in the manufacturing and retail and service trades. Yet, Mr. President, Department of Agriculture figures show that the dairy farmer receives a much smaller amount per hour for his labor.

I have never gone in for the practice of applying catch phrases to describe any group or segment of the economy, but, Mr. President, if there is a "forgotten man," forgotten by Congress, forgotten by the public, it is the dairy farmer. What other worker today would accept such a low rate for the services he renders or the work he performs?

There are some who blandly say, "Well, market prices will probably continue at the present average level; there is no need for legislation."

I would respond to this suave assertion by pointing out that production costs, increasing as they have in recent years, and with milk supplies in good balances with market outlets, now is the time to give dairy farmers a decent minimum of $3.22 per hundredweight for their milk, and not less than 59.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

I join with my fellow cosponsors of S. 2917 in urging its approval by the Senate and enactment by Congress. It is the very least we can do for the very best among us.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the cost of the bill, if adopted? I asked the Senator from Wisconsin that question, but I would like to have some statement made on the floor in answer to that question.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio for the purpose of propounding such inquiry.

Mr. PROUTY. As I understand, the estimate is practically nothing. The price, as of March, was $3.22 or $3.23. This bill will bring it up to $3.22. There are practically no surpluses, as I understand. I think the cost is negligible.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the present price of milk, the cost would be nothing. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. I think the cost would be very negligible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] such time as may be allotted to him by those who are controlling the time in opposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the absence of the majority leader, who has control of the time, I will take 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I recognize the futility of even trying to oppose a subsidy bill on the eve of a presidential election. We had a vote earlier this afternoon which indicated how free the Members of the Congress are on the eve of an election with respect to all of the various proposals which give something to different segments of the economy. It has always been popular to try to buy votes out of the Federal Treasury.

I invite special attention to the fact that this bill which seeks to raise price supports on milk products will only be in effect some 7 months. If it is a good bill, why do not the sponsors try to have permanent legislation enacted? It is only advocated that we enact the bill and raise the price supports until after the people go to the polls to vote. After the election under this bill we shall go back to the old price support level or somewhere else.

With regard to the argument which has been made on the floor that passage of the bill will not cost the Federal Treasury anything, I simply ask the question: How can we give the American farmers anything from the Federal Government without there being a cost? Either we are kidding somebody or we are not going to give them anything. I do not think any Senator would try to argue with that point.

This bill is opposed not only by the administration but also by the American Farm Bureau, one of the largest farm organizations, and a sound farm organization.

While this bill will give a short term benefit to the dairy farmers in the long run it will not help them.

As production increased due to the certainty that market prices would remain at about present levels, some dairy farmers would realize a temporary increase in their gross and net incomes. However, huge surplus stocks soon would be in the hands of the Federal Government and these would hang as a tremendous weight over the market system, preventing any increase in market prices over support prices such as occurred in recent years. As a result, dairymen's gross incomes would be reduced in future years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Department of Agriculture, as written to the committee under date of March 22, 1960, in which they oppose the bill, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1960.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This replies to your request of February 4 for a report on S. 2917, a bill to amend subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by adding the following new sentence to be inserted immediately after the first sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1960, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.22 per hundredweight and 59.6 cents per pound, respectively."

This Department recommends that the bill not be enacted.

It is not advisable to fix by law a specific support price for a particular marketing year without regard to current production and consumption conditions. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, now requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices to producers for milk and butterfat at such level from 75 to 90 percent of parity as will assure an adequate supply. The act leaves to the Secretary the determination of the support level, within the authorized range, that will accomplish the objectives of the act with respect to dairy products. This

permits the Secretary to take into consideration the developments in production and consumption in determining the support level for each marketing year.

The announced support prices for the 1959–60 marketing year are $3.06 a hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 56.6 cents a pound for butterfat. These prices are 77 percent of the parity equivalent and parity prices as of the beginning of the marketing year. Further progress has been made toward closing the gap between production and consumption in commercial outlets. It has been necessary, however, to buy substantial quantities of dairy products during the year. It is estimated that the total purchases for the marketing year will contain about 2 percent of the milkfat and 9 percent of the nonfat milk solids marketed by farmers in the form of milk and cream for all uses. These price support purchase operations have been supplemented by special programs, involving substantial expenditures, to increase the consumption of milk by schoolchildren and military personnel.

Market prices of some dairy products rose above the CCC buying prices in the last 5 months of calendar year 1959. For the first 9 months (April-December) of the 1959–60 marketing year, the actual prices received by farmers averaged $3.22 a hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 59.6 cents a pound for butterfat. This is the level that the bill seeks to maintain throughout the 1960–61 marketing year.

On January 8 the Department announced that the present support program for milk and butterfat would be continued through the 1960–61 marketing year. There is reasonable prospect that market conditions again will keep prices above the support level during part of the year. If market demand will not result in such a higher level, maintaining the higher level through support operations would tend to widen again the gap between production and consumption and to increase Government purchases. Continuation of the present program will provide assurance that prices to producers will not drop below the support level at any time during the next marketing year. Market conditions will be permitted to determine whether actual prices will be above this level.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President it is time that the American taxpayers begin to ask themselves how long they can keep buying these elections for the various candidates by passing these special privilege bills.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEATING. I yield such time as is allotted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts such time as he desires.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the bill. I am a cosponsor of the bill. I had a good deal of experience in the winter of this year in a strong dairy State, Wisconsin. I have some idea as to how hard hit the dairy farmers of that section of the United States have been.

The University of Wisconsin figured that the average farmer's wage was 50 cents an hour, and that only a relatively few farms in the State were paying an income which permitted the farmers to pay interest, to pay the upkeep on the machinery and feed, and to make what we would call a good living for the farm family.

The farm people are a group of people who work hard, who have spent a long time building up their farms, and who have been hard hit in recent years. I think the bill would be of some help to them. I do not think it will in any way solve the problems of dairy farmers, but I think it is a step in the right direction.

I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for bringing the bill before the Senate, and I am delighted to cosponsor it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill, also. I wish to state briefly why I support the bill. Personally, I am no longer producing milk, though for some 25 years I did produce milk.

The bill fixes a floor. It would give to the farmer a guaranteed price of about 6½ cents a quart. The people who buy milk either in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere know what that means. We have been talking about minimum wages but not for the farmer. We have been talking about aiding everybody else. For centuries the small farmer has been the backbone of the country not only in America but also throughout the world. I know from my own experience that the cost of production of milk is more than 6½ cents a quart, considering the costs of labor and the costs of machinery.

I know how the farmers work. They do not work 6 or 7 hours a day, but they work 12 or 14 hours a day, when they own the land themselves, which gives them a return of from 60 to 70 cents an hour.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield me 1 more minute.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILEY. I know it is our business to see to it that we do not have a paralysis in the farm area. Every depression in the past started in the farm area.

There has been some talk about powdered milk. I was in Lisbon last year, and I flew to southern Spain, to Rota. They were using powdered milk there at a military establishment. It was wonderful.

This bill is only a palliative, it is not a curative. It is not the medicine needed to cure the problem. In Wisconsin we produce 17 to 18 billion pounds of milk a year. We have to find an outlet for that milk. If it is not butter, cheese, and powdered milk, the outlet will have to be found somewhere else.

I suggest that since this is an exploratory age we should explore the utilization of the constituent parts of milk not only for food but also for other things. I think that is the field in which we will find the answer.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to use time, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and that the vote be taken on the pending bill.

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I shall vote against S. 2917. In my opinion, this approach to a segment of the agricultural production of our country is unrealistic and incompatible with any concept of either existing farm programs or proposed farm programs. It is completely unrealistic to set a specific minimum support in dollars and cents for an agricultural commodity without taking into account either consumption or demand, as is accomplished through the concept of parity. The present law requires that milk and butterfat be supported at a level of from 75 to 90 percent of parity as will assure an adequate supply. The dollars and cents minimum prescribed by S. 2917 abandons entirely the flexibility necessary to assure an adequate supply of milk and butterfat. Neither does the approach of a dollar and cents minimum leave room for consideration of fluctuation in consumption. Existing legislation gives sufficient authority, and the present program provides the necessary assurances, that the prices received by producers will not drop below the support level of $3.06 during the next marketing year. I cannot acquiesce in any such shallow proposal as this innovation of the price support program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill—S. 2917—was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. [Putting the question.]

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I made no extended remarks on the milk bill that was before us, but the Department of Agriculture had released a statement, and I thought that statement ought to be made a part of the body of the RECORD. I now submit that statement, which has been ut-

tered by Forest W. Beall, Deputy Administrator for Price Support, Commodity Stabilization Service, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, STATEMENT ON S. 2917 BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, MARKETING, AND STABILIZATION OF PRICES, BY FOREST W. BEALL, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR PRICE SUPPORT, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE, MAY 19, 1960

This statement is based on and supplements the Department's report of March 22 recommending against enactment of S. 2917.

S. 2917 would amend subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by adding the following new sentence to be inserted after the first sentence:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1960, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.22 per hundredweight and 59.6 cents per pound, respectively."

The Department feels that it is not advisable to fix by law a specific support price for a particular marketing year without regard to current production and consumption conditions. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, now requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices to producers for milk and butterfat at such level from 75 to 90 percent of parity as will assure an adequate supply. The act leaves to the Secretary the determination of the support level, within the authorized range, that will accomplish the objectives of the act with respect to dairy products. This permits the Secretary to take into consideration the developments in production and consumption in determining the support level for each marketing year.

The support prices for the last marketing year which ended March 31, 1960, were $3.06 a hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 56.6 cents a pound for butterfat. These prices were 77 percent of the parity equivalent and parity prices as of the beginning of the marketing year. While a little progress was made toward closing the gap between production and consumption in commercial outlets, it still was necessary to buy substantial quantities of dairy products. During the last marketing year CCC purchased 185 million pounds of butter and 50 million pounds of cheese. Also, the Department removed from the market 857 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. The total acquisitions for the marketing year contained about 2.9 percent of the milkfat and 9.3 percent of the nonfat milk solids marketed by farmers in the form of milk and cream for all uses.

The price support purchase operations have been supplemented by special programs, involving substantial expenditures, to increase the consumption of milk by schoolchildren and military personnel.

Market prices of some dairy products were above the CCC buying prices in the last 8 months of the 1959–60 marketing year. The actual prices received by farmers for the entire 1959–60 marketing year averaged $3.23 a hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 59.5 cents a pound for butterfat. The bill seeks to maintain approximately this level for the current 1960–61 marketing year.

The number of milk cows on January 1, 1960, was 0.7 of a percent smaller than a year earlier. This was the smallest decrease in 6 years. The numbers of yearling heifers and heifer calves on January 1 were larger than in recent years. The numbers of these replacements per 100 milk cows were the largest on record. The increases in production per cow in 1958 and 1959 were not enough to offset the declines in cow numbers, and total milk production declined slightly each year. In 1959, however, farm use of milk declined more than milk production did and total farm marketings of milk increased slightly. Meanwhile, there was a further shift from farm-separated cream to whole milk deliveries by farmers which brought more nonfat milk solids onto the market.

Milk production in the first 4 months of 1960 totaled about 1 percent above a year earlier. Only part of this increase was accounted for by the extra day in February. Feed supplies are at record levels and lower priced than last year. These developments indicate that a potential exists for a significant increase in milk production.

On January 8 the Department announced that the support prices for the 1959–60 marketing year would be continued through the 1960–61 marketing year. As of the beginning of this marketing year these support prices are percent of the parity equivalent and parity prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat.

Prices received by farmers in April for manufacturing milk and butterfat were above the support level. There is some prospect that market conditions will continue to keep prices above the support level during at least part of the 1960–61 marketing year. If market demand will not continue to result in such higher level, maintaining the higher level through support operations would tend to widen again the gap between production and consumption and to increase Government purchases. Continuation of the present program will provide assurance that prices to producers will not drop below the support level at any time during the next marketing year. Market conditions will be permitted to determine whether actual prices will be above this level.

It should be noted that the estimated cash receipts of $4.7 billion from farm sales of milk and butterfat in 1960 will be the highest on record.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR RAMON ESCOVAR, OF VENEZUELA

During the consideration of S. 2917,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Oregon to introduce a distinguished guest to the Senate?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again it is my privilege and honor as chairman of the Senate subcommittee which deals with Latin American affairs to present to the Senate a distinguished parliamentarian from a Latin American neighboring country. Today it is our privilege to have as our guest on the floor of the Senate Senator Ramon Escovar, of Venezuela, representing the Federal District of Caracas. Senator Escovar has been a Senator in the Venezuelan Senate since 1958. He is also a professor of law at the Central University of Venezuela in Caracas, which is one of the national universities of the Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. President, it is my great privilege to present Senator Escovar to the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR ROBERT J. MYERS TO BE PRESENT ON FLOOR DURING DEBATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the debate on the social security amendments I may have upon the floor to assist me Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to emphasize that Mr. Myers is a career employee, and that there is no implication with respect to the legislation or the support of the department in his being with me. It is strictly to give me technical assistance on my amendment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MUTUAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so that I may move to have the Senate consider a bill, which will then be the unfinished business?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I will yield with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1908, S. 3855.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 3855, to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the President of the United States has requested an increase of $100 million in the mutual security contingency fund. Originally, the President called for $175 million for the contingency fund in his budget request for 1961, but the House has already cut $25 million from that. Now, the perilous course of events in Africa makes it clear that by its very nature a contingency fund cannot be completely budgeted for in advance. New events will always crop up that will require quick U.S. action. In such cases,

it is very important that the United States not be hamstrung and delayed by too close a congressional leash.

The $100 million which the President has just requested in addition to the $175 million originally sought is to be used, among other things, to help pay the costs for airlifting United Nations troops to the Congo. If this airlift had not been available at once so that United Nations forces could be shipped to the troubled area without delay, who can say what chaos and confusion would have developed? Unquestionably, the situation would be even worse than it is now. Perhaps there might even have been Russian troops in the Congo ready to subjugate not only Belgians or rebels, but also the whole of the African Continent.

Mr. President, as we certainly have seen in the last few months, the course of international affairs is anything but smooth and predictable, even to a government that is as careful and well informed as our present administration. Moreover, the Russians especially seem to take great delight in behaving as unpredictably as they possibly can, with the aim, it has been suggested, of deliberately throwing this country, with its slower democratic processes, for a loss. Under these circumstances, a larger contingency fund is a must.

From the point of view of long-term economy, an effective contingency fund is also very important. Whatever we do, we must not make the mutual security program so rigid and inflexible that we are forced to pay for projects that changing events have rendered less necessary or, on the other hand, not to lay the groundwork in time for projects that might pay big dividends in the future. Timing is often the key to success in foreign ventures. The Congress should allow the Government some leeway in determining, in the face of changing times, when projects that for one reason or another have not been specifically budgeted, should be undertaken. In the long run, this flexibility will save us money and contribute to the success of our policies.

I am especially interested in the implications of this particular request for money for airlifting U.N. troops to the Congo because it bears out the importance of a recommendation that I have long made. That is that the United Nations should have a standing police force that would be ready at any time to go anywhere to face up to just the kind of situation that has evolved in the Congo. The existence of such a force, and still further, the knowledge of the existence of the force, would, I feel, do much to lower international temperatures the world over.

Until this force can be set up, however, or until the world reverts to an easier, more predictable pattern, I do not believe that this country can do without a contingency fund that really is large enough to meet most contingencies. Mr. President, I urge full approval of the President's request. It is in the best interests of this country and of the whole free world.

AMERICAN WAR CLAIMS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there are now pending on the agenda of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the privilege of being a member, a number of American war claims bills. One of the most important of these bills—H.R. 2485—provides for the payment of compensation to Americans who suffered injury or death or who suffered property losses in certain areas as a result of World War II. A serious omission from this otherwise very salutary bill are thousands of Americans who were unable to become citizens of the United States until after the war. I have for many months been urging amendments to H.R. 2485 to correct this unjustified discrimination in our treatment of American citizens and I shall continue in committee and on the floor if necessary to press for inclusion of these needed amendments in the pending legislation. I do not believe that this legislation will be fully adequate until such provisions are included to prevent discrimination against Americans, based on the date on which they obtained that happy status.

It is abhorrent to our concepts of citizenship to distinguish between Americans on the basis of when they happened to become naturalized. We have never recognized in this country any concept of second class or junior citizenship. Even European countries which have adopted war claims programs in behalf of their own nationals have made provision for claimants who become nationals after they suffered their original loss. Certainly we in the United States can do no less. At the very least, those Americans who were subjected to persecution during the war by their former governments should not be discriminated against under this generally humanitarian program. I have a specific amendment prepared for this purpose as well.

Some war claims bills have been before the Congress in one form or another for many years. There is great interest in these throughout the country.

In my opinion, a number of amendments in addition to those relating to our newer citizens will have to be adopted before we can claim to have dealt with this subject in a completely fair and equitable maner. For several months I have had such amendments in readiness. Because of the large number of inquiries I have received about this subject and my growing concern that we may default in our obligation to act in this field, I would like briefly to discuss this subject on the floor today.

First, I express the fervent hope that it will be possible to take action on these measures before the adjournment of this session. In many instances the beneficiaries or claimants under these measures have been waiting for more than 15 years for some relief. The House has already approved a number of the bills that are pending. It remains only for the Senate to fulfill its responsibility.

The Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has held many extensive hearings on the problems raised by these bills. Its last hearings were completed in July 1959. I have made every possible effort since that date to induce the subcommittee to meet and report to the full committee the measures involved. Unfortunately, it was not until the last weeks of the first part of this second session of the Congress that a meeting of the subcommittee was called by the chairman and action was taken on any of these measures. By that time it was too late for the full committee to complete its consideration of the bills prior to our adjournment on July 5.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator restate the purposes of his proposals?

Mr. KEATING. I shall cover the high spots in my remarks. I do intend to outline briefly some of the things that I have in mind.

The subcommittee's recommendations left a great deal to be desired. A majority of the subcommittee not only failed to correct the omission of our newer citizens from this legislation, but also recommended the deletion from the House-passed war claims bill—H.R. 2485—of all the provisions relating to the actual payment of claims. In my opinion this was a completely unwarranted change, and I have been attempting in the full committee, and shall continue my efforts in this regard, to obtain reinstatement of the omitted House provisions. I have a specific amendment prepared for this purpose.

The House bill also inexplicably omitted from its provisions losses suffered by Americans as a result of the removal of their property from Germany for reparations purposes. Such a provision was included in the administration's original proposals, and I believe should be allowed in the final version of this legislation. I shall offer such a provision in committee and on the floor.

Another of the measures pending before our committee is the heirless property bill, H.R. 6462. The sole purpose of this bill is to provide for lump sum settlement of all heirless property claims in the amount of $500,000. Since all of this money will come from the property of former victims of Nazi persecution who died without heirs and will be used for the needy survivors of such persecution, and since the total sum represents only a small fraction of the amount of such property which was vested by the Government, there should be no objection whatsoever to approval of this bill in the full amount called for.

An effort has been made to reduce the $500,000 still further, indeed, to cut it in half, to $250,000 but there is no basis for any such a reduction.

Finally, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will approve my bill, S. 1103, which would permit the sale of property vested by the Government to American bidders, despite the pendency of litigation over the ownership of the property. The chief impact of this measure would be to permit the Government to turn over to private industry the

operation of the huge General Aniline & Film Corp. facilities. The litigation over this property has been in progress for more than a decade, and it appears to be endless. Under the terms of the bill, every safeguard would be provided in the event the claimants in this litigation should ultimately prevail, since they would be entitled to just compensation for the amount of their interest. The bill is strongly endorsed by the AFL–CIO, the supervisory association of the General Aniline Corp., the International Chemical Workers Union—which represents most of the rank-and-file employees of the corporation—and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

When we get a combination like that approving a bill, it is a rather happy day. It is a rather singular accomplishment.

S. 1103 also is strongly supported by the Department of Justice. Indeed, I know of no opposition to the bill except on the part of representatives of the parties involved in the litigation. There is no reason for the indefinite continued operation of this plant by a Government agency, and I hope that before long this huge company can be placed in the hands of free enterprise, so that it can prosper and grow to the full extent of its potential.

This is not the time to discuss in detail all of these facets of the war claims problem or the other measures involved in our committee's deliberations. I would like to mention, however, that a majority of the subcommittee also recommended to the full committee a bill which would provide for the return to citizens of the United States of property vested from them at the time they were enemy nationals. I did not raise any objection to the provisions of this bill when it was under consideration in our subcommittee. However, I would point out that if there is merit in this bill, as I believe there is, then after-acquired citizenship on analogous reasoning must also be held to qualify individuals for filing claims under the war claims bill. There certainly would be no equity in using citizenship on the date of enactment as the standard for returning the property, and not as the standard for allowing claims to be filed. I do not believe that any such inconsistency would be supported by a majority of the Congress or countenanced by any member of the public who was informed on the subject.

Mr. President, I shall continue to work diligently for final congressional approval of these measures, with the amendments I have outlined, before this session is concluded. This is certainly a must item for the thousands of Americans, many of them men and women of very modest means—many of them widows and orphans who lost their loved ones in the great conflict—who have been waiting for 15 years for some measure of recompense. I do not believe these Americans will be very understanding if in a frantic effort to hit the campaign trail we shirk our duty to do justice to their cause.

Mr. President, in compliance with the suggestion so graciously made by the Presiding Officer, I wish to discuss the subject of the legislative program which the President sent to us in his special message on August 8.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, before the Senator gets into that, will he yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which nation or nations are in the category of enemies during World War II, against whom these claims are asserted?

Mr. KEATING. Let me put it this way. The bill refers to physical damage or physical loss or destruction of property in Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Free Territory of Danzig, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, or in any territory which was a part of Hungary or Rumania on December 31, 1937. I do not know whether that answers the Senator's question or not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does that deal with property damaged by violent means during the war, or does it also mean expropriated property?

Mr. KEATING. It refers only to property which was damaged as a result of military operations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps I can clarify what is in my mind. I have received numerous letters asking that we do something to compel Tito to reimburse those citizens whose properties he took in Yugoslavia, and who subsequently came to the United States and became citizens of this country. That subject, it will be observed, deals with the expropriation of property within one of those foreign countries.

Mr. KEATING. The claims in Yugoslavia and in some of the other countries are what are called nationalization claims and are covered by separate treaties and legislation. Each country has a separate treaty, and such claims are not involved in this legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It appears, from what the Senator from New York has said, that persons who are now citizens have property in one or more of those nations which he described, and that their property was damaged by bombing. So what nations will principally have to respond to absolute claims through funds which we have here?

Mr. KEATING. Under the terms of the original bill, these claims would be paid out of the assets of former enemy aliens vested during the war.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from New York.

WHY THE SPECIAL SESSION WAS CALLED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator tell me his understanding of why this special session was called?

Mr. KEATING. Having opposed the calling of the session at this time, and feeling that if it was necessary to go over, we should have gone over until November, and not have had a special session on the eve of an election, I am a little hard pressed to answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not a fact that this session was called at the request of the majority leader, and not at the request of the President of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. That is true. This is not a session which was called by the President of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. But since then, the President has submitted a number of measures which have not been acted upon, some of which he has been recommending for more than 5 years.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. I intend, in my detailed analysis, to point out when every one of these 21 points was previously recommended to Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not a fact that all these recommendations have been made by the President to this or previous Congresses before we adjourned in July?

Mr. KEATING. There are only three proposals in his message, one calling for an increase in the mutual security contingency fund, one calling for a $600 million Latin American assistance fund, and one calling for an international food bank, which were not previously included in messages up to that time.

However, with those exceptions, the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I have the impression that heretofore Congress, in a period of 2 weeks, has been able to enact a couple of hundred measures or more.

Mr. KEATING. I believe that 426 bills were once passed in a 2-week period. I do not know whether that was in this Congress or previously. I am sure that figure came from authentic sources.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Senator agree with me concerning the occurrence which we noted yesterday? Through a parliamentary tangle there was an exemption of coverage of 900,000 people rather than some 400,000 people; or, as was represented originally, an error of 500,000 people in coverage was made in the bill. At the last session the other body, in the same minimum wage bill, made an error by striking out 14 million people from coverage. Does not the Senator agree with me that that is very sloppy, careless legislating, and that perhaps it arises from the fact that we may be attempting to enact legislation in a climate which is not altogether favorable for highly controversial legislation?

Mr. KEATING. I think that is a very good illustration of hasty action and an effort to dispose, in an inadequate time, of very complicated legislation. The Senator has used that illustration very well. If we had had a minimum wage bill before us in March or April, or around that time, for mature deliberation and consideration, I feel certain that we would not have made the errors to which the Senator has referred. It is very difficult to legislate on a complicated subject of that kind in a limited time—a sharply delimited time—and with other things pressing in so much upon us. If

we had gone to work earlier and had not tread water so long earlier in the session, we would have been able to take up that legislation at that time.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator, too, is aware, is he not, that the other body, which was scheduled to meet on August 15, has been unable to acquire a quorum and, therefore, has not met all of this week?

Mr. KEATING. My understanding is that the other body has been unable to muster a quorum.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator know, in view of the various conflicting statements, whether the Senate will be in session tomorrow or not?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. I have not been advised as yet. I have an item taken from the UPI ticker. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of it, but I know the fine journalists who represent the UPI on Capitol Hill, and I have every reason to believe that this is an accurate statement.

It refers to the majority leader as having said yesterday that he was now uncertain whether the Senate would meet on Saturday. Notice was given by some Senators that they will be out of town for political speeches. The majority leader added that the absentees do not include the presidential candidates.

Then I noticed on the ticker this afternoon that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will leave the National Airport at 8 a.m. tomorrow for Kansas City en route to Independence, Mo., and conferences with former President Truman, and the Democratic farm conference at Des Moines.

Mr. SCOTT. This is truly a puzzlement. What does the Senator make of it?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know what to make of it. I do not want to be critical of the majority leader or of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. One possible conclusion would be that the Senator from Massachusetts has withdrawn as a candidate for President and is no longer a presidential candidate. But I cannot believe that that is so. He certainly has not imparted that information to me. He was right beside me today when he paid a very fine tribute to a great American, Bernard M. Baruch. I am sure that if he had withdrawn as a candidate for President he would have told me about it at that time.

So I do not think that conclusion can correctly be reached, and I would not want to draw any sinister conclusions of any nature.

I am merely stating what the UPI ticker shows and the Senator from Pennsylvania must draw his own conclusions.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator tell me where the junior Senator from Massachusetts has gone, in Missouri?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. I am not responsible for where he goes. The ticker item says he is leaving tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock. He was here just now, with his usual friendly countenance, and asked me to yield to him, in order that both of us could pay our tributes to a great American. I do not know where the Senator from Massachusetts has gone but certainly he does not need to be responsible to me for where he goes.

Mr. SCOTT. I just wondered whether the Senator from New York thought we could transact any business tomorrow in the absence of the majority leader and the majority leader's leader.

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. The last I heard was the statement of the majority leader that we would not be in session tomorrow. I do not know whether that arrangement has been changed, or what the present situation is. I have just now read from what appeared on the UPI ticker.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am pleased to state that there will be a session tomorrow; and I hope both the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New York will be here at that time.

Let me remind the Senator from New York that when the majority leader discussed the matter yesterday, he said there would be a session tomorrow provided the committee was able to get the bill before us. And the bill will be before us.

As to the comments in regard to where certain persons are, let me say the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has been on the floor all day.

Let me ask now, where is the Vice President? He is a candidate. Where will he be tomorrow? And where was he on Wednesday of this week? And where has he been day after day, not during the campaign, but during the regular session of the Senate?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to reply to the Senator on both points.

First, I wish to say that I am glad to know there will be a session tomorrow. Certainly we will be here then.

Second, as to the presence of the Vice President, I do not consider that I am any more responsible for his presence than I am for the presence of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Yesterday the distinguished majority leader said the absentees did not include the presidential candidates. So I assume that the majority leader spoke for both the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Vice President, who are the two presidential candidates.

I do not know about the statement which appears on the ticker. It seemed curious to me that these two stories appeared on the ticker. But I cannot answer about them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield once more to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to make clear, also, that it is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate stay in session tonight, to take action on two important measures which the President has requested. So if the Senator from New York will finish his speech, we shall get to work on those two measures.

One of them calls for $100 million to be added to the President's contingent fund. The President has requested that. The committee met this week, and proceeded under forced draft and under pressure, and worked overtime, long hours, and reported that bill as the President requested it; and now the bill is the pending business, and we are here, and are eager to reach a vote on it.

Immediately following that bill, we shall take up another measure the President has requested; and it calls for $600 million.

The Senator from Ohio was in the Foreign Relations Committee when we worked long hours, overtime—and did not receive any time and a half pay for overtime, either. [Laughter.] We have reported that bill, too. And as soon as the pending business is finished, we shall call up that bill; and we intend to remain here tonight until both those bills are finished.

Mr. KEATING. That is fine.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So I trust that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania will be here with us.

Of course, I am sure the Senator from New York will continue to make a very interesting speech on the President's legislative program. And as soon as the Senator from New York finishes his speech, we shall do our best to enact these parts of the President's legislative program. But we cannot do that if the dialogue between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania continues and if they continue to discuss the presence or the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just came in. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, excuse me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to answer my able and courteous friend, the Senator from Alabama. I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and his confreres have reported these two bills. I assure him that I shall be here for their consideration, and I shall support them. I commend the committee for promptly reporting these parts of the President's program.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

In view of the statement made by the Senator from Alabama as to where the Vice President was, I think I can assure the Senator that at the time when the Senate voted on the amendments to the minimum wage bill, and particularly when it voted on the one key amendment, the Vice President at that time was in the Chamber; and at other times he was immediately off the Chamber, close to it, in the event that any of those amendments involved tie votes.

I do not need to remind the distinguished Senator from New York that the duty of the Vice President is limited by the Constitution to voting in the case of a tie vote. The Constitution does not even require the Vice President to preside over the Senate. The Constitution

says the Vice President shall be the President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, save in case of a tie.

And ever since the Senator from New York and I have been in the Congress—some 16 or 18 years—both of us have been aware of the fact that the President pro tempore, now the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is a member of the other party, is in control as to what Senator shall occupy the chair following the time when the Vice President presides over the Senate at the opening of the sessions, and that the President pro tempore can put in the chair any Senator he may wish to designate.

The Vice President has far more important duties than merely sitting on the rostrum; and the Vice President has made of the office of Vice President a more useful office than it has ever been before. The Vice President could not have presided over the National Security Council, and occasionally over the meetings of the Cabinet, if he had been required to sit on the rostrum in the Senate Chamber every moment of the time when the Senate was in session.

As a matter of fact, if the Vice President had been required to be in the Senate Chamber at all times when the Senate was in session, and to have presided over the Senate on all such occasions, no one would have been more unhappy than would the Senators on the other side of the aisle, who then would have claimed that our side was appropriating a function which was properly theirs, in view of the fact that they constituted the majority party here.

In fact, it seems apparent that all the smokescreens and obfuscations, particularly those by my dear friend, the Senator from Alabama, are designed to conceal the fact that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] during most of the sessions of the 86th Congress has been absent from the Senate. Yet the junior Senator from Massachusetts has the same obligation to be here that the Senator from New York and I have. On the other hand, the Vice President has no obligation, either under the Constitution or otherwise, to be here, except to vote in case of a tie vote.

Therefore, there is no merit whatever in the continued arguments by Senators on the other side of the aisle as to where the Vice President is. I would imagine they are going to hear sufficiently from the Vice President, from now on, and certainly enough to satisfy them. I am sure there will be a complete answer to any question they may have to ask about where the Vice President is.

I am sure the Vice President can take care of himself; but I do believe that the public are not going to be deceived by all the talk which is designed for only one purpose, and that is to make the public believe—falsely—that the Vice President has an obligation to be here, to take part in the debate, to occupy a seat as a Senator, and to participate in the debates in this body—which, indeed, he cannot do. And since he cannot, he has done more than any other Vice President has ever done, which is to make that post a useful post of service to the United States both here and abroad. He has indicated that, in his view, the next Vice President, whoever he may be, ought to have even more duties than he himself has had during his term of office.

I hope the Senator from New York agrees with me that this constant cry which arises from the other side of the aisle as to "Where is the Vice President?" and the rather juvenile stopwatch technique are designed solely to try to cloud and conceal the fact that the majority leader's leader has failed throughout the session, on numerous occasions, to be present and to exert the leadership which others tell us he is potentially capable of exerting.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree completely with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania about the duties of the Vice President. He has not been a leather-bound Vice President, and there would have been great criticism of him if he had been. We have had previous Vice Presidents, many of them beloved men, who have enjoyed sitting in the seat now so graced by a distinguished colleague, and they have enjoyed sitting around in the cloakrooms and talking with Senators. That is fine. We have enjoyed having them. But the present Vice President has gone to the four corners of the world, representing our country, and he has announced that he would expect the next Vice President would do so. Knowing both of the candidates for Vice President, I can scarcely imagine that either of them would sit there for very long. We know the custom that the filling of the chair is primarily the responsibility of the majority party. I am sure that will be continued. The only caveat I would want to inject with respect to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is that there might be an implied criticism of our distinguished, beloved, able, revered colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is the President pro tempore of the Senate; and we have a President pro tempore for the very purpose of presiding or designating someone to preside here.

Certainly, there is no Senator on either side of the aisle who would say that the distinguished Senator from Arizona ought to sit up there all the time, or even a substantial part of the time, particularly when it is as well graced as it is by the present occupant of the chair [Mr. MUSKIE].

I now yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 1856—SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, three thousand additional copies of Senate Report No. 1856, current session, being the report made by that committee on the social security amendments of 1960, together with minority views.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 365) was considered and agreed to.

EARL W. KINTNER

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois on the condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Paul Healy, one of the columnists for the Daily News, has written a very interesting article on Earl W. Kintner, whose name is before us as nominee to the Federal Trade Commission. The article appeared in the Daily News of Monday, August 15, 1960, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Daily News, Aug. 15, 1960]

(By Paul Healy)

WASHINGTON, August 14.—The man who has gone to extremes to protect you from gyp schemes and other phony business practices is facing an end to his Government career—unless the Senate Democrats undergo a nonpolitical change of heart.

The living proof that virtue is its own reward is Earl W. Kintner, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Kintner is a former General Counsel of the FTC and the only career man ever appointed to head the agency. During the 14 months he has been Chairman, Kintner and the FTC have filed 503 complaints against unscrupulous businessmen—as many as were filed in the first 5 years (1948–53) he worked for the agency.

On the question of payola, Kintner's administration this year has brought 102 complaints against radio and TV stations charging undercover payments to diskjockeys to push phonograph records. Sixty-three of these complaints already have resulted in agreements to stop the play-for-pay music.

Also during his term as Chairman, Kintner has made 160 speeches, appeared 300 times on TV programs, and held nearly 300 press conferences. Maybe this seems like overexposure of a bureaucrat, but Kintner maintains that he can't tell his story too often.

"My aim in speeches is to alert the public to dishonesty in the marketplace," he explains. "If the housewife can spot the gyp schemes and gyp advertising, it will cut down the work of this agency and protect the honest businessman."

Kintner has built a fire in one of the oldest and coldest of our executive agencies. There is still a widespread misconception about the function of the FTC, which is authorized to guard our free enterprise system by rooting out come-on tricks as well as unfair competition between firms.

In the old days within the FTC, there was never any doubt about the lack of urgency in its mission. It was called "the country club of the Federal Government." Some cases took over 3 years to "expedite."

SURE KINTNER'S A GOOD MAN, BUT—

What has Kintner gained by crusading against shady businessmen? Last February

President Eisenhower nominated him to another 7-year term. In May, the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing, and Democrats as well as Republicans smiled on Kintner for his good works. But this was the kiss of death. Since then, his nomination has been ignored—and his term is due to expire September 27.

The point is that the Democrats expect to take over the White House in January and Kintner's $20,000-a-year job is a sugar plum they want to pluck. Kintner is a Republican and the makeup of the FTC is now three Republicans and two Democrats.

What's more, the two Commissioners whose terms expire next after Kintner's are Democrats. The new administration thus would have to wait until the two GOP members' terms expired in 1963 before they could replace a Republican with one of their own—unless they first created a vacancy in Kintner's job.

Actually, partisanship plays no part when the FTC votes. More important than the makeup of the Commission, for patronage purposes, is the job of Chairman, since he hires the agency's staff. And the new White House rulers will be free to appoint any FTC member as Chairman of the Commission, regardless of whether Kintner is still a member.

GOOD RECORD DOESN'T MEAN MUCH

Nonetheless, the Democrats have made it clear that Kintner is tabbed as the first—if slightly premature—casualty of the Andrew Jackson spoils system. The fact that Kintner is well liked on Capitol Hill, and that no one claims he has been careless about the public business, means nothing.

LAWMAKING IN DOG DAYS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my old friend, Raymond Moley, whom I have known a very long time, and who does an article for Newsweek, on the last page of that very distinguished publication has written an article on "Lawmaking in Dog Days." I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate and to all of the citizenry of the country, and ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From Newsweek, Aug. 22, 1960]

LAWMAKING IN DOG DAYS

(By Raymond Moley)

To claim that this resumption of the final session of the 86th Congress is necessary is a monstrous fraud. The Senate leadership, deliberately or by acquiescence, permitted a slowdown in May and June. To pass legislation in the dog days for political purposes is to put political advantage above a sacred public responsibility. For the intention is either to present strident minority groups with handouts from the Federal revenue or to force a President with a will and conscience to be pilloried by his vetoes in September and October as a man callous to the needs of the poor, the ill, the elderly, and to the necessary public services of the Nation. The dog days, according to Webster, are a time of "malignant influences." The phrase is apt.

Let us consider one subject listed for action in this period—medical care for the elderly. It may be taken for granted that the Democratic majority is intent upon carrying out the terms of the party platform on this subject: "We shall provide medical-care benefits for the aged as part of the time-tested social security insurance system. We reject any proposal which would require such citizens to submit to the indignity of a means test."

POINT OF MADNESS

The Republican platform would allow for optional purchase of private insurance and provide Federal assistance grants to the States for those who need help. It recognizes that to give to all without regard to need would be financial insanity. For no one knows how many would participate in a free scheme for all. We do know, however, that to limit assistance to recipients of social security benefits would give to many who do not need help and omit many who do.

For the Democratic platform to call social security (OASI) "insurance" is wrong. "Insurance" was never used in the original Social Security Act. It has been judged by the Supreme Court to be a gratuity, not the payment of an equity in insurance. Those who receive payments are getting benefits paid out of the earnings of those below retirement age and by their employers.

The income to the so-called trust fund is not enough to meet the outgo. The fund could be headed for bankruptcy, and all that those who will have paid into it for years can rely upon is a grant by Congress from general revenues or from a big increase in the present rate of tax. To load health onto the burden—that is to make OASI into OASHI—would, according to William R. Williamson, who used to be chief consulting actuary for the system, carry "fiscal irresponsibility to the point of madness." It is a conservative estimate that OASI plus health "insurance" would shortly cost 20 percent of the first $4,800 of payroll.

LEGISLATING IN DARK

The enormous increase in tax on employers would obviously be passed on to consumers in inflationary prices and would be a powerful force in pricing the United States still further out of the world market.

To enact the Forand bill in any modified form would be legislating in the dark. I have read laboriously hundreds of pages of hearings and other literature on the subject and I cannot find that anyone, in either Congress or the administration, knows how many people would need such help or has any idea of what it would cost.

It is further evident that no one in the Government has fully explored how much of the problem could be solved by practical application of tax deductions. For example, a deduction for children or other relatives of aged persons so that private insurance could be bought. There is a moral issue here. Would or would not JOHN F. KENNEDY help Father Joe if he went broke and got sick? Or would he disregard the moral strictures of religion and pass old, sick Joe over to a vague thing called society?

Further exploration should be made of tax adjustments for corporations which would provide health insurance payments for their retired employees. Another possibility would be whatever assistance is necessary to help private insurance to cover elderly people as well as younger ones.

The whole subject should be studied further, and any legislation should be considered next year in a calmer and more rational climate.

CANDIDATES IN THE NATIONAL ELECTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Walter Trohan is a distinguished representative of the Chicago Tribune, and has labored in the vineyard in the Capital City for a long time. He succeeded Arthur Henning as the chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau.

Walter Trohan is a distinguished historian in his own right. He did a column on the Senate and on the conventions which has some rather interesting and verified historical material. I think it is of general interest, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 13, 1960]

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, August 12.—In the 1960 presidential campaign the U.S. Senate has reached a plateau of prestige comparable to the dignity of the senate of ancient Rome.

For the first time in American history all four candidates on the two national tickets have served in the Senate. Three of the four are now in the Senate. Further, both the Democrats and Republicans have picked Senators as national chairmen to run their parties' campaigns.

In the beginning the way to the White House was paved through the legislature. The first 11 Presidents served in the Continental Congress or the Constitutional Congress, or both. The first, who did not was Gen. Zachary Taylor, the hero of the Mexican War, who never voted.

Since Taylor, 10 Presidents have not served in Congress. These are Ulysses S. Grant, Chester A. Arthur, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

After the adoption of the Constitution, John Quincy Adams, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, Franklin Pierce, John Tyler, James Buchanan, Andrew Johnson, Benjamin Harrison, Warren G. Harding, and Harry S. Truman served in the Senate. Harding was the only man elected directly from the Senate and Johnson was the only President who served in the body before and after leaving the White House. Buchanan had the longest Senate service among the Chief Executives.

Presidents who served in the House as well as the Senate were Adams, Jackson, Harrison, Tyler, Pierce, Buchanan, and Johnson. Presidents who served in the House but did not serve in the Senate were James Madison, James K. Polk, Abraham Lincoln, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley.

All in all 22 of the 33 Chief Executives have had congressional experience. Three others served in State legislatures—Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Of the 36 Vice Presidents, 28 had congressional experience. Eight who had no House or Senate service are Daniel D. Tompkins, under Monroe; Chester A. Arthur, under Garfield; Garret A. Hobart, under McKinley; Theodore Roosevelt, under McKinley in second term; Thomas R. Marshall, under Wilson; Calvin Coolidge, under Harding; Charles G. Dawes, under Coolidge; and Henry A. Wallace, under F. D. R.

In 1960 the Democratic Party is offering the first ticket in history composed of two incumbent Senators—JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas.

The Republican candidate, Vice President NIXON, served in the Senate in 1951 and 1952, before he was elected to preside over the Senate. The GOP vice-presidential candidate, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., served from Massachusetts from 1937 to 1944, when he resigned to join the Army, and then re-

turned to serve from 1947 until 1953, having been beaten by KENNEDY in the 1952 campaign.

Both NIXON and KENNEDY have House service. They entered the House together in 1947 and NIXON was elected to the Senate in 1950. JOHNSON served in the House from 1937 to 1948, when he was elected to the Senate. Lodge did not have House service.

The Republican National Committee is headed by Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, who was named April 11, 1959. The Democratic chairman is Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, who was named after the nomination of KENNEDY in Los Angeles.

SECRETARY GATES ESTABLISHES DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to a recent directive of the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

The matter I refer to is the announcement by the Defense Department on Wednesday, August 17, that Secretary Gates established a single agency for strategic target planning. This action by the Secretary of Defense should be a source of great reassurance. It is possibly one of the most meaningful improvements in our national security efforts since the end of World War II. By this action, Secretary Gates has anticipated the increasing importance of ballistic missiles, and particularly the contribution which the Polaris submarines will make to our strategic retaliatory strength.

Briefly, the action by Secretary Gates has designated the commander of the Strategic Air Command, Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, as Director of Strategic Target Planning. In this capacity, as Director of Strategic Target Planning, and not as commander of the Strategic Air Command, General Power will be the chief planning agent for the JCS in developing and keeping up to date the detailed plans which are necessary to assure the maximum effective employment of all of our strategic retaliatory forces. There will be a Deputy Director, probably an officer of vice admiral rank in the Navy, who will be the principal assistant to the Director of Strategic Target Planning. Under the Director and his Deputy, there will be a carefully selected staff comprised of officers of the various services who have the special skills required for this highly important type of duty.

I believe it is important to recognize that this new system does not involve the establishment of an overall strategic command. Very wisely, Secretary Gates completely rejected a proposal for such an overall strategic command. His decision in this respect is obviously a very sound one, because the devastation and destruction which would accompany the initiation of a sudden attack might well destroy command and communication facilities. Accordingly, the execution of the plan prepared under the supervision of the Director of Strategic Target Planning will be the responsibility—and very properly so—of the unified commanders and the forces under them which have a role to execute in carrying out such plans.

Thus the newly instituted system provides for centrally directed operational planning, and realistic decentralized responsibility for execution of the plans.

It is further important to note that the Director of Strategic Target Planning is a subordinate agent of the JCS, and the plans prepared by his organization are not effective until reviewed and approved by the JCS and the Secretary of Defense. This emphasizes the Director's role as an agent of the JCS, and at the same time strengthens the JCS organization by providing it with a more meaningful participation in the strategic target planning process.

By way of summation, I believe it is important to recognize the following features of this recent action by Secretary Gates in establishing a Director of Strategic Target Planning:

First. It rejects an overall supreme strategic command.

Second. It strengthens our war proven and increasingly effective JCS system.

Third. It utilizes—and thus avoids duplicating—the highly specialized and expensive resources of the Strategic Air Command involved in target planning.

Fourth. It provides a highly selective staff of officers possessing specialized skills required for this important type of work.

Fifth. It assures a continuous planning process that will reflect changes in intelligence, new technological developments, and strategic capabilities. This is, as Members of the Senate will appreciate, another salient contribution by Secretary Gates to the efficiency of our Armed Forces and the enhancement of our national security.

This most recent action of solving the highly complex problem of strategic target planning take its place along with Secretary Gates' decision to sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his consolidation of long-distance communications facilities, as another historic contribution to the effectiveness of our defense organization and forces.

Once again, our Nation and the free world have benefited from the leadership and professional knowledge of our present Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Gates Organizes Group To Assign Atomic Targets," by Peter Braestrup, appearing in the New York Times of Thursday, August 18. Mr. Braestrup's analysis of this recent directive of Secretary Gates is commended to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1960]

GATES ORGANIZES GROUP TO ASSIGN ATOMIC TARGETS—GENERAL POWER HEADS CENTRAL PLANNING BODY GEARED TO MEET ANY ATTACK

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., created today a central planning group to assign nuclear weapons to enemy targets in case of war.

He called the decision the most important during his tour in the Pentagon.

Gen. Thomas Power, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, will "wear a second hat" as director of the interservice group, based at SAC headquarters in Omaha, Nebr., the Secretary said.

General Power will have a Navy officer, probably a vice admiral, as his deputy.

The Omaha group's first war plan is scheduled for completion by December 1. It will be subject to final command decisions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military body, now headed by Gen. Nathan Twining of the Air Force.

HOPE TO EASE DEBATE

Defense Department officials hope that the plan, though not intended as a compromise, will ease an Air Force-Navy debate over control of the Navy's Polaris missile; end overlapping target planning by the separate services and further strengthen the Joint Chiefs in accord with the Reorganization Act of 1958.

Secretary Gates emphasized that the plan did not represent "any change in the established national military policy" of deterrence and retaliation. Neither does it mark any change in U.S. relations with its allies, he said.

He rejected the idea of a single, centrally controlled strategic force. Instead, he said, the objective is centralized planning by the new group and decentralized execution of prearranged target assignments by the unified theater commanders and the SAC, should a nuclear attack occur.

INTEGRATED SYSTEMS SOUGHT

Mr. Gates and General Twining noted that the concept of a single retaliatory force, advocated in some Air Force circles, overlooked the possibility that its commander might become a casualty at the outset of war. Command flexibility in directing retaliatory forces, they said, would be precluded by the 15-minute warning expected in advance of any attack.

The new group has been ordered to develop an integrated target plan not only for the SAC B–47 and B–52 bombers and the Atlas missiles now operational, but also for Polaris submarines.

Aircraft carriers, Air Force fighter-bombers and Army medium-range rockets based overseas will be added as the Joint Chiefs and theater commanders see fit.

Representatives of the theater commanders who head the unified forces overseas and of the 3 services will be among the 40 members of the Omaha group.

A spur to first creation, Mr. Gates said, was the shift in U.S. retaliatory forces from manned bombers to a complicated "mix" of bombers, land-based and submarine missiles.

The current targeting system and strategic planning is "coordinated" rather than "integrated" by the various forces affected, Mr. Gates noted. This is a good plan, he said, but the future complexity and variety of weapons has made necessary the new system, which was created after a year's deliberation.

The new plan to properly integrate nuclear retaliatory forces was outlined by the Secretary to the Joint Chiefs and eight generals and admirals commanding unified theaters overseas and in the United States. General Power was present, as was Gen. Lauris Norstad, commander of U.S. forces in Europe.

The others, and their commanders, were: Adm. Harry D. Felt, Pacific; Army Gen. Charles D. Palmer, Europe; Adm. Robert L. Dennison, Atlantic; Army Lt. Gen. Robert F. Sink, Caribbean; Air Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Alaska, and Adm. Harold P. Smith, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

BIRTHDAY FELICITATIONS TO SENATOR MORTON, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today, if this is the 19th of August—and I think it is the 19th of August—marks the birth anniversary of another distinguished Member of this body, THRUSTON B. MORTON, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

He was born in Louisville in that great Commonwealth on the 19th of August 1907. So if anyone is curious about his age, all he has to do is examine this statement and, by simple arithmetical deduction, he can ascertain how old, or how young, this distinguished Senator from Kentucky is.

I think the fact ought to be noted because probably never again in the century will we see quite the juxtaposition of personalities in this body that obtains today, for sitting in this body as active Members are the presidential nominee on the Democratic ticket, the vice presidential nominee on that ticket, the Vice President of the United States as the nominee for President on the Republican ticket, the vice presidential nominee on that ticket being a former Member of this body, and the two party chieftains of the great national parties, both Members of this body.

I know it is against the rules, but I hope that somewhere along the line the rules may be suspended and that a photograph may be taken of this body with every one of these distinguished personalities at his respective station.

Mr. President, I return to facts about my great friend from Kentucky. He graduated from Yale University in 1929. He was a great soldier. When I use the word "soldier" I use it generically, for it includes the Navy and it includes the Marine Corps. I believe our distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] served in that great corps at one time.

THRUSTON MORTON—I accent the "Thru," because sometimes he is called "THRUSTON" and sometimes he is called "THURSTON" but his name is "THRUSTON, and I think every individual has a certain pride about his name and likes to have it correctly pronounced—I emphasize that THRUSTON MORTON spent 51 months on active duty in the U.S. Navy. That is nearly 4½ years. It is a great record.

He was elected to the House of Representatives and served in the 80th Congress. That is the last Congress in which I served in the House of Representatives. He was reelected to the 81st and 82d Congresses.

Thereafter he became an Assistant Secretary of State, and he served in that capacity for 3 years, from January 1953 to March 1956.

He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1956.

It must be evident from this very brief sketch that he has had a great background as a legislator in the most numerous branch of the National Legislature, as the Constitution states; in this great, distinguished and deliberative body; and as a distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for 3 years.

In addition to his senatorial duties he manages and operates and is the directing head of the Republican National Committee. He is a man of charm, of great personality, who does justice to every one of the fine traditions of the Blue Grass State. I wish he were present at this moment to hear these encomiums, because I am confident that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle share this high estimate of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the party manager or chieftain of the Republican National Committee. Not only is he an affable and charming person, but he is tough, as we would have a national party chairman be. In that respect, I think he walks in the footsteps of Daniel Boone. If anyone could wear the coonskin cap not only in his own right but also in pursuance of a great tradition, that man is THRUSTON MORTON, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Today we observe his 53d birthday. I observe all these distinguished gentlemen on the floor of the Senate. I utter what I asserted the other day, "Oh, to be 53 again." That comes from the pinnacle of age, as I look down the vista of years and sometimes refer to these distinguished young gentlemen as only an older protege can do. One would think I have become conscious of the fleeting years, and yet the years do not fleet. That is a myth, Mr. President. Time does not fly. The years do not fleet. It is we who, like some great part of a cascading fountain, merge through this motionless and stationary medium we call time.

Long ago, some perverse characters taking account of the sun, the stars, and the moon, beset us first with hour glasses, then with calendars, and then with clocks, all obedient, of course, to the motions of the planets. So when the earth goes around the sun once we put a little mark down and we say, "A year has gone by." No, Mr. President, a year has not gone by. We have simply, as individuals, moved through a year.

So THRUSTON MORTON, our distinguished colleague, has moved through 53 years. Fifty-three times the Earth has gone around the Sun to mark his progress. May the length of his days be many, as those in ancient days used to recite it, and with it may the worth of his days be great. I salute our distinguished colleague from Kentucky on his 53d natal anniversary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was happy to yield to the genial and distinguished minority leader for brief remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the remarks were brief.

Mr. KEATING. They were brief and very much to the point.

I join with the distinguished Senator in the tribute to our delightful companion and able colleague, THRUSTON MORTON, who occupies the desk next to mine. We entered the House of Representatives together. We have been good friends. He occupies a position in the Senate, and also a strictly partisan position. I know of no one who has combined those two rather arduous duties more ably than has our colleague. He is able to separate the one duty from the other in an admirable fashion.

I join in congratulating our colleague on his natal day, and I wish him many more and great success. I wish him, indeed, political success.

I am happy to have him referred to—if I may have the attention of my friend from Illinois—as THRUSTON MORTON. He is sometimes called "THROOST," or "THRUST," but it is very important to get away from "THURSTON," for there is nothing which annoys him more than to have his name pronounced wrong.

One thing I would not want to have him called is "THRU," because he is not through. He has a great future ahead of him. I hope it is not only a great personal future but also a great political future. I know my friend from Illinois joins with me in that expression.

Mr. RANDOLPH rose.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my friend from West Virginia, with the understanding that I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

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

DRAMATIC GROWTH OF AIR TRANSPORT AND GENERAL FLYING ARE REVIEWED ON NATIONAL AVIATION DAY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, August 19 is the birth date of Dr. Orville Wright, the first man to successfully pilot heavier-than-air craft. Today is also the day set aside as National Aviation Day, in acknowledgment of the achievement of the Wright brothers and of the contributions of the thousands—both famous and anonymous—who have built aviation into a great industry.

It was my privilege to introduce in the House of Representatives the Senate Joint Resolution which led to the establishment of the first National Aviation Day in 1939.

Since that time, Mr. President, we have seen the aviation industry grow to become a major segment of our economy, a decisive factor in war, and a vital component in maintaining the peace. Since this is National Aviation Day I think it is fitting to comment on some of the milestones of civil aviation and briefly glance at some of the measurements of its growth.

FIRST TRANSCONTINENTAL FLIGHT REQUIRED MORE THAN 33 HOURS

The first transcontinental flight in 1921 required 33 hours and 21 minutes from coast to coast. Now an eastbound flight covers the same distance in approximately 4 hours.

The most dramatic growth in commercial air transportation has occurred, however, in the past two decades. Common carrier air service is now available to all cities over 100,000 population, more than 75 percent of those cities over 10,000 and 50 percent of those communities over 1,000. West Virginia cities and our States citizens have benefited from this expansion.

Since 1939, passengers carried have multiplied 30 times—the ton-miles of freight, more than 200 times. The num-

bers of aircraft have increased more than 5 times and seats available more than 20 times.

The people employed has increased some 12 times, from 13,300 in 1939 to 162,029 in 1959, while airline payrolls have increased during the same period some 50 times, from $24 million to $1,200 million.

Perhaps even more dramatic has been the evolution of the aircraft itself. In two decades, cruising speeds have increased from 160 miles per hour to over 600 miles per hour. From aircraft with nonpressurized cabins operating at altitudes of 8,000 to 10,000 feet above sea level, we have advanced to pressurized flight 5 to 6 miles above the earth. Planes capable of carrying a maximum of 21 passengers have given way to planes with more than 100 seats plus great capacity for freight and mail.

A large and growing factor in the total aviation industry, and one which makes substantial contributions to the national economy, is a category of flying known as general aviation.

BUSINESS AND PRIVATE FLYING ARE ON INCREASE

This embraces all civil flying except that of the scheduled airlines and includes business, industry, agriculture, air taxi and air cargo services, instruction, geophysical research, survey and patrol, and nonbusiness personal uses.

Today there are more than 70,000 general aviation aircraft providing air transportation between 6,412 listed airports in the United States and territories.

The Federal Aviation Agency has predicted a 100-percent increase in active general aviation by 1975. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, a trade association of owners and users of general aviation aircraft, now has more than 75,000 members throughout the United States. Hours flown in business use have more than doubled during the past 10 years, from 2,615,000 in 1949 to an estimated 5,700,000 in 1959.

These are but a few of the dramatic and important facts of the development in civil aviation during the past two decades. And they more than justify, Mr. President, the hopes and faith of the early pioneers of aviation.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from West Virginia has given us some most interesting facts. In the latter part of June 1939, in the company of the great and late Senator Lundeen, of Minnesota, Congressman Cannon, of Missouri, Marvin McIntyre, Steve Early, and others and I participated in the initial flight on the *Yankee Clipper*, the amphibian that sank in Lisbon Bay, and at that time it took us 34 hours in order to get from New York City to points in Ireland. That flight illustrates the difference between aviation at that time and what it is at the moment. Today, conventional aircraft fly to Ireland from New York in 10 to 11 hours, while jets reach England in 6½ hours.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The observation of my colleague is timely. I believe the words of Tennyson in 1840 were beautifully prophetic when he wrote:

I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails;
Pilot of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper of the southwind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-storm;
'Til the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world,
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapped in universal law.

Yes, Mr. President, those were prophetic and beautiful words, symbolic of the growth of an important phase of the transportation development in our Republic.

THE PRESIDENT'S 21 POINTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have heard a great deal of talk on the floor of this Chamber about the legislative program that the President set forth in his special message on August 8. I have heard it said, by several Senators, that the items embodied in the President's message were new. I have even heard it said that the President got his ideas for the message from the Democratic platform, that he had never had these ideas before, but that, now in—and I quote "his twilight years"—he was forced to turn to the Democratic Party for his program.

When I heard these points first made, I thought our colleagues on the other side were just joking. I found it hard to believe that they could possibly have such short memories. In short, I was astonished.

Now, in the words of a distinguished Democrat of my State, the late Alfred E. Smith, "Let's look at the record." The truth of the matter, Mr. President, is the proposals in the President's message are not new at all. With only one or two exceptions the President has been urging the passage of these very measures for years—not even for months, but for years. If anyone thinks that these are new proposals, the only conclusion that I can reach is that they have not listened to any of the President's previous messages. Perhaps they were absent on other business. That is the only way they could possibly have managed not to hear every single one of these recommendations earlier. Or perhaps they are so concerned with their own program that they do not recognize its perfectly legitimate forebears.

But it is time, I think, to set the record straight. I should like to trace, for the edification of those who are interested in the truth, the history of the proposals which the President made at the beginning of this session. For those who have been Members of the U.S. Congress for the last 8 years and who have carefully listened to the recommendations from the White House, this history may seem somewhat tedious. But to the majority, who have apparently never heard any of the President's previous words, no doubt the following account will be completely new and fascinating. In any case, I hope, it will be instructive.

Just a few statistics to start with. Of the 24 projects which the President mentioned on August 8, 4 were first proposed as far back as 1953. In other words, for 7 years and 7 months, these projects have been on the President's agenda, but not, it would appear, on that of Congress. Two were proposed in 1954. Two more were proposed in 1955. One more was proposed in 1957, one in 1958, two in 1959. Only one of the major proposals was made for the first time this year. On the average, each of these proposals was made not once, but seven times. The President did specifically label as new three proposals, one calling for an increase in the mutual security contingency fund, one calling for a $600 million Latin American assistance fund, and one calling for an international food bank. All of his other proposals—I repeat that—all of his other proposals were first made at an earlier date.

First. Mr. President, I shall take up seriatim and document this statement. The first item on his list is civil rights legislation. As the President pointed out, the civil rights legislation that was passed this spring, after 2 months of procrastination and filibuster, did not contain two major items that the administration had requested. The 1960 law omitted, first, any measures to assist State and local agencies in meeting costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs. Second, it failed to provide for a Commission on Equal Job Opportunities Under Government Contracts.

Both of these proposals were clearly in the President's mind January 9, 1959, when in his state of the Union message he pointed out that progress in the field of civil rights must continue. He declared that the administration's specific legislative plans would be offered early in the session.

The President lived up to his word in a special message February 5 of that year, 1959, that is, 18 months ago. Then, in virtually the same words as he used 2 weeks ago, he recommended laws to provide temporary aid to State agencies to facilitate desegregation processes, and to provide a Commission on Equal Job Opportunities Under Government Contracts.

When this message bore no fruit, the President pointed out again, in his state of the Union message in January 1960 that he hoped his earlier recommendations "will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session." The requests were repeated in the budget message of that same month and in the Economic Report.

Although the President signed the emasculated civil rights bill that finally emerged from Congress, he pointed out in his May 3 special message, that the Congress had "rejected certain of my recommendations in this area—those relating to equality of job opportunity and assistance to States attempting to desegregate their schools." After the conventions, he quite rightly assumed from the platforms of both parties that still further advances were possible in this field. Therefore, his special message last week contained these important provisions that the Congress, not the White House, had omitted from the 1960 Civil Rights Act.

How then, anyone could say these were new proposals, is a mystery to me, especially in view of the number of words that were expended on civil rights this session. The only thing that is new about these suggestions is the expressed—I repeat—the expressed willingness of the majority party to support them.

Second. Let me take the next item on the President's agenda for this session—Federal assistance in the construction of educational facilities. The President first spoke of the need for some kind of Federal help for the school system in February 1953, that is, in his first state of the Union message. That was, if I may use the image of one of my distinguished colleagues, in the dawn of this administration, 7 years and 6 months ago. Two years later in 1955 and again in 1956 and again in 1957 an entire Presidential message was devoted to this subject. School construction needs were mentioned in the economic report for 1957, in the budget message for 1958, in the 1960 state of the Union message, in the budget message for 1961, and in the special message of May 3, 1960.

Yet, somehow, the idea of Federal aid for school aid seems to be a brandnew one to some. It is still a revolutionary concept. They can only assume that the President got the idea from the Democratic platform, now barely a month old.

In delineating these items I am not stating that the Senator from New York or any other Senator would support all of them. What I am saying is that the President's program is not new. It has been here a long time. To say it is a new program which he sent to us for this special session, makes no sense whatever, as I hope I shall be able to show.

Third. Let us take the issue of medical care for the elderly, the next point on the President's list. Early in May, the Eisenhower administration offered a program that, in the words of the President "will take full advantage of, and support, the progress that has been made by private effort"; "It will recognize," he continued "the traditional Federal-State relations in various fields of assistance; and additionally, it will not do violence to the private relationships that must continue to characterize the rendering of health care services." Whether one supports in detail the exact administrative arrangements of the program that was presented by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or not, there is still no reason to pretend that the administration had not offered this plan well in advance of this post convention session.

Fourth. The President's proposals for an extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act and an increase in the minimum wage have a 5-year history. In January 1954 and 1955 the President requested both an increase in the level of the minimum wage and an extension of the workers covered. In January 1956, the minimum wage was raised to the present $1 an hour rate. The President continued to recommend that the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act be expanded in both the budget messages and the Economic Reports of the years 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960. In May of 1960, the President once again reminded Congress of his wish for an extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage, and pointed out that the minimum wage could be upped again without weakening the economy. Surely 5 years of administration-proposed bills cannot be forgotten so fast. In fact, on this issue as on many others, the administration has consistently, politely, and clearly indicated just what legislation it would like passed. Unfortunately, the majority not only has failed to pass the legislation—up to last night; it appears also to have forgotten that the President asked for it.

Fifth. Let us take up next the question of agricultural bills. No one, I think, would have the temerity to suggest that the Eisenhower administration just invented this problem to put in the President's special message. But there are those who want to blame the administration for the fact that no responsible, effective, and workable legislation has been produced. The policies of the Eisenhower administration were fully set forth in the special message on agriculture of January 11, 1954, that is, 6½ years ago. At that time the administration called for a program of flexible price supports on most agricultural commodities with the aim of reducing the vast surplus supplies that had been accumulating.

This recommendation was repeated in every state of the Union message that the President prepared, with the exception of one. The farm problem in one aspect or another was dealt with in seven different special messages, most of them devoted only to the one problem of farm surpluses and declining agricultural income. Every single budget message and Economic Report touched on the subject in one aspect or another.

Yet, in the face of clear administration desires for a policy of flexible supports, the only actual legislation that Congress has passed that was directed at cutting down in the production of surplus foods was a bill to raise prices to a fixed 90 percent of parity. That the President vetoed such an artificial and rigid piece of legislation was hardly surprising, since it represented a violation, not a fulfillment of his program.

In his state of the Union message last January, the President again called attention to the failure of Congress to face up to the basic issues of the farm problem. Still no congressional action. In his special message on agriculture, February 9, 1960, the President went as far toward accommodating Congress on this matter as any responsible Executive could go. He said he would approve any one or a combination of constructive proposals which Congress might enact, just as long as they kept realistic price-support levels and avoided direct subsidies.

In May, he repeated his plea for constructive congressional action. Still we have no wheat bill. The costs of surplus commodity storage are mounting. The President and the American people are waiting for action. Yet, amazingly enough there are those who actually seem to think that the farm problem is just a new political demon that the President is exercising for the benefit of the campaign.

Sixth. The next item of important legislation on the President's list was a program of area assistance for chronically blighted regions. In 1955 the President called for a major study of the problem. In 1956, the state of the Union message pointed out that "a soundly conceived Federal partnership program" could be of real assistance to local government bodies in eliminating dependence on a single industry and thus reducing unemployment. In 1957 and 1958, the subject was dealt with in both the budget message and the Economic Report.

In August 1958, the Congress finally passed an area redevelopment bill that bore little or no relation to what the President had requested. The bill that was passed would have provided a real gravy train for any community that had even a slight and temporary unemployment rate. The Federal Government would have been expected to subsidize any number of projects that are perfectly within the capabilities of the States and municipalities. That was in no way the bill that the President wanted, so the President vetoed it, calling for action along the more limited lines that he had originally proposed.

Budget messages and Economic Reports continued to stress the need for a limited program for areas with chronic unemployment. Throughout 1959 there was no congressional action. Then, in 1960, another election year, as the President noted, the Congress passed another bill, which was unsatisfactory to the President.

Since then there has been much wailing and gnashing of teeth about the depressed areas. What I can only assume must be crocodile tears have been shed by the boatload for the people of the chronically depressed areas. But still, Congress has taken no action. Perhaps some people would rather use this subject as a campaign issue than provide the actual relief that could so readily be made available.

In other words, it seems to me quite incredible for anyone to think that area assistance is a new program. It has been on the agenda ever since the beginning of the Eisenhower administration. The fact of the matter is that Congress has repeatedly ignored the President's recommendations. There is still time to do something about area redevelopment, if

the leaders of the Congress really want to. The President's request is as old as his term in office, but congressional desire to carry it through appears not yet to have been born.

Seventh. Another action which the President called for very early in his second administration was the creation of additional judgeships. There is a tendency right now to pretend that this is a new idea, designed to pack the courts with Eisenhower-appointed judges. But there is nothing new or political about it. The Judicial Conference pointed out the need for more judges as early as 1954. The President, in his budget message of January 16, 1957, urged that these judgeships be created. This is, as the President has pointed out in every subsequent budget message, an important need that Congress should not neglect. Access to the courts is a vital right to every individual in a country where laws are supreme. Yet, despite the President's timely request, the concept of equal justice under the law has been subordinated to the idea of politics first, justice second. To the many citizens who are still waiting to have their cases tried and suffering financial and other losses as a result, the need for more judges must be painfully apparent. But to the Congress, as it has even been publicly admitted, patronage is more important than patriotism. And to justify this procrastination, it is necessary to pretend that the President's own request was a hasty, last minute affair, conceived on election eve, instead of the careful, thoughtful, and timely suggestion that it in fact was. Once again politics makes it easy for some people to forget that the call for new judges is 3½ years old.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished majority leader with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hesitate to ask the Senator from New York to indulge us further, but the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is in the Chamber. I believe it will be a matter of a very few minutes, without any other speeches, if we may have the permission of the Senator from New York, for the Senator from Arkansas to call up these two rather important bills, one involving the President's contingent fund, and one involving the Latin-American program.

If we are unable to dispose of these measures within 10 minutes, I shall ask that Senators wait until after the Senator from New York has concluded his address. In any event, I shall ask that the yea-and-nay votes be postponed until after he has finished. However, it might be possible to secure the third reading of the bills if the Senator will indulge us for 10 minutes.

I ask that permission with the understanding that this colloquy will appear at another point in the RECORD. I shall be most grateful for the Senator's cooperation, if he feels disposed to give it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the majority leader is most persuasive. The Senator from New York took the floor at 4 o'clock, or shortly thereafter, and started to speak on his present subject at about 20 minutes of 6. Because I have yielded to all and sundry, I certainly do not want to stop my generosity at this point. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of expediting action on the two bills reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with the understanding, which was set forth by the majority leader, that I do not lose the floor.

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

AMERICAN REPUBLICS COOPERATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1910, Senate bill 3861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3861) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is the second time this year I have taken the floor without enthusiasm to perform a public duty which falls to me as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. My task is to explain and justify S. 3861, a bill which the committee has favorably reported authorizing the appropriation of $600 million for economic aid for Latin America.

Foreign aid bills are unpopular even during the regular session of the Congress. I suspect that they will prove to be even more unpopular during a special session when the Congress, with only a limited time available, is trying to give adequate consideration to a number of major bills.

Another reason for feeling unenthusiastic about my task is that my sense of justice is injured by the President's proposal. It has been a long time since I have felt so torn between my sense of duty and my sense of fairness regarding a proper assignment of praise and blame. For a good many years responsible citizens and legislators, predominantly Democrats, have been calling for a really adequate, long-term program of assistance for economic development in Latin America. For 8 years of this administration these recommendations have been ignored. Senator SMATHERS on August 17 addressed the Senate with remarkable restraint, considering the provocation, concerning his own past warnings and recommendations regarding economic aid to Latin America.

Now, at the 11th hour, as the last dying gasp of this administration, we have received a request for a special authorization for economic aid to Latin America. The administration deserves little credit for this proposal. It has been forced on them. Not even the rocks which were thrown at Vice President NIXON in 1958 were sufficient to rouse the administration from its lethargy. It was only when Cuba went down the Communist road that the light began to dawn. Perhaps the President has finally realized that we have a very serious situation to the south of us.

I also lack enthusiasm because of the vagueness of the proposal. No program has been presented to the committee. No details worth speaking of have been offered. There is no country breakdown. There is not even the usual illustrative program. The Department of State speaks of this as an initial contribution. I would not mind this indefiniteness so much if I thought that the administration were adequately aware of the magnitude of the job in Latin America, of the time which will be needed, and of the methods which will be required.

Finally, I speak with a heavy heart because I realize that behind the President's failure to act during the past 8 years to meet the growing crisis in Latin America lies the fact that the American people have not yet accepted the idea that some kind of foreign aid program will be necessary for years to come, as far as we can see ahead. Our people continue to cling to the more comfortable idea that the present program of aid is temporary. They have the idea that after a few years the foreign problems will be solved and the United States can devote exclusive attention to our domestic affairs. We do not as yet have a conception such as the Communist leaders have of a bitter struggle over a long period of years or, as they put it, a "permanent revolution."

Having said all this—in full recognition that the administration's proposal is very late, much too indefinite and vague—nevertheless, I must vote for the proposal. The temptation to reject it is great for the reasons I have given, but the committee has done what it could hurriedly to provide appropriate policy guidelines. In the circumstances I feel that I have no choice but to go along with the proposal. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The bill which is before the Senate is frankly a stopgap measure. It is a promise to do something. It is designed to be of use especially at a major economic conference of representatives of American Republics which is to be held in Bogotá, Colombia, next month. The purpose of the bill is to enable the U.S. representatives at that conference to say to the others present that the United States agrees that there is an urgent need for immediate improvement in the living standards in Latin American

countries. The bill will enable our representatives to offer U.S. assistance. The Department of State wishes to say to our Latin American friends that over and above loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and in addition to the export of U.S. goods financed through Export-Import Bank loans, and in addition to the loans which will be made in Latin America by the Development Loan Fund—in addition to all these sources—we agree that there is a need for what the administration refers to as social development aid. That is, a need to do more to remedy inadequate education, poor health conditions, and social unrest. As Secretary Dillon put it to the committee in explaining the President's proposal, the administration has in mind "assistance in such fields as land settlement and land utilization, housing, vocational, technical, and scientific training and basic public facilities such as potable water systems and sewage systems."

The administration hopes that at the meeting in Bogotá the framework can be established for a comprehensive plan for cooperative development. The needs of Latin American countries should be assessed and cataloged. The assets for increased development should be appraised and a plan should be worked out to meet the gap. The phrase "Marshall plan" immediately comes to mind as one thinks of this process but the administration does not use the phrase.

The administration has not asked for an appropriation at this time. The amount is $500 million. A specific program is to be submitted to the Congress next year. It is obvious that such a program will have to spell out the proposed uses for the money and specify the channels through which it is to be expended. The relative priority as among such needs as land reform, basic education and housing must be worked out. There may be a need for new institutions, both bilateral and multilateral, although at the present time the administration is thinking of using the Inter-American Bank—which will come into operation on October 1—and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. At the present time the administration expects that most of the funds will be used for loans but it reserves the possibility that 10 to 15 percent will be in the form of grants.

The remaining $100 million out of the $600 million which is authorized by the bill is earmarked for reconstruction in Chile. I need not dwell on the damage done there by earthquakes and floods. The ruins can be counted and the cost of reconstruction reasonably forecast over a short term. Again the administration does not intend to ask for an appropriation this year. The purpose of the authorization now is to serve as an assurance to Chile that as that country exerts itself to rebuild it can count on further help from the United States eventually.

So much for this brief description of the President's proposal. I believe I need not spend a great deal of time on the reasons why the United States should assist Latin America. The importance to us of our friendship with Latin American countries, of our trade with the area, of American investments of the many cultural ties, and of the strategic considerations are all well known.

The depth of poverty in Latin America—where there is a per capita gross national product of $115 per year as compared with $2,500 per year in the United States—is something which most people are dimly aware of but choose not to think about very often. It is not easy, however, to measure the need for capital investment in Latin America. President Kubitschek of Brazil and his associates may be thinking in terms of $40 billion of capital from all sources over a period of years. What is not known, however, is the extent to which Latin American countries themselves can provide this capital.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has had some estimates made as to the capital requirements but the experts are reluctant to use firm dollar figures. I quote from a paragraph in the report to the committee prepared by the National Planning Association and released in January of this year:

> Thus, there appears to be a major capital import requirement in Latin America which is not now being met by existing agencies, international and U.S. Government, or by private foreign investors. Nor is it likely to be adequately filled in the future by the two new international lending institutions that will become operative in the next few years. [The International Development Association (IDA) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB).] However, it must also be pointed out that the magnitude of the need is not really known. There has as yet been no detailed or reliable estimate of the specific amounts and uses of imported capital required in the third category to supplement the resources of the Latin American countries available for such purposes. To obtain the necessary cooperation and information from Latin American governments, such a study would have to be conducted by an international institution. But, the study would be neither realistic nor worthwhile if the agency undertaking it were compelled to accept without critical review and substantial revision the national estimates of needs and indigenous resources.

Another way to measure the need in Latin America is to look at the danger signals. We can examine the causes of the falling off of U.S. exports to Latin America. We can review the reasons given for the insults which were hurled at Vice President NIXON as he traveled in South America. We can recall the deep concern expressed over and over again in public and in private by leaders of Latin American countries who have visited in the United States. We can count the recent revolutions. There have been revolutions of every kind, engineered by military officers, by middle class citizens, by coalitions of dissatisfied citizens of every level, and by Communists.

Any way you look at it, it becomes clear that this Government must do more to assist Latin American economic development than we have done in the past. The President's mutual security program which was presented to the Congress in February—only 6 months ago—called for economic aid to Latin America of the kind we are now talking about in the amount of $64 million for the fiscal year 1961. It remains to be seen how much of that program will ultimately be funded with appropriations. The record shows that the cumulative economic aid under the mutual security program for Latin America for all the past 14 years amounts to $564 million. To place this figure, which covers all the past, alongside the President's proposal now for $500 million, which he labels as an initial contribution, gives one a rather good measure of the inadequacy of our past efforts in Latin America.

I doubt that any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations thought that the fiscal year 1961 program of aid to Latin America which was presented in February was adequate. It is equally true that members of the committee were aware that there was no point in trying to increase the amounts asked for. Anybody who has ever observed the fate of an attempt to increase an authorization for a mutual security program over and above what the President asks for will readily understand my point.

It was only last year that the Committee on Foreign Relations tried to place the Development Loan Fund on a long-term basis with adequate funds and with public debt financing. As soon as it became clear that the Treasury and the President were opposed there was no longer any hope that the Senate could be persuaded to support the committee.

Mr. President, I shall try to anticipate several questions about this bill which I know will be asked. Why is it that between July 1 and August 8 the President has changed his mind and has presented us with this large request for economic aid money for Latin America? Why is it necessary to legislate at all now, instead of waiting until a specific program has been developed? Does not the bill as it stands constitute a blank check for the President because it contains no guidelines as to how he is to spend the money?

I shall try to deal with these three questions. First, as to the President's change of mind. I can only speculate as to the reasons and the motivation for this. The President's legislative message was not very helpful. I speculate that the President himself on his recent tour of Latin America may have sensed that behind the courteous welcome which he received all was not well.

A second factor, I think, has been the situation in Cuba. For the first time in the Western Hemisphere we now have a Communist government in full control of a very important country near our shores. This is enough to throw a scare into the most complacent among us.

The really scary fact, however, is the same conditions which led first to revolution and then to Communist control in Cuba also exist in many other countries in Latin America. Castro's success was no middle-of-the-night coup. He was supported from the very beginning by a broad spectrum of the people of Cuba. Cuba was ripe for revolution and the Communists have been able to grab the reins.

All over Latin America there are areas containing the same kind of dissatisfaction and readiness for revolution. In most of the countries the wealth is held by a very few and the overwhelming majority of the people are very poor. The

system of taxation in many Latin American countries not only is designed to favor the rich but has the more serious result that vast areas of productive land and other resources are kept from being used for the benefit of the growing population. Illiteracy in Latin America is as bad as in any other part of the world. The point I wish to make is that while the President may have been frightened by the Cuban crisis into presenting his program, it is my hope that the administration sees beyond that immediate danger to the similar breeding grounds for revolution elsewhere in the area.

Mr. President, I turn to the second question which is being asked about this bill. Why not hold it up until there is a specific program to accompany the authorization? There are several answers to this question. First of all, making a program of economic and social development for Latin America is not something than can be done by experts sitting here in Washington. Such a program is not even something that can be worked out through a series of bilateral arrangements with Latin American countries. The reason is this: No program of economic development in Latin America is going to succeed unless the governments concerned are willing to put through programs of tax reform and investment which will require a big change in their internal affairs and large sacrifices on the part of some segments of the population. It would be counterproductive for the United States to insist upon reforms of this kind bilaterally. The only hope for them lies in all of the countries getting together and agreeing that they all must institute such measures cooperatively.

It will be necessary for the Latin American countries to agree on the priorities of outside aid to them. Unless they do this there will be jealousies among them and the ultimate cost of the development bill will be larger than it need be.

Some Senators may say that they agree with all that I have said but they still cannot see why we cannot wait until the Latin American countries agree on their internal reforms and their aid priorities. The trouble is that, owing to our past actions, this Government is forced to do something rather dramatic in order to convince the Latin American countries that we are really serious. State Department representatives have gone to so many meetings with Latin American representatives over the years and uttered so many platitudes about our eagerness to cooperate—without any corresponding action—that something a little more concrete than a verbal offer to help is called for. Hence this bill.

The Congress and the Executive would join, through this bill, in issuing a kind of promissory note. The bill constitutes an assurance that if the Latin American countries join with us in a cooperative plan for economic and social development the United States will back up the plan with sizable capital investment. Since the amount which is mentioned in the bill, $500 million, is as large as all of the past mutual security aid for Latin America put together, this shows that we really mean business.

Finally, Mr. President, we should not, in my opinion, delay enactment of a bill of this kind because of the views of those who say that we shall soon have a new President who will wish to review the whole subject of foreign aid before making his proposals. Fortunately, our presidential election process need not paralyze us to that extent. The Democratic candidate for President is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and he supports the bill which I am discussing. I do not know for certain the position of the Republican candidate for President but I have no doubt that he supports it too.

I shall now deal with the assertion that this bill constitutes a blank check for the President. The basis for this contention lies in the fact that the authorization permits an appropriation to the Secretary of State of $500 million which he may use to carry out the purposes of the bill on such terms and conditions as he may specify.

I concede that this bill is a blank check only to the following extent: It does constitute a promise on the part of the United States to help Latin America to the extent of $500 million when adequate programs are developed. Aside from that there is no blank check. The bill is not an appropriation. No obligation of funds can be made pursuant to the bill. Moreover, the program for the future should be planned in accordance with the guidelines laid down in the bill.

I should like to take a little time to explain these guidelines. I am glad to say that they are bipartisan guidelines. They have been derived in part from the language of S. 3839, the administration's bill, introduced by request; they have been derived in part from amendments to S. 3839 which were introduced by Senator CAPEHART; they have been derived in part from Senate Resolution 353 which was introduced by Senator MANSFIELD.

The effect of the policy statements contained in the committee bill, S. 3861, is to instruct the U.S. representatives who will be working out development plans with the Latin American Republics.

I shall summarize the main parts of these instructions:

First. There must be a plan of hemispheric development worked out. This plan must be open to all Latin American Republics. The plan must be based upon "a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, the growth of free economic and social institutions, and the development of economic cooperation."

Second. There must be greater economic cooperation in this hemisphere, especially through the removal of barriers to trade. In this effort, the United States must be prepared to do its share. The bill specifically refers to the advantages which we have enjoyed here in the United States arising from the absence of internal trade barriers. The bill specifically encourages the gradual development of regional common markets among the American Republics.

Third. There must be developed measures which will stabilize extreme price fluctuations for the export commodities on which Latin American countries depend so heavily. Until recently the administration consistently opposed every attempt by Latin American countries to get anywhere with the establishment of commodity price stabilization mechanisms. In the last year or so we have finally changed that policy. We have now actually assisted in the establishment of a marketing agreement among coffee producing countries. It is this kind of cooperative undertaking for other commodities which must be vigorously pursued.

Fourth. There is an urgent need for additional measures to increase understanding among the peoples of this hemisphere. We need more exchanges of persons. We need more interchange of ideas and techniques of production. We need more exchanges of teachers and educators. We need more traffic in cultural delegations and exhibits. We need a further increase in tourist and other travel by the peoples of the hemisphere.

Fifth. There is a need for gradual achievement of a consensus about the use of private capital in the hemisphere. This consensus must extend not only to the question of protection to be given to capital investment which comes from outside a country; it must also extend to the questions of local participation in the operation of businesses and to the proper treatment of local employees.

These are some of the principles which will guide the preparation of the program which is authorized by the bill. If these policies are not followed no program of financial aid, however large, can succeed.

Mr. President, I shall close these remarks in support of S. 3861 with what I hope will be two sobering thoughts. First, I hope that no one will be misled by this bill. None of its sponsors believe that the dangers in Latin America can be eliminated for the price of $500 million. This $500 million is just the beginning. No one can say how much money will ultimately be necessary. No one can say how long the job will take.

The other sobering thought is this. I have been talking only of Latin America. We all know full well, however, that there are similar needs and dangers elsewhere. While we need a plan for much more rapid economic and social development in Latin America there is also a need for similar plans in other critical areas in the world.

Finally, the money herein authorized is the least important part of the program if it is to succeed. Of much greater importance is the wisdom, the patience, and the foresight in planning for the future, which has been so sadly lacking in the past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we come to this measure late in the day. But this is a situation where the philosophy of "better late than never" should prevail.

What we are considering is a commitment long overdue—a commitment to our friends and neighbors to the south. We are pledging to them the help they

need to help themselves in developing their resources—both human and physical.

We had the warnings—many of them expressed from this floor. But it took the impact of unpleasant events to bring action.

A number of years ago, a great President of the United States committed this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor. It was a fruitful policy which welded the Western Hemisphere into a strong unit to the mutual advantage of all its member countries.

This was a policy which assured us friends in peace and allies in war. The Western Hemisphere flourished as never before in its history.

Unfortunately, the passage of time brought us many problems. Frequently, the press of events leads us to ignore those who are closest and dearest to us.

Our eyes became fixed on another hemisphere and our neighbors to the south became secondary in the thoughts of our policymakers.

Tremendous changes have taken place in Latin America since the days that Franklin D. Roosevelt announced the good neighbor policy. The population has increased tremendously and is still increasing at a faster rate than any other area of the world.

Great shifts have taken place in trade patterns. Commodities which provided the economic base for some nations have declined in value. And political changes in other parts of the world have had a direct effect upon the trade of our neighbors.

These economic and social changes led inevitably to political changes. And these changes crept up on us unnoticed until they burst into the open with bewildering rapidity.

Now we find ourselves confronted with disturbing trends right on our own doorstep. We have come to the realization—and it is frightening—that the Western Hemisphere is not safe from Communist penetration.

The cold war is no longer something remote to be waged in remote corners of the globe. It is right here at home in our own hemisphere.

These developments jolted us out of our complacency. But we must realize that we will not solve the situation if we merely seek to wage and win the cold war.

Our motives must be nobler; our objectives must be sounder; our foresight must be greater than merely defeating communism.

We must rededicate ourselves to the good neighbor policy. We must offer the help of neighbor to neighbors—not just the assistance of an embattled power seeking allies.

The situation in the Western Hemisphere will not be solved solely by money. What is needed is a change in attitude. We must recognize our Latin American neighbors as people who have problems—and who can solve those problems themselves with some neighborly help.

I sympathize with the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who handled this bill. As the committee report notes, the administration has made a most unusual request. In effect, we are being asked to grant the administration a $600 million blank check.

The committee acceded reluctantly to the request because of the urgency of the issue at stake. Furthermore, we are told that there will be no request for an appropriation until firm programs have been developed.

Under the circumstances, the responsible course is to approve the measure. We will trust to the next Congress the task of laying down legislative guidelines to give substance to this authorization.

We must also entrust to the next administration the vital job of reviewing our entire Latin American policy. Although this measure is one which I am willing to approve, I am not willing to consider it a policy.

It is merely an authorization to back our representatives at the Bogotá Economic Conference on September 5 and to assist in the reconstruction of devastated Chile.

There are tremendous forces stirring in the world to the south. What we have seen so far is merely a surface manifestation of the trends that are underway.

Our Latin American neighbors are on the march. Their goal is the development of their resources so their nations can enjoy the full benefits of the 20th century and so grinding poverty will become merely a memory.

They are entitled to intelligent help—the intelligent help that should come from a good neighbor. And we are obligated to grant that help—not just out of self-interest but in the name of morality.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this measure is broken down to an authorization of $500 million for economic aid to Latin America and an authorization of $100 million, really, for the relief and rehabilitation of Chile, which, as Senators know, recently suffered very great damage from earthquakes.

I shall be glad to answer any questions about the bill.

The committee had very grave reservations about this measure. We would have preferred not to approve this authorization, but to have our negotiations with the Latin American countries continued. But the State Department insisted on the authorization.

It is our understanding that after the first of the year they will submit a program for the utilization of this fund—one which should be arrived at after consultation with the Latin American countries concerned.

In this bill we provide for such a contingency—namely, that it will be subject to further programs to be developed and authorized later on. We expect to have an amendment to this part after the first of the year.

The administration believes it very important that its representatives go to the Bogotá Conference with an authorization. I think it is a little strange that the administration believes it necessary to have an authorization in order to give validity to its promises.

Nevertheless, that is the position of the administration. So the committee very unenthusiastically acceded to the administration's request, and reported the bill. I am speaking now of the $500 million authorization for aid to Latin America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is this a grant program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it is a loan program, except that it is anticipated that possibly up to 15 percent may be grants. But it is intended to be a loan program almost entirely, and they now intend it to be administered through the Inter-American Development Bank.

As I have said, this is an unusual procedure. The saving grace is that they are not asking for an appropriation; and we believe, in good faith, that we shall have the program as to what the money will be spent for, at the beginning of the next year; and I am confident that the Appropriations Committee will see to it that no appropriation is made until the program is outlined.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the terms of the authorization, would this amount to contractual authority?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. This is an authorization, which must be followed by an appropriation. And I say they will not make contracts or appropriations until the program has been submitted and acted on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a considerable number of Senators are now present, I ask that we may now ask for the ordering of the yeas and nays, with the understanding that the vote will not be taken until after the Senator from New York concludes his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the final vote on Senate bill 3861.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Can the Senator state in what particulars this program differs from the Development Loan Fund program or the part of it which applies to Latin America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The objectives of this one will, in my judgment, be similar to the objectives of the development loan program, except that in presenting it the administration has a much broader concept of its objectives. They are set forth in the policy statement in regard to this matter—a much broader field, including land settlement and educational reform, and so forth.

Within the past few months the administration has gone much further in its acceptance of responsibility for the development of Latin America. Prior thereto, the administration took a very restricted view as to what should be done.

I would say the objectives set forth in the bill and in the report are broader than ever before.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for his lucid statement. I certainly share his point of view.

Mr. President, I support this bill with great reluctance, only because the gravity of the situation requires that we give the President the benefit of the doubt.

For the first time in our history a Communist beachhead has been established within 90 miles of our shores. Cuba is becoming a Russian satellite. The Monroe Doctrine is being openly challenged. Worse still, other Latin American governments tremble, knowing full well that the same conditions exist in their countries that led first to revolution and then to Communist domination of Cuba.

Mr. President, I would ask the Senator whether he shares my opinion that this bill is not a program, but, rather, a demand for a $500 million promissory note, drawn in blank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I agree.

Mr. CHURCH. I think that all of us on the Foreign Relations Committee have come to realize the urgent needs of Latin America for capital. That capital has to be considered as the sum total of direct assistance, loan programs, and private investment, which, in the aggregate, could come to as much as $10 billion during the next few years.

Private investment in Latin America has virtually ceased, owing to the experience in Cuba.

The present rate of private investment has dropped, I understand, from about half a billion dollars a year to about $32 million a year.

In the testimony given by Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, he referred to this bill as an initial contribution. It seems to me that the administration should make a clean breast of the matter. They know that any program really designed to improve living standards in Latin America must have the continuity of a Marshall plan, and then it will be successful only if it is accompanied by basic tax and land reforms within these countries, which will assure the people better earnings.

Otherwise, it seems to me we are in danger of pouring our money onto the sands, making the rich richer, while the growing disparity between the rich and the poor will only breed new revolution and feed it into the hands of the Communists.

I feel very strongly that something more than a blank check is needed, and that unless we have a sufficient program of the dimensions and continuity of the Marshall plan, for all the Americas, our money may very well be wasted. I feel that the administration's bill fails to meet the essential prerequisites; and I support it only because the gravity of the situation requires that the President be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR PRESIDENT'S MUTUAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1908, Senate bill 3855.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3855) to increase the authorization for appropriations for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall make a statement in explanation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, Mr. President, I wish to ask for the ordering of the yeas and nays on the question of the passage of this bill, so that Senators may know that there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been demanded on the question of the final passage of the bill. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this bill does two things:

First. (a) It authorizes the appropriation of $100 million to increase the President's contingency fund from $150 million to $250 million for the current fiscal year; and (b) it authorizes for 1 year waiver of a section of the Mutual Security Act which limits the use of certain program funds for administrative expenses.

Second. The main reason for increasing the contingency fund is that the failure of the summit conference has increased tensions and it is obvious that the Soviet Union is trying to make trouble everywhere, especially in Latin America.

Some of the funds will be useful in the Congo. But 16 other nations will become independent in Africa this year and it is only good sense for the President—whoever he may be—to have flexibility in dealing with these situations.

Third. Use of the contingency fund is limited by two principal requirements: (a) It is to be used only when "the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States"; and (b) if the President must use his special waiver authority not more than $30 million may be used in any one year for any one nation.

Fourth. The attached letter from Secretary Dillon clearly sets forth the need for this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from the Acting Secretary, Mr. Douglas Dillon, to me, together with some material attached thereto.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 17, 1960.

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for further comment as to the purposes for which the additional $100 million of contingency funds requested by the President might be used, I should like to make several points.

In the first place, it should be clearly understood that we are not asking that these funds be appropriated to finance a program of assistance just for the Congo or of any particular amount for the Congo. The uncertainties of the present situation and of the future course of events in the Congo make it both unwise and undesirable to attempt to make any final determination now as to the amount, if any, of U.S. participation in meeting the needs in that country.

As I testified before your committee, we believe that the United Nations is the proper organ to undertake technical and economic assistance programs in the Congo. We believe that assistance from outside sources including the United States should be handled by the United Nations. It is our belief and expectation that other free world countries will agree with this view and will join in contributing assistance. So far as the Congo is concerned, our purpose in asking for additional contingency funds is to put us in a position whereby we can join with other nations is responding to United Nations needs.

It is highly important to realize also, as I testified, that the whole situation in Africa has dramatically altered since our regular program proposals were prepared nearly a year ago and submitted to the Congress 6 months ago. The possibility of additional unforeseen contingencies in this troubled area is quite real.

It should be borne in mind also that at the time our original estimates of requirements for contingency funds were presented to the Congress the situation in the world was one of guarded hope that some relaxation of international tensions might be obtained through discussions with Communist leaders at the projected summit meetings. The events which have since occurred have produced a much less optimistic outlook for the near future. The Soviet leaders not only destroyed the summit conference, but, as your committee is aware, have continually made plain their intention to intensify and prolong tensions. I am enclosing a tabulation of the major Soviet actions and statements since the disruption of the summit meeting. It may be helpful in providing a perspective substantiating this point.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Acting Secretary.

SOVIET ACTION AND STATEMENTS SINCE THE SUMMIT

May 18: At Paris press conference, Khrushchev declares that shattering blows will be struck at bases from which U.S. planes overflying U.S.S.R. take off.

May 28: In a Moscow speech, Khrushchev repeats threat against U.S. oversea bases and adds: "But we also have intercontinental rockets destined to strike the aggressor across the ocean."

May 30: Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky declares Soviet rocket troops have been ordered to attack the takeoff base of aircraft violating Soviet airspace.

June 1: Replying to Dutch note of April 12, a Soviet note accuses the Netherlands of increasing the danger of war in southeast Asia by sending military reinforcements to West New Guinea.

June 3: Khrushchev, at a Moscow press conference, vilifies President Eisenhower and repeats previous threats against U.S. foreign bases; he says that Malinovsky's May 30 threat should be understood "literally."

June 15: Soviet note to Japan repeats earlier protests against the United States-Japanese security treaty made in the Soviet note of May 20, complains of the lack of a reply, and warns that Japan must face the consequences of alleged U.S. military provocations.

June 19: In conversation with Western reporters in Bucharest, Khrushchev reiterates missile threat if overflights occur, asserting: "We will strike with missiles that can hit precisely a very small target far away."

June 22: Second Soviet note to Pakistan on U–2 warns of retaliation for any repetition of such flights.

June 27: Soviet and bloc delegations walk out of 10-nation disarmament conference in Geneva. Khrushchev addresses letters to heads of government of the five Western conference participants, in which he attributes chief blame for the failure of the conference to the United States.

June 28: U.S.S.R. announces series of missile tests will be conducted in the central Pacific in July.

June 29: TASS releases a Soviet Government statement urging Japan to abrogate its security pact with the United States.

June 30: Soviet notes to the United States, the United Kingdom, and France protest the alleged use of West Berlin for the military building of the Federal Republic and the recruitment of West Berliners into the Bundeswehr.

July 1: U.S.S.R. shoots down RB–47 in international waters over the Barents Sea. Moscow maintains silence about the incident; Gromyko, touring Austria with Khrushchev, declares on July 6 the Soviet party has "no information at all about the plane." Soviet vessels voluntarily join in the search for possible survivors.

July 4: Speaking in Austria, Khrushchev praises Austrian neutrality and declares U.S.S.R. will not remain aloof "if anyone violates this neutrality."

July 6: Khrushchev warns that United States use of bases in Italy would be "a deliberate violation of Austrian neutrality."

July 8: At Vienna press conference, Khrushchev threatens that if West German Bundestag meets in West Berlin in September, he might then consider signing a peace treaty with the East German regime.

July 9: In a Moscow speech, Khrushchev warns that the U.S.S.R. will use missiles to defend Cuba against U.S. aggression.

July 10: A Khrushchev message, read by Cuban President Dorticos in Havana, pledges that the U.S.S.R. will buy Cuban sugar refused by the United States if the Cuban Government has difficulty in selling it.

July 11: U.S.S.R. sends protest note to United States alleging violation of airspace by RB–47, revealing plane was shot down, and declaring that Moscow will try surviving crewmen. Similar notes are given to Norway and the United Kingdom, accusing them of complicity in the "aggressive act."

July 12: Khrushchev, at a Moscow press conference, belligerently discusses the RB–47 incident, Cuba, and the Congo. On the plane incident, Khrushchev accuses the United States and its allies of "openly provoking a serious military conflict," and charges that the RB–47 flight gave the lie to the President's assurances concerning the suspension of overflights. The Soviet Premier also repeats and confirms the continuing validity of the Malinovsky missile threat against U.S. oversea bases. On Cuba, Khrushchev asserts that the Monroe Doctrine is "dead," and pledges Soviet support if the United States should undertake "aggressive action" against Cuba. On the Congo:

July 12: Khrushchev denounces the sending of Belgian troops as a "policy of brigandage" and accuses NATO of complicity in such "aggression."

July 13: A Soviet Government statement on the situation in the Congo, handed to all missions in Moscow, condemns supposed Belgian and Western military intervention against the Congolese Republic.

July 13: The U.S.S.R., in a note to Belgium, charges Brussels with "enslavement" of the Congo.

July 13: In a Security Council session on the Congo, the U.S.S.R. accuses the United States of planning to take away the Congo's independence.

July 15: Khrushchev, in a message to the Congolese Government, warns that the U.S.S.R. might consider direct intervention in the Congo if "aggression" continues.

July 15: Soviet note to the United States on the RB–47 attacks the U.S. note of July 13 as "full of inventions."

July 15: Soviet memorandum to the United States protests the "provocative buzzing" of Soviet ships by U.S. planes. Similar notes sent to other Western countries.

July 16: A Tass statement disclaims that the U.S.S.R. meddles in Latin American affairs, accuses the United States of doing so, and reasserts Soviet support of Cuba against the United States. The statement makes a full-scale attack against the Monroe Doctrine.

July 18: Tass announces that the trial of U–2 Pilot Powers will begin on August 17 before the military Collegium "in open session."

July 19: Soviet notes to the United States and the FRG on the arming of the Bundeswehr with Polaris missiles warn of "fearful and dangerous consequences."

July 20: Soviet-Cuban communique issued at the end of Raul Castro's visit in Moscow repeats Khrushchev's pledge that the U.S.S.R. would support Cuba against the United States. At Security Council meeting on the Congo, the Soviet delegate reiterates the threat of Soviet intervention.

July 26: U.S.S.R. vetoes two Security Council resolutions on the RB–47, one of which would have permitted the International Red Cross to render humanitarian aid to the surviving crewmen.

July 28: Soviet notes to the United States, the United Kingdom, and France protests the Bundestag's passage of a law establishing a Federal German radio council with its seat in West Berlin.

July 31: A Soviet Government statement on the Congo threatens that the U.S.S.R. will take "resolute measures" if the "imperialist aggression" against the Congo continue.

August 2: Soviet note on the RB–47 to the United States reiterates past Soviet stand, and rejects U.S. charges.

August 3: Soviet note to the United Kingdom on the RB–47 accuses the British of adopting a strange position and conniving with the United States in aggression.

August 5: Soviet Government statement on the Congo declares that if U.N. troops are unable to secure the withdrawal of "interventionist troops," then forces should be sent "by nations which are prepared to share in carrying out this fair act."

August 9: U.S.S.R. releases indictment of U–2 Pilot Powers, says he pleaded guilty to the bulk of the charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

The bill (S. 3855) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have had the third reading on these two bills. We have used I do not know how much of the time allotted, but I appreciate what the Senator has done. At the conclusion of the Senator's address we hope we can get to an early vote.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, are not we going to have an opportunity to discuss it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; after the Senator from New York finishes his speech. He has yielded so the chairman could explain it. The chairman has completed his explanation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator be here to answer some questions?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will be here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator want to ask him questions now?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No. I will wait.

THE 21 POINTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I now turn to the eighth item of the President's program.

Eighth. Proper financing to avoid delays in our Interstate Highway program has been one of the President's requests for the last 6 years. In his second state of the Union address, delivered January 7, 1954, the President made the very plea that has echoed down the years with so little effect on the Congress. What the President said was "so that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the Interstate Highway System, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half cent decrease which would otherwise become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken."

The problem of financing the highway program was again mentioned in the budget and economic report of that year. But the major document which the administration presented to Congress was a 54-page special message devoted entirely to the national highway program. This was submitted, not yesterday, as some might have us think, but February 22, 1955, that is, 5 years and 6 months ago. Despite the President's urging, no program was adopted that year. In the state-of-the-Union message for 1956, the President pointed out that there were 3 million more cars on the roads than in 1955, and that nearly 40,000 people had been killed that year. In response to this plea, the highway program was enacted into law in 1956.

Then, under legislation enacted in 1958, grant-in-aid funds to the States for highway construction under Federal-aid programs were sharply increased to combat a mild recession. Therefore, it became clear in mid-1959 that the highway trust fund would face a deficit in 1960. Under the mandatory terms of the legislation, apportionments to the States would have to be cut back. To avoid such postponement, which would have been costly in every respect, the administration requested a 1½-cent increase in the gasoline excise tax. Since

Congress approved an increase of only 1 cent per gallon, cutbacks were unavoidable.

It was to prevent this setback in highway building that the President, in May 1959, called for another temporary increase in the tax on fuel. In other words, as soon as it became apparent that the program could not proceed as fast as desired, the President called for an increase in revenues to keep the whole project on its mandatory pay-as-you-go basis. Twice he requested the increase in 1959, and again this year he has twice requested a similar increase.

The President's position on this matter has been clear, reasonable, and consistent. The idea of financing Government projects on a pay-as-you-go basis is not a new one, although it may be foreign to the thinking of some people. The President has wisely and properly stressed this approach in the highway expansion program. He has given ample warning to Congress when new taxes were needed. To term his latest request for increased revenue an innovation is indeed a very peculiar way of using the English language.

Ninth. Also in the field of transportation and communication, the President has long urged that a moderate tax be assessed on aviation gasoline and jet fuel. The President pointed out in his budget statement of January 13, 1958, that the Federal Government provide a wide range of services for the private users of airspace. In order that those who use these services should bear the burden of their cost, instead of foisting it onto the general public, Eisenhower suggested a tax of 3½ cents per gallon on jet fuels and an increase in the aviation gas tax, bringing that also up to 3½ cents per gallon, plus yearly increases bringing the total rate up to 6½ cents per gallon. The President's plea was repeated in the economic reports and budget messages of 1959 and 1960. Therefore, when the President mentioned the subject in his special messages of May and August of this year, he was talking about something that the Congress had indeed heard before.

Tenth. Another request that the administration has made, not once but seven times, in the course of the last 7 years and 7 months is that the ceilings on interest for Government bonds and on the national debt be raised. The President first made this request in the form of a special message devoted exclusively to the need for more economical management of the public debt. The President was even more insistent in his 1960 state-of-the-Union address. He said of the Treasury:

> Its ability to deal with the difficult problem 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.

That was January 1960. The same arguments were repeated in the economic report for 1960 and in the budget message for 1961. Since there was still no congressional action, the appeal, naturally enough, was made again in the special messages of May 3 and August 8. But by that time it was already more than a year old.

Eleventh. Also on the President's agenda of must items for the last 7 years and 7 months have been measures to reduce the mounting deficits of the Post Office Department. Over the past 13 years the cumulative postal deficit has amounted to $6.8 billion. The interest charges on this debt alone amount $200 million each year. Ever since his first state-of-the-Union address the President has been concerned, and rightly, with this appalling drain on the budget. Postal rate increases were first called for July 20, 1953. They were repeated in 1954, and then again in the budget message for 1958 and still again in the budget message for 1959.

Finally, as a result of executive insistence, a small postal rate increase was passed in the middle of 1958, but the pay raise of that year made further increases imperative. Therefore, the President continued to request an upping of the postal rates in the budgets and economic reports of 1959 and 1960. On March 11 of this year another special message was devoted exclusively to the postal deficit problem.

Yet despite this long and rather discouraging effort by the President to maintain a policy of fiscal responsibility and to insure that our grandchildren are not left to pay the bill for the postage we forget to put on today, the whole subject seems new to some people. I can only envy those who have missed this wrangling and the persistent efforts to avoid responsible financial policy. It has been a long and sad story of procrastination and evasion on the part of many Members of Congress.

Twelfth. The administration's efforts to liberalize immigration laws is another long and sad story of congressional inactivity. In his first state-of-the-Union address, February 1953, the President pointed out that "existing legislation contains injustices." He, therefore, requested that Congress "review this legislation and enact a statute which will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness for all."

The plea was reiterated 2 years later in the state-of-the-Union address of 1955. Then, in 1956 and 1957, the President sent the Congress two special messages on the subject. Still, there was no congressional action on the scale necessary to effect a genuine liberalization of the existing law or to omit discriminatory provisions which reflect very poorly on this country throughout the free world. Budget messages for 1959, 1960, and 1961 have repeated the call for action. Only this March the President sent another special message to the Congress, again dealing entirely with the subject of immigration legislation, and recommending specifically a doubling of the number of quota immigrants and an easing in restrictions against refugees fleeing from oppressed areas. Reminders of congressional inactivity in the field were also included in the May 3 special message, as well as that of 2 weeks ago.

This then, Mr. President, is the history of executive policies on immigration. The call for a liberalized program is as old as the Eisenhower administration. But the echo of congressional response is still very faint and far away.

Thirteenth. Also in his first state-of-the-Union message the President urged extension of the present Government Reorganization Act for a period of 18 months, or 2 years beyond its expiration date of April 1, 1953. Then again in 1955 the President urged another continuation in force of his authority to make necessary reorganizations. In 1957 the President urged that the period for transmitting legislation on Government reorganization be extended for 4 years beyond its 1957 expiration date. A special message was sent to Congress on the subject in 1957. Budget messages in 1959 and 1960 included similar requests. And both the special messages of May and August respectively covered the subject.

Fourteenth to seventeenth. Conservation measures have also been requested by the President for a long period of time. Some of these date back to 1955. They include the Fryingpan-Arkansas project for development of the Colorado River, first mentioned in January 1955, and then requested by the President in one message or another for virtually every year thereafter. Conservation measures include also the proposals for an arctic wildlife range, for the preservation of seashore areas, and for permission to western communities to expand into public land areas, all of which were first proposed early this year.

Eighteenth. Amendments in the current space law were also requested by the President in his state-of-the-Union address in January 1960. In a special message of the same month, the President proposed that the power of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be extended to manage the entire national program of nonmilitary space activities. Other clarifications of the relationship between NASA and the Department of Defense were called for, too.

Nineteenth. Earlier this year the President also recommended that the traditional relationship between retired and active pay of military personnel be restored. This would require special legislation which the President first suggested in his January budget message.

This is an item which calls urgently for action at this session of Congress. It is a very unfair situation which has been created, and one which cries out for remedial treatment.

Twentieth. And, of course, the President called for passage of the 1961 mutual security appropriation without the damaging cut which the House of Representatives has made in this bill.

Twenty-first. This relates to the only subject on which there actually has been congressional action, the Antarctica Treaty, which was drawn up last year and submitted to the Senate early in this session. The Senate, I am happy to note, ratified that treaty last week.

This, Mr. President, completes the list of recommendations which the President of the United States repeated on August 8 of this year in his message to the Congress. These are recommendations which had already, as I have tried to point out, been made—many of them many times, and all of them at least once before. In fact, the average number of times that each of these programs has been laid before the Congress is not once, nor even twice, but seven times. Indeed, in the last 7 years and 7 months President Eisenhower has on the average proposed—and I repeat—has on the average proposed each one of these measures seven times.

With this record in mind, then, I think that anyone who has not heard these proposals before must have been asleep. Otherwise he must certainly have noticed the President's consistent and relentless efforts to prod congressional action over long periods of time on virtually every issue outlined in the President's message. I hope that even those who were asleep have now sufficiently bestirred themselves to give the President's program their wholehearted support. Certainly congressional energy would be better expended in advancing this legislation than in petty wrangling over its timeliness and origin.

In any case, there can be no doubt that the President's record on these issues has proved two things: First, that every one of these subjects had been thoroughly explored on many occasions and could be quickly approved if a majority of the Senate favored them; and, second, that the administration has vigorously pursued progressive and constructive programs throughout its life, but that these measures have not had the attention and support of the Democrats in Congress.

It is not too late for the Congress to make up for this lag in its support of the President. In many ways this is the most propitious moment for action on a large number of legislative items. Three-fourths of the national ticket of both parties, and both party chairmen sit in this Chamber. No matter which party wins in November, perhaps never again will there be such a splendid opportunity for these men to exercise their leadership and responsibilities in this Chamber to fulfill the promises made in the respective party platforms.

I would like to take this opportunity Mr. President, to urge one and all to use the few remaining weeks of the 86th Congress to give the American people results and not just phony issues. A premature exodus from Washington would only show political bad faith. Congress should stay on the job until the major part of these provisions in the President's program has been given fair consideration. When this is done, it will not be twilight, but dawn. It will be the dawn of a new day when political promises and political platforms come true. It is within the power of Congress to make this dawn a reality, if the majority leadership really puts the people's business ahead of their own.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a full documentation of the times that the President has recommended his legislative program. This is a documentation that should be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although it is lengthy. It is a historical résumé of the legislative requests of President Eisenhower on the points which are contained in his message of August 8.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS

State of the Union message, January 9, 1959:

"The government of a free people has no purpose more noble than to work for the maximum realization of equality of opportunity under the law. That is the concept under which our founding papers were written. This is not the sole responsibility of any one branch of our Government. The judicial arm, which has the ultimate authority for interpreting the Constitution, has held that certain State laws and practices discriminate upon racial grounds and are unconstitutional. Whenever the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States is challenged I shall continue to take every proper action necessary to uphold it.

"One of the fundamental concepts of our constitutional system is that it guarantees to every individual, regardless of race, religion, or national origin, the equal protection of the laws. Thus, those of us who are privileged to hold public office have a solemn obligation to make meaningful this inspiring objective. We can fulfill that obligation by our leadership in teaching, persuading, demonstrating, and in enforcing the law.

"We are making noticeable progress in the field of civil rights—we are moving forward toward achievement of equality of opportunity for all people everywhere in the United States. In the interest of the Nation and of each of its citizens, that progress must continue.

"Legislative proposals of the administration in this field will be submitted to the Congress early in the session. All of us, I believe, should help to make clear that the Government is united in the common purpose of giving support to the law and the decisions of the courts."

Message to Congress transmitting recommendations on civil rights, February 5, 1959:

"Fourth, I recommend legislation to provide a temporary program of financial and technical aid to State and local agencies to assist them in making the necessary adjustments required by school desegregation decisions.

"The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be authorized to assist and cooperate with those States which have previously required or permitted racially segregated public schools, and which must now develop programs of desegregation. Such assistance should consist of sharing the burdens of transition through grants-in-aid to help meet additional costs directly occasioned by desegregation programs, and also of making technical information and assistance available to State and local educational agencies in preparing and implementing desegregation programs.

"I also recommend that the Commissioner of Education be specifically authorized, at the request of the States or local agencies, to provide technical assistance in the development of desegregation programs and to initiate or participate in conferences called to help resolve educational problems arising as a result of efforts to desegregate.

* * * * *

"Sixth, I recommend that Congress give consideration to the establishing of a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

"Nondiscrimination in employment under Government contracts is required by Executive orders. Through education, mediation, and persuasion, the existing Committee on Government Contracts has sought to give effect not only to this contractual obligation, but to the policy of equal job opportunities generally. While the program has been widely accepted by Government agencies, employers, and unions, and significant progress has been made, full implementation of the policy would be materially advanced by the creation of a statutory commission."

State of the Union message, January 7, 1960:

"Early in your last session I recommended legislation which would help eliminate several practices discriminating against the basic rights of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has developed additional constructive recommendations. I hope that these will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session. I trust that Congress will thus signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under the law for all our people."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"I urge the Congress to enact the remaining six points of the civil rights program that I recommended last year. The Civil Rights Commission, extended for an additional 2 years by the last session of Congress, continues its important work and has developed additional constructive recommendations, particularly for protecting the right of every citizen to vote. I hope these recommendations will also be earnestly considered by the Congress."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"Of this, presumably the last congressional session during my term of office, 4 months have gone by. Thus far the one major accomplishment is enactment of civil rights legislation. Although Congress rejected certain of my recommendations in this area—those relating to equality of job opportunity and assistance to States attempting to desegregate their schools—the new civil rights measure is another important step toward the attainment of the ideal of equal rights before the law for every citizen."

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will present this week a new program which will enable older people truly in need of help to meet the calamity of catastrophic illness. This program will take full advantage of, and support, the progress that has been made by private effort; it will recognize the traditional Federal-State relations in various fields of assistance; and, additionally, it will not do violence to the private relationships that must continue to characterize the rendering of health care services.

"Behind this program is a meticulous and thoughtful weighing of many alternatives. I believe the Congress will find this proposal of great value to our people most in need of medical protection in their later years. I urge this program in place of compulsory schemes which over a period of years would blight America's unexcelled medical standards and leave unaided large numbers of citizens we are striving to help."

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

State of the Union message, February 2, 1953:

"Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congres-

sional study and action. I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

"One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year."

Special message on school construction, February 8, 1955:

"For the consideration of the Congress, I herewith propose a plan of Federal cooperation with the States, designed to give our schoolchildren as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have.

"Because of the magnitude of the job, but more fundamentally because of the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life, the means we take to provide our children with proper classrooms must be weighed most carefully. The phrase "free education" is a deliberate choice. For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purposes of freemen.

"STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION

"A distinguishing characteristic of our Nation, and a great strength, is the development of our institutions within the concept of individual worth and dignity. Our schools are among the guardians of that principle. Consequently, and deliberately, their control and support throughout our history have been, and are, a State and local responsibility.

"The American idea of universal public education was conceived as necessary in a society dedicated to the principles of individual freedom, equality, and self-government. A necessary corollary is that public schools must always reflect the character and aspirations of the people of the community.

"Thus was established a fundamental element of the American public school system—local direction by boards of education responsible immediately to the parents of children and the other citizens of the community. Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained. We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens.

"The legislative proposals submitted to the last Congress were offered by the administration in the earnest conviction that education must always be close to the people; in the belief that a careful reassessment by the people themselves of the problems of education is necessary; and with a realization of the growing financial difficulties that school districts face. To encourage a nationwide examination of our schools, the 83d Congress authorized funds for conferences on education in the 48 States and the territories and for a White House conference to be held in November this year.

"THE CURRENT PROBLEM

"These are the facts of the classroom shortage:

"The latest information submitted by the States to the Office of Education indicates that there is a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, a legacy, in part, of the years of war and defense mobilization when construction had to be curtailed. In addition, to keep up with mounting enrollments, the Nation must build at least 50,000 new elementary and high-school classrooms yearly. It must also replace the thousands of classrooms which become unsafe or otherwise unusable each year.

"During the current school year, about 60,000 new classrooms are being built. Capital outlays for public-school construction will reach an alltime high of $2 billion this year. During the last 5 years, new construction, costing over $7 billion, has provided new classrooms for 6,750,000 pupils in our public schools. During that time more than 5½ million additional children enrolled in school. Thus the rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment. But it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit.

"As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part time or under conditions of serious overcrowding. To build satisfactory classrooms for all our children, the current rate of school building must be multiplied sharply and this increase must be sustained.

"Fundamentally, the remedy lies with the States and their communities. But the present shortage requires immediate and effective action that will produce more rapid results. Unless the Federal Government steps forward to join with the States and communities, this emergency situation will continue.

"Therefore, for the purpose of meeting the emergency only and pending the results of the nationwide conferences, I propose a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction and to increase materially the flow of private lending through them, without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems. Over the next 3 years, this proposed effort envisages a total of $7 billion put to work building badly needed new schools, in addition to construction expenditures outside these proposals.

"THE RECOMMENDATIONS

"1. Bond purchases by the Federal Government:

"The first recommendation is directed at action, effective as rapidly as school districts can offer bonds to the public for sale.

"I recommend that legislation be enacted authorizing the Federal Government, cooperating with the several States, to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate. This proposal is sound educationally and economically. It will help build schools.

"To carry out this proposal, I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $750 million for use over the next 3 years.

"2. State school-building agencies:

"Many school districts cannot borrow to build schools because of restrictive debt limits. They need some other form of financing. Therefore, the second proposal is designed to facilitate immediate construction of schools without local borrowing by the school district.

"To expand school construction, several States have already created special statewide school-building agencies. These can borrow advantageously, since they represent the combined credit of many communities. After building schools, the agency rents them to school districts. The local community under its lease gets a new school without borrowing.

"I now propose the wider adoption of this tested method of accelerating school construction. Under this proposal the Federal Government would share with the States in establishing and maintaining for State school-building agencies an initial reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment on principal and interest.

"The State school-building agency, working in cooperation with the State educational officials, would issue its bonds through the customary investment channels, then build schools for lease to local school districts. Rentals would be sufficient to cover the payments on principal and interest of the bonds outstanding; a payment to a supplemental reserve fund; and a proportionate share of the administrative expenses of the State school-building agency. In time, the payments to the reserve fund would permit repayment of the initial Federal and State advances. When all its financial obligations to the agency are met, the local school district takes title to its building.

"I recommend that the Congress authorize the necessary Federal participation to put this plan into effect so that State building agencies may be in a position to issue bonds in the next 3 years which will build $6 billion worth of new schools.

"3. Grants for school districts with proved need and lack of local income:

"My first message to the Congress on the state of the Union stated the view that "the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income." In my judgment, any sound program of grants must adhere to this principle. Some school districts meet the conditions. In them the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building.

"I now propose a program of grants-in-aid directed clearly and specifically at the urgent situations in which the Federal Government can justifiably share direct construction costs without undermining State and local responsibility. Under this proposal the Federal Government would share with the States part of the cost of building schools in districts where one of the following conditions is met:

"(a) The school district, if it has not reached its legal bonding limit, cannot sell its bonds to the Federal Government under proposal 1 because it cannot pay interest and principal charges on the total construction costs.

"(b) The school district, if it has reached its legal bonding limit, is unable to pay the rent needed to obtain a school from a State agency on a lease-purchase basis, as described in proposal 2.

"The State would certify the school district's inability to finance the total construction cost through borrowing or a rental arrangement. It would also certify that the new school is needed to relieve extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or hazardous or unhealthful conditions.

"The Federal and State aid would be in an amount sufficient for a school district to qualify under either proposal 1 or proposal 2 for financing the remainder of the building costs. The requirement that Federal funds be matched with State-appropriated funds is an essential safeguard to preservation of the proper spheres of local, State, and Federal responsibility in the field of public education.

"By authorizing this program of joint Federal-State aid to supplement the financing plans set forth in proposals 1 and 2, a workable way will be provided for every community in the Nation to construct classrooms for its children. I recommend that the Congress authorize the appropriation of $200 million for a 3-year program.

"4. Grants for administrative costs of State programs:

"In addition to immediate school construction, the Nation needs to plan sound long-term financing of the public schools free from obsolete restrictions. Our State

conferences on education will help accomplish this. Out of these meetings of parents, teachers, and public-spirited citizens can come lasting solutions to such underlying problems as more efficient school districting and the modification of unduly restrictive local debt limits.

"The Federal Government, having helped sponsor the State conferences on education, should now move to help the States in carrying out such recommendations as may be made. I propose, therefore, that the Federal Government furnish one-half of the administrative costs of State programs which are designed to overcome obstacles to local financing or to provide additional State aid to local school districts.

"For this purpose I recommend a total authorization of $20 million with an appropriation of $5 million for the first year of a 3-year period.

"This program is sound and equitable. It accelerates construction of classrooms within the traditional framework of local responsibility for our schools. It does not preclude other proposals for long-range solutions which undoubtedly will grow out of the State conferences and the White House Conference on Education.

"CONCLUSION

"The best possible education for all our young people is a fixed objective of the American Nation. The four-point program, herein outlined, would help provide proper physical housing for the achievement of this objective. But the finest buildings, of themselves, are no assurance that the pupils who use them are each day better fitted to shoulder the responsibilities, to meet the opportunities, to enjoy the rewards that one day will be their lot as American citizens.

"Good teaching and good teachers made even the one-room crossroads schools of the 19th century a rich source of the knowledge and enthusiasm and patriotism, joined with spiritual wisdom, that mark a vigorously dynamic people. Today, the professional quality of American teaching is better than ever. But too many teachers are underpaid and overworked and, in consequence, too few young men and women join their ranks. Here is a shortage, less obvious but ultimately more dangerous, than the classroom shortage.

"The conferences now underway and the massive school-building program here proposed will, I believe, arouse the American people to a community effort for schools and a community concern for education, unparalleled in our history. Taken together, they will serve to advance the teaching profession to the position it should enjoy.

"Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom. In no form can it ever approach the mighty effectiveness of an aroused people. But Federal leadership can stir America to national action.

"Then the Nation's objective of the best possible education for all our young people will be achieved."

Special message on education, January 12, 1956:

"For several years now our educational system has been the object of intensified appraisal.

"Signs of heartening progress have come to light. Among these are classroom construction at a higher rate than ever before; teachers' salaries increased in many communities; the number of small, uneconomical school districts reduced; substantially more young people preparing for the teaching profession; private gifts to higher education at new heights; support of education at all levels greater than ever before.

"Encouraging as these advances are, they are not enough to meet our expanding educational needs. Action on a broader scale and at a more rapid rate is clearly imperative.

"We still do not have enough good classrooms for our children. There is insufficient emphasis on both short-range and long-term research into the core of educational problems. We need examination and study, from a broad viewpoint, of the increasing needs of higher education. These lacks are magnified by an ever-increasing stream of student enrollment and the increasing complexity of modern society.

"THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

"Two years ago the Congress approved my recommendation of a program to direct nationwide attention and action to our educational problems and opportunities. As a consequence, more than 4,000 State and local conferences were held throughout 1955. The White House Conference on Education, the first such conference in our history, was held last November. The work of the conferences has aroused the Nation. The final report of the White House Conference Committee should receive wide and serious attention.

"Benefits already are apparent. About half a million people across the Nation, representing all segments of life, came to grips with the problems of education. The status of American education—where it is; the future of American education—where it should and can go—have been illuminated as perhaps never before. Most important of all, there has been a reawakening of broad public interest in our schools. The conferences helped to erase the corroding notion that schools were the other person's responsibility.

"In our society no firmer foundation for action can be laid than common understanding of a problem; no more potent force can be devised for assailing a problem than the common will to do the job. For the improvement of our educational system, the people themselves have laid the foundation in understanding and willingness.

"THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID IN MEETING THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

"The responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local communities. Federal action which infringes upon this principle is alien to our system. But our history has demonstrated that the Federal Government, in the interest of the whole people, can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough.

"Clearly this is the kind of situation we face today in considering the school-classroom shortage. In the war and postwar periods school construction was drastically curtailed by shortages of materials. And then schools were filled to overflowing by the largest, most rapid enrollment increase in history. Today hundreds of thousands of children study under overcrowded conditions, in half-day or doubledup school sessions, or in makeshift buildings not designed as schools. Further, many classrooms in use today are obsolete, inadequate—and each year more rooms become so. School enrollments will continue to increase rapidly over the years ahead—and this will require still more classrooms.

"Against this backdrop of needs, States and communities are substantially increasing their classroom construction. But many communities simply do not have available locally the resources needed to cope both with the legacy of shortages from past years and with future needs. Unless these communities get help, they simply cannot provide enough good schools. The best estimates indicate that, on a nationwide basis, the current rate of construction only a little more than meets each year's new enrollment and replacement needs. This rate barely dents the large accumulation of needs from past years.

"The rate of classroom construction must be further increased, as the White House Conference on Education asked, by a greater combined effort of local and State governments. And the Conference concluded that Federal assistance also is necessary. The facts support this conclusion.

"THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS

"A year ago I proposed a Federal program designed to aid the States and communities in overcoming the classroom shortage. The Congress has not yet enacted legislation. In the light of a full year of further experience and study, in the light of congressional hearings and the White House Conference on Education, I now submit a revised and broadened program to meet our pressing classroom needs. I propose—

"A program of Federal grants amounting to $1,250 million, at a rate of $250 million annually for 5 years, matched with State funds, to supplement local construction efforts in the neediest school districts.

"A program to authorize $750 million over 5 years for Federal purchase of local school construction bonds when school districts cannot sell them in private markets at reasonable interest rates.

"A 5-year program of advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. These bonds would finance local construction of schools to be rented and eventually owned by the local school systems.

"A 5-year, $20 million program of matching grants to States for planning to help communities and States overcome obstacles to their financing of school construction.

"If speedily and fully utilized, this Federal program, added to the increased basic efforts of States and communities, should overcome the Nation's critical classroom shortage within 5 years. Once this shortage is overcome, the Federal-grant program can and must terminate. The States and localities should then go forward, without Federal funds, to meet their current and future needs. Present construction levels indicate their ability to do this.

"I am confident the Federal Government with this program can help construct schools without in any way weakening the American tradition that control of education must be kept close to the local communities. Any legislation enacted should embody this principle.

"ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES IN FEDERAL GRANTS

"I strongly urge the Congress, in providing grants for school construction, to follow certain principles, which are indispensable if Federal aid is to serve the cause of American education most effectively.

"The first broad principle is that Federal grants must not reduce the incentive for State and local efforts—but rather should stimulate an increase in such efforts. If Federal funds are used merely to replace funds which otherwise would or could be provided at State and local levels, there is no net gain of schools for our children. I propose, therefore, that Federal grants be matched by State appropriations. Because many of the State legislatures will not have a session this year, I recommend, in order to speed the program at the outset, that during the first year of the 5-year period the matching of Federal funds may be by either the States or by local school districts. The requirement for State matching will result in a larger total program of school construction, and will assure active participation of the States in improving laws relating to financing of school construction, as well as sound administration of the program.

"Furthermore, I propose a formula to reduce the proportion of Federal funds for those few States which are noticeably lagging, behind their ability, to support their

public schools. This feature should act as an incentive for the lagging States to increase their effort.

"Another fundamental principle is that Federal funds, under this type of program, should be distributed according to relative need. We must recognize that some States have more financial resources than others. We must recognize that a weakness in education anywhere is a weakness in the Nation as a whole. Federal appropriations will most quickly accomplish the most good if a relatively larger share of Federal funds is distributed where local and State resources are least adequate to meet classroom needs.

"I propose that this principle be fulfilled in three ways: First, in distributing Federal funds, larger amounts per school-age child should be allotted to States with lower income per child. Second, in fixing matching requirements, States with lower income should not be required to put up as large a proportion of funds as higher income States. For the Nation as a whole, the total of State matching funds would approximately equal the total of Federal funds. Third, as the States distribute these funds, the highest priority should be given to school districts with the least economic ability to meet their needs.

"CREDIT SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"Some school districts find difficulty in marketing bonds to finance needed school construction. To meet this situation, I again recommend that the Congress authorize Federal purchase of local school-construction bonds unmarketable except at excessive interest rates.

"Some school districts, however, are unable to raise capital funds needed for school construction because of bonding limits. To encourage school construction in these districts, as well as in districts where construction would be speeded by the lease-purchase method, I propose again that Congress authorize advances to the States as a reserve for bonds of State school-financing agencies.

"Several States have made marked progress in building schools through State agencies which issue long-term bonds to finance school construction in the districts. The school district leases the new building. Revenue from rents is used by the agencies to retire their bonds. After the bonds have been paid, title to the school is transferred to the local district. The program of Federal support is aimed at helping more States start such school-financing agencies, and thus at helping local districts overcome barriers to building more schools.

"The credit support for bonds of communities and State agencies, taken together with the planning grants, should help the States and communities continue their present annual rate of substantial increase in school construction over the next 5 years. The partnership program of Federal grants, matched by the States, should complete the task of building the classrooms that are critically needed.

"AID TO FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"In considering the school-construction problem, there is a special related area which should have the attention of the Congress at this time. The Congress has for some years recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to aid communities where Federal activities result in excessive burdens on the local school system. Authority to provide Federal funds for school construction in federally affected school districts will expire next June and should be extended.

"EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

"Basic to all endeavors in improving education is a vigorous and farsighted program of educational research. This has been a sorely neglected field.

"Such a program should be comprehensive in its approach, planned on a broad scale and executed thoroughly. In this way, educational research can, among other things, point the way to advances in making life more meaningful to more people and in the more efficient use of manpower and funds for education.

"To increase the effectiveness of education, national leadership could well be directed to research in such areas as ways of educating more people to their fullest capacity; staffing and housing the Nation's schools and colleges; educating the retarded child to help him lead a more normal life, and educating the child of special abilities so that he may utilize these abilities more fully; the relationship of schools to juvenile delinquency; educational effects of population mobility; educational needs of low-income families. These studies would be conducted through the Office of Education in cooperation with the Nation's colleges, universities, and State departments of education, thus encouraging and strengthening existing research efforts.

"It is imperative that we now give renewed attention and support to this arm of education—to the end that the country may have a sound, factual basis for identifying and analyzing problems and finding solutions. For these research purposes, and also to expand and improve other services, I urge the Congress to provide a major increase in funds for the Office of Education.

"EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

"Our vision would be limited if we failed at this time to give special thought to education beyond the high school. Certain problems exist now in this field, and already we can foresee other needs and problems shaping up in the future.

"Shortages now exist in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and in other fields of knowledge which require education beyond the level of the secondary school. Changing times and conditions create new opportunities and challenges. There are now possibilities for older persons, properly trained, to lead more productive and rewarding lives. The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions. Within 10 years we may expect three students in our colleges and universities for every two who are there now.

"Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions. But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field. Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation, in the years ahead.

"TEACHING

"In all our efforts for education, in providing adequate schools, research and study, we must never lose sight of the very heart of education: Good teaching itself.

"Good teachers do not just happen. They are the product of the highest personal motivation, encouraged and helped in their work by adequate salaries and the respect, support, good will of their neighbors. The quality of American teaching has never been better. But the rewards for too many teachers are not commensurate with their work and their role in American life.

"It is my earnest hope that, along with progress in other aspects of education, the States and communities will give increasing attention to this taproot of all education—good teachers, and hence good teaching.

"CONCLUSION

"These several proposals are designed not only to correct current problems but to build for the future. For today's decisions will influence tomorrow's education—and, hence, the welfare of the Nation.

"The actions here proposed, I believe, constitute a sound and realistic approach to those educational problems on which the Federal Government should now act. They have a primary reliance on the private initiative which wells from the free spirit of a free people.

"With this program, we can lay the basis for better education in America in the years ahead. In this way we keep faith with our children."

State of the Union message, January 10, 1957:

"High priority should be given the school construction bill. This will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now. A program designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms should be enacted without delay. I am hopeful that this program can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration. I urge the people in all sections of the country to approach these problems with calm and reason, with mutual understanding and good will, and in the American tradition of deep respect for the orderly processes of law and justice."

Budget message for 1958:

"In the course of the next few months the administration will recommend to the Congress a number of important legislative proposals. In the immediate future, I shall forward a message emphasizing the urgency of enactment of an adequate program of Federal aid for school construction, and a message on my proposals for amendment of our immigration laws. In connection with the administration's proposals on education, this budget provides for the start of a 4-year program of aid for school construction."

Economic Report of President, January 1957:

"Federal assistance in the development of public assets must be extended to help meet needs in certain areas of vital national interest. None of these is more important than the speedy expansion of school classroom facilities. The Congress was requested last year to enact a program of Federal assistance to help overcome the critical shortage of schoolrooms. This program was designed to supplement the already large efforts of State and local governments to the extent necessary to meet the backlog of these needs within 5 years, after which time full responsibility for school construction would revert to the State and local governments. The Congress is again urged to act on these recommendations. To make up for lost time, provision should be made for completing the program in 4 instead of 5 years."

Special message on education, January 28, 1957:

"In several previous messages to the Congress I have called attention to the status of American education—to accomplishments of the past and to certain problems which deeply involve the national interest and welfare.

"Today more Americans are receiving a higher level of education than ever before. Progress has been made in building more and better schools and in providing more and better teachers. And yet problems in education still persist, and time has more clearly defined their scope and nature.

"The educational task in this country is basically a State and local responsibility. Looking ahead, that task is unprecedented in its sheer magnitude. Elementary and secondary schools already are overflowing under the impact of the greatest enrollment increase in our history. The number of pupils in public schools has increased by 5½ million in the past 5 years, and will further increase by about 6 million in the next 5 years.

"We have already reached an alltime peak in enrollment in colleges and universities. Yet, in the next 10 to 15 years the number of young people seeking higher education will double, perhaps even triple.

"Increasing enrollments, however, by no means represent the whole problem. Advances in science and technology, the urgency and difficulty of our quest for stable world peace, the increasing complexity of social problems—all these factors compound our educational needs.

"One fact is clear. For the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions to provide the teachers and buildings and equipment needed from kindergarten to college, to provide the quality and diversity of training needed for all our young people, will require of them in the next decade the greatest expansion of educational opportunity in our history. It is a challenge they must meet.

"State and local responsibility in education nurtures freedom in education, and encourages a rich diversity of initiative and enterprise as well as actions best suited to local conditions. There are, however, certain underlying problems where States and communities, acting independently, cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough, and where Federal assistance is needed. But the Federal role should be merely to facilitate, never to control, education.

"TEACHERS

"Solutions to all the other problems in education will be empty achievements indeed if good teaching is not available. It is my earnest hope that the States and communities will continue and expand their efforts to strengthen the teaching profession.

"Their efforts already have accomplished much. Progress has been made in reducing the teacher shortage. There are encouraging increases in the number of persons training to teach and the proportion of those so trained who enter the profession. Still, this year thousands of emergency teachers with substandard certificates had to be employed. Far more needs to be done in our various communities to enhance the status of the teacher—in salary, in community esteem and support—and therefore attract more people to the profession and, equally important, retain those who bear so well the trust of instructing our youth.

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"By providing statistics and analyses on trends in education, and by administering other services, the U.S. Office of Education performs a valuable role in helping public and private educational institutions better to perform their tasks.

"A significant first step was taken last year toward strengthening the Office of Education. The appropriation for the Office was increased to implement a cooperative research program, and to expand statistical and professional advisory services and studies.

"This year I am asking for increases in funds for these activities, because they hold such promise for real progress toward solving some of the basic and longstanding problems in education.

"EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

"If the States, localities, and public and private educational institutions are successfully to meet, in the next decade, the increasing needs for education beyond the high school, their effort must begin now. The Federal Government, however, can take certain appropriate steps to encourage such action.

"Already the Congress has enacted legislation for long-term loans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to help colleges and universities expand their dormitory and other self-liquidating facilities.

"Last year I appointed a Committee on Education Beyond the High School, composed of distinguished educational and lay leaders, to study and make recommendations in this field. The Committee's interim report of last November delineates issues that should have the most careful attention.

"It pointed out that much more planning is needed at the State level to meet current and future needs in education beyond the high school. The Congress at the past session enacted Public Law 813, which authorized Federal funds to help the States establish State committees on education beyond the high school. The funds, however, were not appropriated. I recommend that the Congress now appropriate the full amount authorized under this legislation.

"The State committees can do much to promote discussion, define problems, and develop recommendations. Their recommendations, however, must be supplemented by detailed plans to meet specific needs for expansion of physical facilities, enlargement of faculties, and other adjustments which may provide new or different institutions. Such detailed planning requires the coordinated effort of both public and private education in each State—and time, personnel, and funds.

"I recommend that the Congress amend Public Law 813 so as to authorize grants to the States of $2.5 million a year for 3 years for these purposes.

"FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"Of all the problems in education, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. The lack of physical facilities is a temporary emergency situation in which Federal assistance is appropriate. Unquestionably, a very considerable portion of the shortage is due to World War II restrictions on all types of civil construction, including schools. With Federal help the States and communities can provide the bricks and mortar for school buildings, and there will be no Federal interference with local control of education.

"I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

"Today there are enrolled in our public schools about 2¼ million children in excess of the normal capacity of the buildings in use. These children are forced to prepare for the future under the handicap of half day sessions, makeshift facilities, or grossly overcrowded conditions. Further, many classrooms which may not be overcrowded are too old or otherwise inadequate. They should be promptly replaced.

"The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory, but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said, realistically, that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years and the States and communities have notably increased their school-building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet, in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage accumulated over many past years. The rate of State and local construction is spotty, with noticeable lags in areas where needs are expanding most rapidly.

"1. Federal grants to the States for school construction, at the rate of $325 million a year for 4 years, a total of $1.3 billion.

"2. The authorization of $750 million over the 4-year period for Federal purchase of local school-construction bonds when school districts cannot market them at reasonable interest rates. These loan funds would be made available to the States on the basis of school-age population. The State educational agency would determine the priority of local school districts for Federal loans based on their relative need for financial aid in the construction of needed school facilities.

"3. Advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. This would facilitate the issuance of these bonds to finance schools which would be rented and eventually owned by local school districts.

"4. The expenditure of $20 million in matching grants to States for planning to strengthen State and local school-construction programs.

"As I indicated in my message on the state of the Union, I hope that this school-construction legislation can be enacted on its own merits, uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration.

"BASIC PRINCIPLES

"Certain basic principles must govern legislation on Federal grants for school construction, if they are to serve the cause of education most effectively.

"First, the program must be recognized as an emergency measure designed to assist and encourage the States and communities in catching up with their needs. Once the accumulated shortage is overcome, if State and local autonomy in education is to be maintained, the States and communities must meet their future needs with their own resources and the Federal grant program must terminate. The States and communities already are building schools at a rate which clearly shows their ability to do this.

"Second, Federal aid must not infringe upon the American precept that responsibility for control of education rests with the States and communities. School-construction legislation should state this policy in no uncertain terms.

"Third, Federal aid should stimulate greater State and local efforts for school construction. Many States now make no contribution to school construction, and in some States which do contribute the amount is relatively small. Further, to increase total funds for school construction, Federal grants should be matched by State-appropriated funds after the first year of the program.

"Fourth, the allocation of Federal funds among the States should take into account school-age population, relative financial ability to meet school needs, and the total effort within the States to provide funds for public schools. An allocation system based solely on school-age population would tend to concentrate Federal aid in wealthy States most able to provide for their own needs. An allocation system which provides more assistance to States with the greatest financial need will help reduce the shortage more quickly and more effectively.

"Fifth, in distributing grants under this program within each State, priority should be given to local districts with the greatest need for school facilities and the least local financial ability to meet the need.

"In a Nation which holds sacred the dignity and worth of the individual, education is first and foremost an instrument for serving the aspirations of each person. It is not only the means for earning a living, but for enlarging life—for maintaining and improving liberty of the mind, for exercising both the rights and obligations of freedom, for understanding the world in which we live.

"Collectively, the educational equipment of the whole population contributes to our national character—our freedom as a Nation, our national security, our expanding economy, our cultural attainments, our unremitting efforts for a durable peace.

"The policies I have recommended in education are designed to further these ends."

State of the Union message, January 7, 1960:

"The administration has proposed a carefully reasoned program for helping eliminate current deficiencies. It is designed to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts. This approach rejects the notion of Federal domination or control. It is workable, and should appeal to every American interested in advancement of our educational system in the traditional American way. I urge the Congress to take action upon it."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"The pressing need now is not for aid to federally affected districts on the basis initiated in 1950 but for general aid to help localities with limited resources to build public schools. Despite encouraging progress in the rate of school construction, many school districts are still finding it difficult to avoid overcrowding and double sessions as enrollments continue to mount. Moreover, increasing secondary school enrollments require facilities which are much more costly than elementary school classrooms. Last year the administration recommended legislation authorizing annual Federal advances to local school districts to pay up to half the debt service (principal and interest) on $3 billion of bonds to be issued in the next 5 years for school construction. This legislation is designed to stimulate, not supplant, additional State and local effort. Affirmative action should be taken this year on that proposal."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"Among such matters still pending I would mention, first, school construction legislation. Long ago the administration asked Congress to approve a sound program to help colleges and universities and elementary and secondary schools meet their pressing construction needs. I have stressed that any such Federal assistance should be provided only to meet genuine need, and that it must preserve for the States, local communities and educational institutions their traditional responsibilities for education. The administration's debt service plan for elementary and secondary schools, and its comparable plan for institutions of higher learning, both before the Congress for over a year, conform to these standards.

"By these programs we would help to construct 75,000 additional elementary and secondary classrooms at a Federal cost, over the next 20 to 30 years, of $2.2 billion, and at a Federal cost of $500 million we would help build higher education facilities costing in the aggregate some $2 billion. The financing for the initiation of these programs is included in my 1961 budget.

"It will be deeply disappointing if the Congress should fail to authorize such programs, and no less disappointing if, instead, programs that basically conflict with these standards should be passed."

MINIMUM WAGE

Economic Report, January 28, 1954:

"LOW INCOMES AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

"The prosperity enjoyed by the overwhelming majority of Americans should not blind us to the minority of families with annual incomes below $2,000, or even $1,500. Low annual incomes are not caused solely by low wages, nor are high incomes assured by high hourly wage rates. Some people have no earnings at all, or extremely low earnings because of partial unemployment, sickness, or other factors. Some do not earn enough, even when fully employed, to support their families at a decent living standard.

"As one means of dealing with the problem of low incomes, Congress and some State legislatures have sought to place a floor under wages by requiring employers not to pay less than a certain hourly rate. Minimum wage laws in the United States now apply to only 28.5 million employees. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act covers about 24 million—two-thirds of them factory workers—at a minimum of 75 cents per hour, with few exceptions other than for learners and handicapped. This 75-cent minimum became effective just before the invasion of Korea, when the cost of living was appreciably lower than at present. Twenty States cover another 4.5 million workers, the majority of them women or minors in retail trade. The State minimums, usually established under wage orders by specially appointed boards, range for the most part between 60 and 75 cents.

"There are several considerations concerning minimum wages that deserve comment. These relate to legal coverage, to appropriate level, to impact upon self-employed persons of low income, to fundamental measures for reducing poverty, and to the method of achieving adjustments in minimum wages.

"Coverage:

"Neither the Federal nor the State laws now include the lowest-paid workers. Yet a floor that does not support the poorest worker may compound his miseries in two ways: it may force him to pay higher prices as a customer of the covered industries whose costs have risen; and it may push down his own wages by obliging him to compete for jobs with persons whom the covered industries have let go, because they are unable to pay the higher minimum. An effective minimum-wage program should cover millions of low-paid workers now exempted.

"Size of the minimum:

"A minimum does not protect the inadequately rewarded worker if it is too low. On the other hand, it may not benefit him if it is so high as to push up the whole scaffolding of wages and of costs of doing business, thus leading either to inflation of prices and the worker's own living costs, or to elimination of the less efficient employers and workers. Yet the ability of the employer to absorb a high minimum wage is limited. Indeed, the low-pay industries of today are often those earning modest profits, having limited opportunities to increase productivity, and containing firms easily squeezed out of business by rising costs.

"The self-employed worker:

"It is important to recognize that the economic condition of the wage earner cannot be set off sharply from that of the person who provides his own employment. The census has revealed that one in four of the families with incomes under $1,500 in 1950 had the major source of their earnings in self-employment. A minimum that would benefit the wage earner materially may put a heavy burden on the small farmer or small business operator, not only of higher prices for what he—like the uncovered wage earner—buys, but also the higher wages he must pay if he hires assistance. Protection to the wage earner must be considered with full regard to the complexities of our society.

"Basic means of reducing poverty:

"A minimum wage fixed by law helps to protect wage earners against unjustifiable low compensation. But a minimum wage program is an expedient of limited value for dealing with low incomes. The best help for the lowest earner is to enhance his usefulness as a worker, and to improve his knowledge and mobility. Some individuals manage to attain economic success with little formal learning; but, on the average, there is a close relation between earnings and education. Fortunately, education as being steadily and rapidly extended. Already, the average American worker under 35 years of age is a graduate of high school.

It is also important to keep in mind that, although some low-wage firms are lucrative, the firms that skimp on rewards to their workers are, not infrequently, those in which profits are also small, owing in part to inefficient management. Improvements in efficiency of worker and employer will take time; but it cannot be doubted that they—rather than a minimum wage—provide the major escape from poverty.

"Conclusions:

"While minimum wage laws do not get at the fundamental causes of poverty, they can make a useful contribution to its reduction. Recognizing that an increase of the minimum now provided by Federal law and an expansion of its coverage are desirable, the exact nature and timing of these changes must be worked out with a view to the best interests of the economy. We must not proceed—as has happened at times in the past—to ignore some workers and pretend to aid others, while in fact raising their cost of living and reducing their chances of employment. We should undertake adjustments of the minimum wage at a time when economic activity can take them in stride, thereby minimizing the risk of unemployment of the less productive workers whose welfare the minimum wage seeks to aid. The Secretary of Labor is continuing his intensive canvass of the highly complex problem and is consulting with appropriate groups. At the proper time recommendations will be made to the Congress."

State of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

"During the past year certain industrial changes and the readjustment of the economy to conditions of peace brought unemployment and other difficulties to various localities and industries. These problems are engaging our most earnest attention. But for the overwhelming majority of our working people, the past year has meant good jobs. Moreover, the earnings and savings of our wage earners are no longer depreciating in value. Because of cooperative relationships between labor and management, fewer working days were lost through strikes in 1954 than in any year in the past decade.

"The outlook for our wage earners can be made still more promising by several legislative actions.

"First, in the past 5 years we have had economic growth which will support an increase in the Federal minimum wage. In the light of present economic conditions, I recommend its increase to 90 cents an hour. I also recommend that many others, at present excluded, be given the protection of a minimum wage."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957:

"Other steps will require legislation. First, the unemployment insurance system should be extended and improved. Similarly, congressional action is recommended to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional workers. The Secretary of Labor will make recommendations on this act when hearings are held by the committees of the Congress. The Federal 8-hour laws should be revised and brought up to date and legislation should be enacted to assure equal pay for equal work. A modest program of grants under which the States can increase their efforts to improve occupational safety should be initiated. Likewise, legislation should be enacted to require the registration of employee pension and welfare funds to protect the interests of beneficiaries."

Economic Report, January 20, 1957:

"In addition to actions designed to help the unemployed and the aged, measures have been taken to improve the income status of individuals. Effective March 1, 1956, an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act raised the minimum wage to $1 an hour, directly increasing the wages of 2 million

covered workers. A number of administrative wage orders of the Department of Labor, specifying various minimum wage rates, were issued or became effective in 1956: for numerous Puerto Rican industries under the Fair Labor Standards Act; for substantial numbers of workers and industries under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; and for large numbers of Federal and federally assisted construction contracts under the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes. It is again recommended that the Congress and the States extend the coverage of minimum wage legislation to additional workers needing this protection.

"Although progress is being made toward equalizing economic opportunity for all citizens, additional legislative steps are desirable. One such step would be the enactment by the Congress of the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination on account of sex."

Budget message for 1959, January 13, 1958: "I again recommend the enactment of legislation to improve the welfare of working men and women. In this field, recommendations are already before the Congress for legislation to assure equal pay for equal work, to revise the laws governing hours of work on Federal construction projects, to extend the coverage of the minimum wage, and to improve the coverage of unemployment compensation. I will make proposals in a special message to the Congress concerning amendments to the legislation on labor-management relations and the registration and safeguarding of union as well as welfare and pension funds."

Economic Report, January 20, 1958: "Recommendations in last year's Economic Report are already pending before the Congress for legislation extending the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional groups of workers needing its protection and to enact the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination on account of sex. Favorable consideration by the Congress is requested for legislation to strengthen the Federal 8-hour laws for the benefit of workers subject to Federal wage standards on Federal and federally assisted construction and other public works."

Budget Message for 1960, January 19, 1959: "Legislation is also recommended to provide equal pay for equal work, to revise the laws relating to hours of work on Federal construction projects, and to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act so that several million more workers can receive its protection."

Economic Report, January 20, 1959: "Certain legislative improvements are required in programs that lie within Federal jurisdiction. Proposals will be made to the Congress to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Favorable consideration is again requested for legislation to revise the ambiguous and outmoded provisions of the 8-hour laws applying to Federal and federally assisted construction projects and to carry out the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination based on sex."

Budget report for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"LABOR AND WELFARE

"Budget totals

"[In billions]

Expenditures:	
1959 actual	$4.4
1960 estimate	4.4
1961 estimate	4.6
New obligational authority:	
1959 actual	4.2
1960 estimate	4.5
1961 estimate	4.5

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

"1. Authorize financial help for local school construction.

"2. Authorize financial assistance for construction of college facilities.

"3. Revise programs for aid to schools in federally-affected areas.

"4. Remove affidavit requirement from National Defense Education Act.

"5. Finance grants for administration of employment security system from trust fund.

"6. Widen coverage of unemployment compensation system.

"7. Strengthen Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act.

"8. Extend protection of Fair Labor Standards Act to additional workers.

"9. Assure equal pay for equal work.

"10. Improve laws governing hours of work and overtime pay on Federal construction projects.

"11. Strengthen authority for air and water pollution control.

"12. Revise military service reimbursement to railroad retirement trust fund.

"Previously proposed amendments to strengthen the basic authority in the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act should be enacted, and the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to several million additional workers in accordance with previous recommendations. Legislation is likewise again proposed to assure equal pay for equal work, and to strengthen and improve laws governing hours of work and overtime pay on direct Federal and certain federally aided construction projects."

Economic Report, January 20, 1960:

"The Congress is again requested to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to several million workers not now receiving its protection. While such a law does not deal with the fundamental causes of low incomes, it may help safeguard the economic interests of workers at the fringes of competitive labor markets."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"The Fair Labor Standards Act likewise needs attention before these next 60 days elapse.

"For several years I have urged expansion of coverage under this act to include approximately 3 million additional wage earners. This is the most urgently needed change in this law, and I hope that the Congress will not fail to provide it.

"The Secretary of Labor recently presented the Congress with information indicating that the minimum wage could be increased moderately without disruptive effects upon the economy. On the other hand we should, as responsible officials, stand firmly against an excessive increase which could cause unemployment and severe repercussions in many industries and areas of our country. It is of great importance to the well-being of the American people that we govern our actions in this area by economic facts rather than by political or social prejudice."

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

Special message, January 11, 1954:

"I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of recommendations affecting the Nation's agriculture.

"PART I

"The agricultural problem today is as serious and complex as any with which the Congress will deal in this session. Immediate action is needed to arrest the growing threat to our present agricultural program and to prevent the subsequent economic distress that could follow in our farming areas.

"I have given assurances to the American farmer that support of existing agricultural laws, including continuance through 1954 of price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of partity, was a moral and legal commitment that must be upheld. Along with the fulfillment of this commitment, an unending effort has proceeded in the past 12 months to provide the American farmer his full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country. This effort requires for success a new farm program adjusted to existing conditions in the Nation's agriculture.

"This message presents to the Congress that new program. It is designed to achieve the stability and growth in income over the years to which our farmers are entitled and which the Nation must assure in the interest of all 160 million of our people.

"Studies of the problem

"In constructing its program, this administration resolved to get the benefit of the best thinking of the Nation's farmers, as well as that of its farm experts. Over 60 different survey groups, and more than 500 of the most eminent farm leaders in the country, have participated in these studies. Agricultural colleges and research institutions contributed their work and thought. Scores of producers, processor, and trade groups, as well as national farm organizations, gave their findings and proposals. Mail from thousands of individual farmers, and opinion polls among farmers, have been analyzed and weighed. The bipartisan, broadly representative National Agricultural Advisory Commission has steadily worked and consulted on the problem for the past 12 months. Numerous commodity organizations have been consulted. Many Members of the Congress have shared their own rich experience in this effort. Accordingly, as promised a year ago, the most thorough and comprehensive study ever made of the farm problem and of governmental farm programs has been completed.

"Recommendations by commodity

"The recommendations which have been reaped from all this inquiry are in the best traditions of bipartisan approach to the Nation's agricultural legislation. They recognize that each farm crop has its own problems and that those problems require specific treatment. Accordingly part II of this message presents detailed proposals for the treatment of 16 commodities or commodity groups. I here confine myself to those aspects of the farm program in which all farmers and all citizens are equally concerned.

"Some fundamental considerations

"In its approach to this problem, the administration has held to the following fundamentals:

"1. A stable, prosperous, and free agriculture is essential to the welfare of the United States.

"2. A farm program must fairly represent the interests of both producers and consumers.

"3. However large surpluses may be, food once produced must not be destroyed. Excessive stocks can be removed from commercial channels for constructive purposes that will benefit the people of the United States and our friends abroad.

"4. For many reasons farm products are subject to wider price fluctuations than are most other commodities. Moreover, the individual farmer or rancher has less control over the prices he receives than do producers in most other industries. Government price supports must, therefore, be provided in order to bring needed stability to farm income and farm production.

"5. A farm program first of all should assist agriculture to earn its proportionate share of the national income. It must likewise aim at stability in farm income. There should therefore be no wide year-to-year fluctuation in the level of price support.

"6. No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another.

"7. A workable farm program must give the administration sufficient leeway to make timely changes in policies and methods, including price-support levels, within limits established by law. This will enable the administration to foresee and forestall new difficulties in our agriculture, rather than to attempt their legislative cure after they have arisen.

"8. Adjustment to a new farm program must be accomplished gradually in the interest of the Nation's farming population and in the interest of the economy of the Nation as a whole.

"9. Research and education, basic functions of the Department of Agriculture since its beginning, are still indispensable if our farmers are to improve their productivity and enlarge their markets.

"10. The soil, water, range and forest resources of the United States are the natural foundation of our national economy. From them come our food, most of our clothing, much of our shelter. How well we protect and improve these resources will have a direct bearing on the future standard of living of the whole Nation.

"The present agricultural situation

"Present laws discourage increased consumption of wheat, corn, cotton, and vegetable oils and encourage their excessive production. The huge and growing surpluses held by the Government act as a constant threat to normal markets for these products. Thus, present law produces results which in turn are hurtful to those whom the laws are intended to help. Partly because of these excessive stocks, farm income has fallen steadily over the past 3 years.

"The urgency in this situation may be illustrated by a few basic facts. During the past year, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm commodities more than doubled, increasing by about $2,500 million. As a result the financial obligations of the Corporation are pressing hard against the $6,750 million limitation on its borrowing authority. In order to assure that present price support commitments on 1953 and 1954 crops will be covered, I shall request the Congress to take early action to restore the Corporation's capital losses as of June 30, 1953, and to increase its borrowing authority to $8,500 million, effective July 1, 1954.

"The Government's commodity holdings are enormous. It has investments in more than $2 billion worth of wheat alone. This includes 440 million bushels owned outright. About 400 million additional bushels are under loan, the greater share of which the Government can expect to acquire. This is more than the domestic wheat requirements of the entire Nation for a full year.

"The cotton carryover will amount to about 9,600,000 bales. Here again the carryover is approximately equal to the domestic needs of the entire Nation for a full year.

"The carryover of vegetable oils may be about 1,500 million pounds, roughly double the carryover that should normally be maintained.

"Because such tremendous supplies are already in hand, acreage allotments and marketing quotas have had to be applied to wheat and cotton. An appeal by the Government for sharp acreage reductions for corn appears unavoidable. These allotments are expected to reduce the acreage planted to these crops in 1954 by the following amounts: Wheat, 16.5 million acres; corn, between 5 and 6 million acres; cotton, 3.5 million acres. Without the most careful handling, a diversion within a single year of 25 million acres of productive cropland—about 8 percent of the total—from their accustomed use could have the most unfortunate impact on the total economy.

"Even these reductions probably will not appreciably lower the surpluses of wheat and cotton because of the likelihood of increased yields that will be sought from the reduced acreage, and because markets will continue to shrink as a consequence of rigid price supports. As for corn, it is estimated that enough diverted land will be used for oats, barley, and sorghums to hold total supplies of feed grains at present levels, thus largely offsetting the purpose of the corn acreage reduction. It is also expected that some 3 million diverted acres may be planted to soybeans, thus aggravating the tremendous oversupply of vegetable oils. The likely production from other diverted acres threatens producers of potatoes, sugar beets, rice, alfalfa, flaxseed, vegetables, and many other crops. Therefore, we must move without further delay to treat the fundamental causes of our present excess supplies of farm commodities.

"The Nation's agricultural problem is not one of general overproduction: Consumer demand continues at or near record high levels; the average prices of farm products that lack direct price supports have been as high in recent years as those of price-supported products. The problem is rather one of unbalanced farm production, resulting in specific surpluses which are unavoidable under the present rigid price supports. The problem is complicated by the continuing loss of some of those foreign markets on which American agriculture has depended for a large part of its prosperity.

"Major features of farm program

"The new farm program here proposed is consistent with all the foregoing conditions and fundamental considerations. It has 5 major features:

"1. The new program should first be given an opportunity to start operating without the handicap of such large accumulated surpluses. This is to be done by setting aside certain quantities of our surplus commodities, eliminating them from price support computations.

"2. The 1948 and 1949 Agricultural Acts were soundly conceived and received bipartisan support. The principles on which they were based are particularly applicable to the agricultural industry today. Although based generally upon those principles, the proposed agricultural legislation of 1954 contains certain new features, improvements, and modifications.

"3. The amendment to the 1949 Agricultural Act providing for mandatory rigid supports, attuned to war needs and demonstrably unworkable in peacetime, will be permitted to expire. After the 1954 crops the level of price supports for the basic commodities will be gradually related to supply, promising farmers greater stability of income.

"4. Modernized parity is to become effective for all commodities on January 1, 1956, as scheduled by law. Provision should be made for moving from the old to modernized parity in steps of 5 percentage points of the old parity per year until the change from old to modernized parity has been accomplished.

"5. The key element of the new program is a gradual adjustment to new circumstances and conditions. Application of modernized parity and the relation of basic crops to supply levels require a transition period to assure a stable farm economy. This transition should be accomplished in a prudent and careful manner to avoid sharp adjustments which would threaten the dislocation of the program.

"6. In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price support levels will be limited.

"7. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to apply price supports at more than 90 percent of parity when the national welfare or national security requires should be continued.

"Parity and price supports

"Under the provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 the Government will:

"1. Support the prices of basic crops of those farmers who cooperate with acreage allotments and marketing quotas when such are in effect;

"2. Announce the price support level for various crops before those crops are planted, insofar as practicable;

"3. Support price levels at up to 90 percent of parity. For some products a schedule of price floors will also be provided as authorized by the 1949 act, ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity, according to the relationship of total to normal supply; and

"4. Vary the price support level 1 percentage point for every 2 percentage points of variation in the total supply. If the supply is short, higher support levels will encourage production. If the supply is overabundant, a lowered price will stimulate consumption. Thus, not only will a floor be placed under all basic crop prices, but variations in price and supply will tend to offset each other, and thus stabilize the income of the farmer.

"Modernized parity

"Parity calculations for most commodities under the old formula are based upon price relationships and buying habits of 40 years ago. Because methods of farm production have changed markedly, the Congress has wisely brought the parity concept up to date. Modernized parity takes account of price relationships during the most recent 10 years. It permits changes in farm technology and in consumer demand to express themselves in the level of price support and restores proper relationships among commodities.

"For the basic commodities, the law provides that until January 1, 1956, the old or modernized parity, whichever is higher, shall be used. For all commodities except wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts, modernized parity is already in use.

"Equitable treatment of the various commodities requires that we should use modernized parity for all farm products as now provided by law, beginning January 1, 1956.

"Insulation of surpluses from markets

"Removal of the threat of huge surpluses of farm commodities from current markets is an essential part of the program here presented. Destruction of surplus commodities cannot be countenanced under any circumstances. They can be insulated from the commercial markets and used in constructive ways. Such uses will include school lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to the people of other countries, and stockpiled reserves at home for use in war or national emergency.

"I recommend that authority be provided to set aside reserves up to the value of $2,500,000,000 from the stocks presently held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Broad discretionary authority should be provided to manage these frozen reserves. This authority should be coupled with legislative safeguards to prevent the return of these stocks to domestic or foreign markets so as to cause disturbance in normal trade. Perishable stocks should of course be rotated. Stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly some dairy products should be set aside after this program takes effect.

"The special circumstances relating to the crop and the date of initiating the proposed new program should govern the time for establishing each such commodity reserve. This reserve program will be effective only if it is carefully integrated with the new program as a whole. The insulation of our excess reserves of food and fiber is an essential first step in launching this new program.

"Expansion of farm markets abroad

"One of our largest potential outlets for present surpluses is in friendly countries. Much impetus can be given to the use of a substantial volume of these commodities by substituting to the maximum extent food and fiber surpluses in foreign economic assistance and disaster relief. I shall request a continuation of the authority to use agricultural surpluses for this purpose.

"It is not enough, however, to rely solely on these measures to move surpluses into consumption. No farm program should overlook continued economic growth and expansion. By revolutionary increases in farm productivity during and since World War II, American farmers have prepared our Nation to supply an ever greater proportion of the food needs of the world. Developing commercial markets for this expanded production is part of the larger problem of organizing a freer system of trade and payments throughout the free world. Because our farmers depend to a considerable degree on foreign markets their interests will be particularly served by strengthening of the work of the Department of Agriculture in developing market outlets both at home and abroad. In my budget message I shall recommend that sufficient funds be appropriated for this purpose.

"Meanwhile, a series of trade missions, working in cooperation with our representation overseas, will be sent from the United States, one to Europe, one to Asia, one to South America, to explore the immediate possibilities of expanding international trade in food and fiber. Moreover, the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, is organizing discussions for the exchange of views with foreign ministers of agriculture on subjects affecting the use of agricultural surpluses and stockpiles.

"Use of diverted acres

"In addition to the removal of surpluses and the expansion of markets, special measures must be taken to deal with the use of acreages diverted from crops under allotment. To avoid these difficulties, the number of diverted acres must be reduced to a minimum. The proposed program accomplishes this by increasing the utilization of commodities, thereby reducing the need for acreage restrictions.

"When land must be diverted from production, it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land. Wherever acreage adjustments are especially difficult, agricultural conservation program funds will be used to help farmers make these adjustments in a manner that will advance soil conservation and long-term efficiency.

"Small farms

"The chief beneficiaries of our price support policies have been the 2 million larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports. During 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, will give further special attention to the problems peculiar to small farmers.

"Conclusion

"The agricultural program proposed in this section, and in part II which follows, will open new market outlets both at home and abroad, not only for current supplies but for future production. It will provide a firm floor on which our farmers can rely while making long-term plans for efficient production and marketing. Year in and year out, it will provide the best prospects for the stability and growth of farm income.

"It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

"It will bring farm production into closer balance with consumer needs. It will promote agricultural interests, along with the public interest generally. It will avoid any sharp year-to-year change in prices and incomes.

"The program will again stimulate and encourage good farm management. It will prevent arbitrary Government control and afford the greatest freedom to the individual farmer. It will provide added incentive to make wise use of all our agricultural resources, and promises the Nation's agriculture a more stable and reliable financial return than any alternative plan.

"I urge its early approval by the Congress.

"PART II

"In this part of the special message the principles developed in part I are applied to specific commodities and commodity groups.

"Wheat

"Wheat is a prime example of the results that ensue from a support program which fails to adjust to the level of demand. As of December 16, more than $2 billion of Commodity Credit Corporation funds were invested in wheat.

"The export market, historically vital to our wheat farmers, was itself partly responsible for the expanded production of American wheat during the war and postwar years. To meet the food needs of devastated countries, our farmers continued their high level of production after the war and thus rendered a great service to humanity and to the cause of freedom throughout the world. These expanded outlets have since greatly diminished. Yet the support price has remained at the level associated with wartime needs. The result is that production has continued at wartime levels and, annually, more and more of this production has become surplus.

"In foreign markets, the high rigid support program of the United States has become an umbrella for competitors. This has created an artificial competitive situation which has cost the American farmer a substantial part of his world wheat market. During the past 2 years our exports of wheat outside the International Wheat Agreement have fallen from 220 million bushels to 64 million, while Canada's free market sales have risen from 105 to 161 million bushels. Thus our price policy shrinks the very market that could otherwise help absorb our excess stocks of wheat.

"Continuance of present price support levels for wheat would confront us with two undesirable alternatives:

"1. Curtail production to the amount needed for domestic use and very limited exports. This would require a reduction in wheat acreage of about 40 percent—from the 79 million acres planted in 1953 to between 45 and 50 million acres.

"2. Subsidize the consumption of wheat by increasingly severe burdens upon the taxpayer.

"The foregoing alternatives make it increasingly clear that the Nation must depart from the high rigid support level for wheat.

"It is, therefore, recommended that:

"1. A substantial part of the present excessive wheat carryover be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

"2. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for wheat be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price support levels will be limited.

"3. Beginning January 1, 1956, a change be made at the rate of 5 percent a year from old to modernized parity;

"4. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas be continued, with the anticipation, however, that adjusted support levels will increase the incentive to employ some of the present wheat land for other purposes.

"Rice

"Price supports for rice at 90 percent of parity have had no recent application. Market prices have been at or above support levels; restraints on production have not been needed; stocks have not accumulated. Nevertheless, present price supports for rice can inhibit an adjustment, if one should be needed, in the same manner that they prevented the adjustment for wheat, when it was needed.

"It is therefore recommended that mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for rice be allowed to expire after the 1954 crop.

"Corn

"Corn is a dominant factor in the feed-grain-livestock economy. This economy is based on an interdependent process involving the production of feed, its conversion into livestock products, and its movement into consumption as meat, dairy products, and eggs. To hold this economy in balance, prices are a critical factor, encouraging and discouraging livestock production by turns, rationing feed when it is scarce and moving it into use when it is plentiful. For the efficient use of corn, some price freedom is indispensable.

"A program of high rigid price supports for feed grains involves the danger of curtailing our livestock industries and limiting the quantity of their products to consumers. We have made great strides in improving the efficiency of corn production and in passing some of those gains on to consumers in the form of reasonably priced livestock products. Our corn support program should be designed to encourage those trends.

"Corn is used in the same manner as pasture and hay on farms where grown. Seldom does more than 25 percent of our corn crop move through commercial channels, and the bulk of this is eventually used as feed by other farmers. Farmers, therefore, are the principal users of corn. It follows that a high support price for farmers who produce corn for sale aggravates the cost-price squeeze on other farmers who normally buy corn and competing feeds to produce livestock products.

"To guide the corn price support program, the adjustable price and income-balancing features of the Agricultural Act of 1949 on the whole are well suited. The level of support specified is designed to move corn into use. Livestock producers are assured of a steady supply of feed at reasonable prices.

"The old parity formula holds the support price for corn too high in relation to livestock prices. Use of modernized parity, scheduled by law to become effective on January 1, 1956, will help to balance these vital price relationships.

"It is, therefore, recommended that:

"1. Modernized parity for corn become effective on January 1, 1956, with modification limiting the rate of the transition to 5 percent in any single year;

"2. Except as provided in (3) and (4) the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for the corn crop of 1955 and subsequent crops;

"3. The act of 1949 be amended to provide a change, within the range of 75 to 90 percent of parity, of 1 percentage point in the support price for corn for each 1 percentage point of change in supply, thereby

giving greater flexibility to corn support prices and tending to prevent the building up of excessive holdings by Government;

"4. Legislation be enacted to raise the normal carryover allowance for corn from 10 to 15 percent of domestic use plus exports, to become effective for 1955 and subsequent crops. This would help to assure more stable feed supplies and reduce the impact of current carryover stocks on future production controls and support levels;

"5. Upon adoption of the foregoing recommendation, the system of marketing quotas be abolished.

"Feed grains other than corn

"The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes price support for such nonbasic crops as oats, barley, and grain sorghums at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. The amounts, terms and conditions of price-support operations and the extent to which these operations are carried out are determined or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture upon consideration of various factors specified in the law.

"Inasmuch as this program has worked satisfactorily, it is recommended that these provisions be continued.

"Meat animals

"The fact that mandatory price supports are ill adapted to meat animals has been recognized by Secretaries of Agriculture for years. The present law provides tools well adapted to deal with the problems peculiar to the livestock industry.

"It is recommended, therefore, that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals be continued.

"Dairy products

"The Agricultural Act of 1949 requires price support for dairy products at such levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity as are necessary to assure an adequate supply. Sufficient discretionary authority is provided to operate a satisfactory program.

"It is recommended that these provisions of law be continued.

"Poultry and eggs

"Price supports have not been generally desired by the poultry industry. Temporarily and in special circumstances, price supports can, however, be helpful.

"It is recommended, therefore, that:

1. Provisions of the 1949 act be continued for poultry and eggs, with discretionary authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices at not to exceed 90 percent of parity;

2. Discretionary authority be continued to purchase poultry products for use in the school-lunch program, in nonprofit institutions, and for certain other purposes.

"Cotton

"Cotton, like wheat, is an export crop whose price is currently supported above the world level. Carryover stocks in the United States have been accumulating rapidly in the past 2 years. These stocks, probably close to 9,600,000 bales by next August, will approximate a full year's domestic requirements.

"Our high rigid price-support program stimulates competition of foreign producers and reduces exports. During the twenties and early thirties our net exports of cotton generally exceeded domestic consumption. Current exports amount to hardly a third of our larger domestic requirements.

"Our problem is to develop a program which will help growers adjust gradually to changing circumstances, including foreign and domestic competition of rising intensity.

"The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price supports for cotton at a level between 75 and 90 percent of parity, dependent on the supply. Thus changes in supply and price would tend to offset one another, giving a relatively stable income. This plan will allow limited price variation, thus affording growers reasonable market stability and yet offering added inducement for heavier use of cotton in years of abundant supplies.

"Separate legislation has made the adjustable pricing provisions of the 1949 act ineffective for cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture is now required by law to set such marketing quotas and allotments that the required price support level can seldom if ever fall below 90 percent of parity. Instead of relying in part on the schedule of price floors intended in the act of 1949, the law requires reliance almost entirely on production controls.

"It is recommended, therefore, that:

"1. A substantial part of the present large carryover of cotton now in prospect be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

"2. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for cotton be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support levels, under the Agricultural Act of 1949, would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price support levels will be limited.

"3. Modernized parity becomes effective for cotton as scheduled on January 1, 1956.

"4. The Congress repeal the present provisions whereby the maximum use of production restrictions before there can be any reduction of the price support level is required.

"Tobacco

"Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

"The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

"It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

"Peanuts

"The law requires that mandatory 90 percent supports for peanuts continue through 1954 and that old parity remain in effect until the end of 1955.

"This program, which has experienced some difficulties in adjusting supplies to demand at the supported price, can operate successfully with certain changes.

"It is recommended that:

"1. The Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for peanuts on January 1, 1955.

"2. The shift to modernized parity for peanuts begins as now provided by law on January 1, 1956.

"3. A transitional provision be provided to limit the change from the old to modernized parity to not more than 5 percent per year.

"Tung nuts and honey

"Tung nuts and honey should be in the same category with other products for which price supports are permissive rather than required. It is recommended, therefore, that the mandatory price supports for these commodities be discontinued.

"Oil seeds

"Price support is authorized for soybeans, cottonseed and flax at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. It is recommended that the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 be continued for these commodities.

"Fruits and vegetables

"Existing law authorizes the use of 30 percent of general tariff revenues to encourage the exportation and domestic consumption of agriculture commodities. In the event of market distress these funds may be used for limited purchases of market surpluses of such perishable commodities as fruits and vegetables. No purchases may be undertaken unless outlets are available.

"It is recommended that:

"1. Present provisions for the use of funds from tariff revenues be continued.

"2. Authorization for the use of marketing agreements be continued and liberalized to—

"(a) provide for inclusion of additional commodities to which marketing agreements are adapted;

"(b) enlarge and clarify the authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to engage in or finance, within reasonable limits, research work from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order;

"(c) provide for the continuous operation of marketing agreements, despite short-term price variations, where necessary to assure orderly distribution throughout the marketing season; and

"(d) enlarge and clarify the authorization for the use of marketing orders to promote marketing efficiency, including the regulation of containers and types of pack for fresh fruits and vegetables.

"Potatoes

"It is recommended that legislation be enacted to allow assistance to potato growers in the same manner as is available for producers of other vegetables and of fruits.

"Sugar

"The sugar program, extended in 1951, is operating in a generally satisfactory manner. It is recommended that this program be continued in its present form.

"Wool

"Price support for wool above the market level has resulted in heavy accumulations of wool—now nearly 100 million pounds—by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the substitution of imported for domestic wool in our home consumption. Two-thirds of the wool used in the United States is imported; yet our own wool piles up in storage.

"A program is needed which will assure equitable returns to growers and encourage efficient production and marketing. It should require a minimum of governmental interference with both producers and processors, entail a minimum of cost to taxpayers and consumers; and aline itself compatibly with overall farm and international trade policies.

"It is recommended that:

"1. Prices of domestically produced wool be permitted to seek their level in the market, competing with other fibers and with imported wool, thus resulting in only one price for wool—the market price.

"2. Direct payments be made to domestic producers sufficient, when added to the average market price for the season, to raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity.

"3. Each producer receive the same support payment per pound of wool, rather than a variable rate depending upon the market price he had obtained. If each grower is allowed his rewards from the market, efficient production and marketing will be encouraged. This has the further advantage of avoiding the need for governmental loans, purchases, storage, or other regulation or interference with the market. Further, it imposes no need for periodic action to control imports in order to protect the domestic price-support program.

"4. Funds to meet wool payments be taken from general revenues within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts from wool.

"5. Similar methods of support be adopted for pulled wool and for mohair, with proper regard for the relationships of their prices to those of similar commodities."

Budget message for 1955, January 21, 1954:

"AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

"My recommendations for Federal agricultural programs are designed to help in the solution of pressing immediate problems such as the hardships arising from severe drought in major farm areas, the squeeze on livestock producers resulting from lower cattle prices, and the disposal of excess stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and dairy products which have been accumulated under provisions of price-support laws presently in force. They also take into account our long-run goals—promotion of a more stable and healthy farm economy, conservation and improvement of our basic agricultural resources, and provision of an adequate supply of food and fiber to match the needs of our increasing population."

Economic Report for 1954, January 28, 1954:

"PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

"In formulating public policies to achieve a more stable, prosperous, and efficient agriculture, we must start where we now find ourselves, and proceed a step at a time. Compromises among partially conflicting objectives—such as stability, efficiency, economic freedom, and governmental economy—are unavoidable here. The present situation is serious, and we can no longer delay making those revisions in agricultural policy that will move us toward desirable goals. Accordingly, it was recommended in the special message on agriculture on January 11, 1954, that, with minor changes, the Agricultural Act of 1948, as amended by the act of 1949, be made fully operative for all commodities.

The acts of 1948 and 1949 had two distinct advantages over previous agricultural legislation. First, for all "basic" commodities except tobacco, they substituted adjustable price-support levels—that is, from 75 to 90 percent of parity, the percentage varying inversely with current levels of supply—for rigid 90-percent supports. Second, they introduced a "modernized" parity-price formula.

"Adjustable price supports:

"By the act of 1949, Congress recognized the necessity of relating price-support levels inversely to current levels of supply, in order to avoid chronic overproduction, excessive stockpiling, and drastic acreage controls. Thus, Congress provided that, if supplies are above normal, price supports shall be lowered by specified amounts to induce greater consumption and smaller output; if supplies are below normal, price supports shall be raised by specified amounts to encourage expansion of output. Although this principle is wholly sound, the Congress has, up to the present time, postponed the shift from high and rigid to adjustable price supports on wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice.

"Largely as a result of this action, the Commodity Credit Corporation's commitments on January 1, 1954, already reached 879 million bushels of wheat, 643 million bushels of corn, and 7.4 million bales of cotton—together representing a cost value of $4.3 billion—and they are still rising. Under these circumstances, the acreage restrictions imposed on 1954 crops are an inadequate corrective. Price-support levels designed to encourage larger sales also appear to be necessary if further piling up of Government stocks and regimentation of individual farmers are to be avoided. Hence, it has been recommended that the price-support legislation of 1949 take effect for the basic crops, as presently scheduled, on January 1, 1955."

State of the Union message, February 2, 1953:

"One of the difficult problems which face the new administration is that of the slow, irregular decline of farm prices. This decline, which has been going on for almost 2 years, has occurred at a time when most nonfarm prices and farm costs of production are extraordinarily high.

"Present agricultural legislation provides for the mandatory support of the prices of basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates will, of course, execute the present act faithfully and thereby seek to mitigate the consequences of the downturn in farm income.

"This price-support legislation will expire at the end of 1954.

"So we should begin now to consider what farm legislation we should develop for 1955 and beyond. Our aim should be economic stability and full parity of income for American farmers. But we must seek this goal in ways that minimize governmental interference in the farmers' affairs, that permit desirable shifts in production, and that encourage farmers themselves to use initiative in meeting changing economic conditions.

"A continuing study reveals nothing more emphatic than the complicated nature of this subject. Among other things, it shows that the prosperity of our agriculture depends directly upon the prosperity of the whole country—upon the purchasing power of American consumers. It depends upon the opportunity to ship abroad large surpluses of particular commodities and, therefore, upon sound economic relationships between the United States and many foreign countries. It involves research and scientific investigation, conducted on an extensive scale. It involves special credit mechanisms and marketing, rural electrification, soil conservation, and other programs.

"The whole complex of agricultural programs and policies will be studied by a Special Agricultural Advisory Commission, as I know it will, by appropriate committees of the Congress. A nonpartisan group of respected authorities in the field of agriculture has already been appointed as an interim advisory group.

"The immediate changes needed in agricultural programs are largely budgetary and administrative in nature. New policies and new programs must await the completion of the far-reaching studies which have already been launched."

State of the Union message, January 17, 1954:

"AGRICULTURE

"The well-being of our 160 million people demands a stable and prosperous agriculture. Conversely, every farmer knows he cannot prosper unless all America prospers. As we seek to promote increases in our standard of living, we must be sure that the farmer fairly shares in that increase. Therefore, a farm program promoting stability and prosperity in all elements of our agriculture is urgently needed.

"Agricultural laws now in effect successfully accomplished their wartime purpose of encouraging maximum production of many crops. Today, production of these crops at such levels far exceeds present demand. Yet the laws encouraging such production are still in effect. The storage facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation bulge with surplus stocks of dairy products, wheat, cotton, corn, and certain vegetable oils; and the Corporation's presently authorized borrowing authority—$6,750,000,000—is nearly exhausted. Some products, priced out of domestic markets, and others, priced out of world markets, have piled up in Government hands. In a world in which millions of people are hungry, destruction of food would, of course, be unconscionable. Yet surplus stocks continue to threaten the market and, in spite of the acreage controls authorized by present law, surpluses will continue to accumulate.

"We confront two alternatives: The first is to impose still greater acreage reductions for some crops and apply rigid Federal controls over the use of the diverted acres. This will regiment the production of every basic agricultural crop. It will place every producer of those crops under the domination and control of the Federal Government in Washington. This alternative is contrary to the fundamental interests not only of the farmer but of the Nation as a whole. Nor is it a real solution to the problem facing us.

"The second alternative is to permit the market price for these agricultural products gradually to have a greater influence on the planning of production by farmers, while continuing the assistance of the Government. This is the sound approach. To make it effective, surpluses existing when the new program begins must be insulated from the normal channels of trade for special uses. These uses would include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, emergency assistance to foreign friends, and of particular importance the stockpiling of reserves for a national emergency.

"Building on the agricultural laws of 1948 and 1949, we should establish a price-support program with enough flexibility to attract the production of needed supplies of essential commodities and to stimulate the consumption of those commodities that are flooding American markets. Transition to modernized parity must be accomplished gradually. In no case should there be an abrupt downward change in the dollar level or in the percentage level of price supports.

"Next Monday I shall transmit to the Congress my detailed recommendations embodying this approach. They have been developed through the cooperation of innumerable individuals vitally interested in agriculture. My special message on Monday will briefly describe the consultative and advisory processes to which this whole program has been subjected during the past 10 months.

"I have chosen this farm program because it will build markets, protect the consumers' food supply, and move food into consumption instead of into storage. It is a program that will remove the threat to the farmer of these overhanging surpluses, a program, also, that will stimulate production when a commodity is scarce and encourage consumption when nature is bountiful. Moreover, it will promote the individual freedom, responsibility, and initiative which distinguish American agriculture. And, by helping our agriculture achieve full parity in the market, it promises our farmers a higher and steadier financial return over the years than any alternative plan."

State of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

Now a most significant element in our growing economy is an agriculture that is stable, prosperous, and free. The problems of our agriculture have evolved over many years and cannot be solved overnight; nevertheless, governmental actions last year hold great promise of fostering a better balance between production and markets and, consequently, a better and more stable income for farmers.

Through vigorous administration and new authority provided by the 83d Congress, surplus farm products are now moving into consumption. From February 1953 through November 1954 the rate of increase in Government-held surpluses has been greatly reduced by our moving into use more than $2,300 million worth of Government-owned farm commodities. Domestic consumption remains high, and farm exports will be higher than last year. As a result of the flexibility provided by the Agricultural Act of 1954, we can move toward less restrictive acreage controls.

Thus, farm production is gradually adjusting to markets, markets are being expanded, and stocks are moving into use. We can now

look forward to an easing of the influences depressing farm prices, to reduced Government expenditures for purchase of surplus products, and to less Federal intrusion into the lives and plans of our farm people. Agricultural programs have been redirected toward better balance, greater stability, and sustained prosperity. We are headed in the right direction. I urgently recommend to the Congress that we continue resolutely on this road.

Special message to Congress, January 9, 1956:

"In this session no problem before the Congress demands more urgent attention than the paradox facing our farm families. Although agriculture is our basic industry, they find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity. For 5 years, their economy has declined. Unless corrected, these economic reversals are a direct threat to the well-being of all our people.

"But more than prices and incomes are involved. In America, agriculture is more than an industry; it is a way of life. Throughout our history the family farm has given strength and vitality to our entire social order. We must keep it healthy and vigorous.

"Efforts toward this goal have been unremitting. Many new foundations of permanent value to all farm families have been laid in the past 3 years. Two years ago a new farm law was enacted, designed to gear agricultural production incentives to potential markets, thereby giving promise to our farm people of a stable and dependable future once the wartime inheritance of surpluses is removed from the farm economy. Loan programs have been substantially improved, enabling many more farmers to acquire family-sized farms and to improve their farms and homes. The benefits of social security protection have been extended to farm families. The return of the Farm Credit Administration to farmer control, expansion of soil conservation assistance and rural electrification and telephone programs, increased funds for research and extension work, initiation of new programs to aid low-income farm families, adoption of tax provisions of benefit to farm people, increased storage facilities, upstream soil conservation programs, greatly expanded disposal activities for surplus farm products, strengthening our Department of Agriculture representation overseas in the interest of expanded markets—these and other advances have permanently reinforced the foundations of all agriculture.

"Yet beneficial though these advances are, persistent and critical farm problems require prompt congressional action in this session.

"Remedies for these problems demand a clear understanding of their principal causes. These are—

"First. Production and market distortions, the result of wartime production incentives too long continued;

"Second. Current record livestock production and near-record crop harvests piled on top of previously accumulated carryovers;

"Third. Rising costs and high capital requirements.

"In short, we have an oversupply of commodities, which drives down prices as mounting costs force up from below. Thus is generated a severe price-cost squeeze from which our farm people, with the help of Government, must be relieved.

"We must free the farm economy from distortions rooted in wartime needs and thus enable our people in agriculture to achieve prosperity; in so doing they will help carry the Nation's prosperity to still greater heights. The administration and the Congress must move together to achieve this goal.

"The requirements are clear. New means are needed to reduce surpluses and to widen markets. Costs must be cut and production must be better balanced with prospective needs.

"THE MAIN PROBLEM—THE SURPLUS

"Of the many difficulties that aggravate the farm problem, mountainous surpluses overshadow everything else. Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperatively needed in wartime but unmarketable in peacetime at the same prices and in the same quantity.

"The plain fact is that wartime production incentives were too long continued.

"During the past 3 years there has been no lack of effort to get rid of surplus stocks. Disposal efforts have been diligent and vigorous. Vast quantities have been moved, much of them given away. In the past 3 years we have found outlets for commodities in a value of more than $4 billion—far more than in any comparable period in recent history.

"But these disposal efforts have not been able to keep pace with the problem. For each bushel-equivalent sold, one and a half have replaced it in the stockpiles. Farmers, the intended beneficiaries of the support program, today find themselves in ever-growing danger from the mounting accumulations. Were it not for the Government's bulging stocks, farmers would be getting far more for their products today.

"Other consequences of past farm programs have been no less damaging. Both at home and abroad, markets have been lost. Foreign farm production has been increased. American exports have declined. Foreign products have been attracted to our shores.

"Steadily this chain of events has lengthened. Our farmers have had to submit to drastic acreage controls that hamper efficient farm management. Even these controls have been self-defeating because acres diverted from price-supported crops have been planted to other crops. These crops have been thrown into surplus and their prices have declined. Today, almost without regard to the livestock or crop he produces, nearly every farmer is adversely affected by our surpluses. The whole process, for instance, has contributed to the present plight of hog producers.

"When 3 years ago this administration assumed its responsibility in agriculture, work was begun immediately on what became the Agricultural Act of 1954. That act was developed and passed with bipartisan support, as all our agricultural legislation should be.

"The 1954 law brought realism into the use of the essential tool of price supports. It applied the principle of price flexibility to help keep commodity supplies in balance with markets. That principle is sound and essential to a well-rounded farm program. For two reasons, the 1954 law has not yet been able to make its potential contribution to solving our farm troubles. First, the law began to take hold only with the harvests of 1955; it has not yet had the opportunity to be effective. Second, the operation of the new law is smothered under surpluses amassed by the old program.

"The attack on the surplus must go forward in full recognition of the fact that farm products are not actually marketed when delivered to and held by the Government. A Government warehouse is not a market. Even the most storable commodities cannot be added forever to Government granaries, nor can they be indefinitely held. Ultimately the stockpiles must be used.

"It is unthinkable to destroy food. Instead, we must move these stocks into domestic consumption or dispose of them abroad. Neither route under present conditions offers the results often expected. Surpluses moved domestically almost always compete directly with crops farmers are trying to sell. Moved abroad in quantities large enough to remedy present difficulties, they would shatter world prices and trade, injure our friends and undermine domestic prices as well.

"To be sure, outlets for some of the surplus exist both at home and abroad. But experience has amply proved that neither the home nor foreign market can, under present conditions, readily absorb the tremendous stocks now depressing our agriculture.

"Clearly new action is imperative. We must stop encouraging the production of surpluses. We must stop shifting acres from one crop to another, when such shifts result in new surpluses. Nor can crop problems be converted into millstones weighing down upon the producers of livestock.

"Remedies are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly. As we seek to go forward, we must not go back to old programs that have failed utterly to protect farm families.

"I recommend, therefore, the following 9-point program. I urge the Congress to pass this program with maximum speed, for delay can only aggravate and multiply the difficulties already sorely harassing millions of our rural people.

"THE SOIL BANK

"Our most pressing need today is to work off our surpluses so that our basic program of 1954 can succeed in gearing production to prospective markets at fair prices. A three-pronged attack is needed.

"First. Future production of crops in greatest surplus must be adjusted both to the accumulated stocks and to the potential markets.

"Second. Producers of other crops and of livestock must be relieved of excessive production from acreage diverted from surplus crops.

"Third. Lands poorly suited to tillage, now producing unneeded crops and subject to excessive wind and water erosion, must be retired from cultivation.

"These essential adjustments can all be hastened through a soil-bank program. I recommend a soil bank of two parts.

"The first is designed to meet the immediate need to reduce the crops in greatest oversupply. It may be called the acreage-reserve program.

"The second part is a long-range attack to achieve better land use and protect farmers and ranchers from the effects of production on acres already diverted. It may be called the conservation-reserve program.

"A. The acreage-reserve program:

"I recommend that the Congress consider a voluntary additional reduction in the acreage of certain crops which today are in serious surplus—wheat, cotton, corn, and rice.

"In considering the application of this program to each of these crops, the Congress will wish to accord special attention to their distinctive problems—notably in the case of corn—as set forth later in this message.

"I do not propose this program as a device to empty Government warehouses so they may be filled again. There is, therefore, a basic corollary to the acreage reserve program; in future years we must avoid, as a plague, farm programs that would encourage the building up of new price-depressing surpluses.

"What I here propose is essentially a deferred-production plan. As a necessary part of the voluntary acreage reduction, it is essential to protect the farmer's income. It would be grossly unfair to require farmers to bear the full burdens of this readjustment. Just as other readjustments from war were shouldered in considerable part by the Nation as a whole, so should this.

"In the case of wheat and cotton, for example, I look to a voluntary reduction equivalent to possibly one-fifth of the acreage otherwise permitted by allotments—perhaps 12 million acres of wheat and 3 million of

cotton. It should be practical to include wheat already seeded if it is incorporated with the soil, as green manure, or by other accepted practices. This would make it possible for more farmers to enter the program immediately and thereby start at once to work down the surplus.

"Administrative discretion is needed to assure that the rates of reduction in different areas are related to the supply and demand conditions for different grades and classes. The farmer's cooperation in this temporary program must not impair his historic acreage allotments. Rights of tenant farmers must be protected. I should expect the reduction in wheat and cotton plantings to continue for some 3 or 4 years, during which time these huge crop carryovers should decline to normal levels.

"In return for their voluntary participation in the acreage-reserve program cooperating farmers will be allocated certificates for commodities whose value will be based on the normal yields of the acres withheld in this reserve. I recommend that these certificates be made available to cooperating farmers through their county agricultural stabilization committees at normal harvesttime for each crop. The certificates will be negotiable so farmers can convert them to cash. They will be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation in cash, or in kind at specified rates.

"I further recommend that the legislation provide that each participating farmer contract to refrain from cropping or grazing any land he puts in the acreage reserve.

"By so reducing crop production, commodities now in Government ownership can be used to supply market needs up to a proportionate amount. Thus the bulging Commodity Credit Corporation stocks can be correspondingly worked down without depressing current market prices.

"The program will operate in this way: A farmer, with an allotment of 100 acres of wheat, for example, may choose to plant only 80 acres and put the remaining 20 in the acreage reserve. His acreage allotment will not be affected. He will agree not to graze or harvest any crop from the 20 acres put into the reserve.

"In return for this cooperation in the temporary acreage reduction program, he will receive a cashable certificate. The certificate will be equal to a percentage of the value of the crop he would have normally harvested from the 20 acres. This percentage will be set at an incentive level sufficiently high to assure success of the program.

"This deferred-production plan uses the surplus to reduce the surplus.

"It will be financed with commodities already owned and paid for by the Government. Time and shrinkage, storage and other costs are eroding away the present value of these stocks. Consequently, the real net cost to the Government—taking these and other facts into consideration—will be substantially less than the apparent cost in payments made on certificates.

"I emphasize that this program is specifically intended to provide an income to farmers while the essential adjustment in stocks is being accomplished.

"There are many virtues in the plan.

"It will help remove the crushing burden of surpluses, the essential precondition for the successful operation of a sound farm program.

"It will reduce the massive and unproductive storage costs on Government holdings—costs that are running about a million dollars a day.

"It will provide an element of insurance since farmers are assured income from the reserve acres even in a year of crop failure.

"It will ease apprehension among our friends abroad over our surplus-disposal program.

"It will harmonize agricultural production with peacetime markets.

"B. The conservation reserve:

"The second part of the soil bank—the conservation reserve program—affects both today's surpluses and tomorrow's needs of our growing population.

"Under the pressures of war and the production incentives continued in postwar years, large areas have come into cultivation which wise land use and sound conservation would have reserved to forage and trees.

"In greater or lesser degree this problem exists throughout the Nation. Continued cropping of these lands results, on the one hand, in wastage of soil and water resources, and on the other, in production of commodities now in surplus.

"Today the Nation does not need these acres in harvested crops.

"We cannot accurately predict our country's food needs in the years ahead except that they will steadily increase. We do know, however, that the sound course both for today and tomorrow is wisely to safeguard our precious heritage of food-producing resources so we may hand on an enriched legacy to future generations. The conservation reserve program will contribute materially to that end.

"Further, production from the acres today diverted from surplus crops is now seriously affecting other segments of our agriculture. The acreage of feed grains, notably oats, barley, and grain sorghums, has been increased. The end product of this diversion has been greatly enlarged supplies of and lower prices for hogs, cattle, and dairy and poultry products. Producers of fruit, vegetables, and other crops have been adversely affected. The proposed conservation reserve can also make a major contribution to solving this problem of diverted acres.

"I propose that farmers be asked to contract voluntarily with the Government to shift into forage, trees, and water storage cultivated lands most needing conservation measures. Any farmer would be eligible to participate in this program regardless of the crop he produces or the area where his farm is located. I would hope that some 25 million acres would be brought into the conservation reserve.

"Forest lands under good management are a constant and a renewable resource. One-third of our forest area is in farm woodlands. From this source can come a large share of the lumber, pulpwood, and other forest products to meet the growing needs of our expanding economy. The conservation reserve can mean productive and protective tree cover for less productive lands now used for cultivated crops.

"The Government itself must encourage this transfer in order to achieve the advantages to the general welfare that will follow from improved resource use. I propose, therefore, that the Government pay a fair share of the costs of establishing the conservation use, up to a specified per acre maximum, that will vary by regions. The Government's share will be sufficiently high to encourage broad participation and thus assure the success of the program. Further, as the farmer reorganizes his farm along these soil-conserving lines, I recommend that the Government provide certain annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish the new use of the land. The Congress will need to develop the basis and procedures for determining the amount of the payments. Here, as in the acreage reserve program, I would not let the farmer's cooperation impair his historic acreage allotments.

"The farmer, in turn, will agree that the acres put into this conservation reserve will be in addition to any land that he may put into the acreage reserve, and will represent a reduction in cropland cultivated. He will agree to carry out sound soil and water conservation on these acres, and to refrain from returning them to crop production and from grazing them for a specified period.

"I urge the Congress to approve this program with the least possible delay so that a significant part of the desired 25 million acres can come into the program in 1956.

"My estimate is that, if the Congress acts in time, some $350 million will be invested in the conservation reserve during the calendar year 1956, and a total of about a billion dollars over the next 3 years. Sums expended under this program will be in addition to the $250 million provided for the agricultural conservation program for the coming fiscal year.

"In return the conservation reserve program will bring these large rewards:

"It will result in improved use of soil and water resources for the benefit of this and future generations.

"It will increase our supply of much-needed farm-grown forest products.

"It will help hold rain and snow where they fall and make possible more ponds and reservoirs on the farm.

"It will reduce the undue stimulus to livestock production, and consequent low livestock prices, induced by feed-grain production on diverted acres.

"It will similarly provide protection for producers of the many small-acreage crops whose markets are threatened by even a few diverted acres.

"In combination with the acreage-reserve program for crops in surplus, the conservation-reserve program will help during the next several years to reduce the total volume of farm production and improve the balance among different farm commodities, both of which are important to a general improvement in farm prices.

"SURPLUS DISPOSAL

"Production adjustments effected by the soil bank are needed to halt current additions to surpluses and to reduce stocks on hand. But additional relief must be obtained from the price-depressing influence of these huge carryovers. In Public Law 480 the Congress has provided basic legislation for this purpose. The problem still exists, but not for lack of vigorous efforts to deal with it.

"Surplus disposals have permitted substantial reductions in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of butter, dried milk, cottonseed oil and meal, flaxseed and linseed oil and seeds. Surplus disposals by the Commodity Credit Corporation have risen from just over half a billion dollars in fiscal 1953 to more than $1.4 billion in fiscal 1954, and to more than $2.1 billion in fiscal 1955.

"In the last fiscal year sales of Government-owned price-supported commodities into the domestic market reached $403 million. These were made with due care for the adverse effect they might have on prices received by farmers for current sales. Domestic donations to supply food for needy persons totaled an additional $196 million. Oversea disposals, through barter and donations for constructive purposes, totaled $1.1 billion. In spite of these vigorous efforts, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in price-supported commodities increased by about $1 billion during the fiscal year.

"Because the problem continues to be so serious and stubborn, the Secretary of Agriculture is appointing an Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator, who will report directly to the Secretary. The duties of the Administrator will relate to all activities of the Department associated with the utilization of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and of our current abundant production.

"Expanded opportunities will be sought to barter agricultural products which deterio-

rate and are costly to store, for increased quantities on nonperishable strategic materials. Additional legislation may be needed in this field.

"The bulk of price-supported commodities held by the Government cannot now by law be sold into the domestic market except at prices equal to at least 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges. This restriction has worked to the disadvantage of both farmers and the Government by blocking sales that would clearly have been advantageous to both. I recommend legislation to permit, under proper safeguards, sales at not less than support levels plus carrying charges.

"Present provisions of surplus-disposal legislation permit export dispositions of Government stocks to friendly nations only. Opportunities clearly to our interest may develop in the future to sell to countries excluded by this legislation. To enable us to realize on such opportunities I recommend repeal of section 304 of Public Law 480.

"STRENGTHENING COMMODITY PROGRAMS

"Our frontal attack on the problems of surpluses, diverted acres, unbalanced production, and unwise use is carried in major part by the soil bank through the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

"These proposals are wholly in keeping with the fundamental principles of sound farm policy set forth in my special agricultural message of 2 years ago. In keeping with these principles the administration—

"(a) Whenever possible will continue to ease or eliminate controls over farmers; and

"(b) For commodities on which price supports are discretionary, will continue to support these prices at the highest levels possible without accumulating new price-depressing surpluses.

"In keeping with this latter principle, I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that, as a direct result of operation of various parts of our present farm program, the supply and demand conditions for soybeans and flaxseed are now such as to warrant an increase in the price-support levels for these crops in 1956. The higher support levels will be announced shortly.

"In respect to other commodity programs I submit the following specific suggestions.

"A. Corn:

"In recent years many farmers have chosen not to observe acreage allotments on corn. Considerably less than half of the 1955 crop was raised within acreage-allotment limitations and thus eligible for price support. It is apparent that price supports alone, even at levels closely approaching the legal maximum, are an insufficient inducement for participation in a corn-acreage-allotment program.

"I recommend therefore that the Congress give serious consideration to adapting the acreage-reserve program to corn. One grave difficulty must be overcome. Unlike wheat and cotton, most of the corn crop is fed on the farms where it is produced. For this reason, marketing quotas such as are used on wheat and cotton are not feasible.

"Thus, broad and effective participation by corn producers in an acreage-allotment program is imperative for the acreage-reserve program to achieve its objective of reducing the corn surplus. With broad and effective participation, in both programs, the acreage-reserve program for corn would—

"(a) Reduce the carryover stocks which currently depress the market;

"(b) Make possible a higher level of price support than would otherwise prevail for the 1956 crop; and

"(c) Reduce the incentive to farmers to produce excessive supplies of hogs and fed cattle.

"If the Congress should choose not to authorize the acreage-reserve program for corn, the Congress may wish to consider an alternative: to eliminate acreage allotments for corn and put price supports for corn on a discretionary basis comparable with the other feed grains. With no acreage allotments and with discretionary supports, all corn producers would be eligible for price supports at a level substantially above the market price which prevailed during the 1955 harvest.

"B. Wheat:

"The problems of wheat are difficult and complex. The proposed, soil bank, with its acreage-reserve program, will make a major contribution toward their solution. This program is particularly well suited to wheat since this crop is grown in large acreage and is now burdened under an accumulated carryover in excess of a full year's needs. The conservation reserve program and the Great Plains program, described later, will also help. Other changes are necessary also, both for current adjustments and for long-term balance between production and consumption.

"(a) Legislation already has passed the Senate and is pending in the House of Representatives which would exempt from marketing quotas those producers who use for feed, food, or seed on their own farms all the wheat they raise. Because of the failure to pass this legislation last year, the Department of Agriculture has been compelled by law to hail before the courts farmers whose only offense was to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas. Again the administration urges prompt enactment of this legislation. Correction of this problem should be delayed no longer.

"(b) Historically a significant proportion of the annual wheat crop has been used for livestock feed. The quantity fed in pre-World War II years ranged from 100 million to 150 million bushels a year, about twice the quantity fed in more recent years. This reduced consumption has aggravated the surplus burden.

"I recommend that the Congress give consideration to authorizing the annual sale for feeding purposes, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, of limited quantities of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat of less desirable milling quality. The authorized sale price should reflect the feeding value of the wheat, precautions being exercised as to the effect of such sales on prices of other feed grains. There are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas distant from the Corn Belt.

"(c) I recommend legislation to expand the non-commercial-wheat area beyond the 12 States now so designated. This action would eliminate acreage and marketing controls for many farmers who characteristically feed on their own farms most of the wheat they raise, and who contribute little to commercial supplies or surplus stocks.

"(d) I recommend extension for 1 year of legislation which exempts Durum wheat from acreage and marketing controls. This type of wheat is in short supply and production should not be restricted.

"We are participating in negotiations for possible renewal of the International Wheat Agreement, which will terminate July 1, 1956, unless it is renewed.

"C. Cotton:

"As in the case of wheat, the acreage-reserve program is especially well suited to cotton. This crop as well is burdened by an accumulated carryover in excess of a full year's requirements. Other legislative changes for cotton, in addition to the soil-bank program, that require consideration are these:

"(a) For all crops except cotton, price-support legislation requires that parity prices shall be computed on the basis of the average grade and quality of the crop. For cotton a special provision of law designates Middling ⅞-inch cotton as the standard grade for parity calculations and price support. Currently less than 5 percent of cotton production is of this grade or lower.

"I urge an amendment to provide for cotton, as for other crops, that the average grade and quality of the crop be utilized for parity-price computations. This recommendation is, in general terms, in keeping with the intent of legislation already pending before the Senate.

"(b) The shortcomings of acreage allotments as a means of controlling production on cotton are evident. In 1955, on an acreage allotment calculated to yield 10 million bales of cotton, nearly 15 million were harvested. Rapidly advancing technology is resulting in production far outrunning expectations based on acreage alone. This is especially true when prices are supported at wartime production incentive levels.

"When production controls must be applied as a result of supply and market conditions, it is imperative to have controls that are effective. As surpluses are reduced through the proposed acreage-reserve program of the soil bank and through other means, new accumulations of surplus must definitely be avoided.

"For these reasons the Congress should consider replacing acreage allotments on cotton with quantity allotments beginning with the crop of 1957. The Congress could well consider similar action for other crops under marketing quotas.

"D. Rice:

"Under the law, accumulated supplies of rice have required a 40-percent reduction in acreage for 1956 compared with 1954, and a decline in the support level to 75 percent of parity.

"Rice production in this country is the most efficient in the world. However, our rice is rapidly being priced out of world markets and is being diverted into Government warehouses and even into the feed markets.

"There are two alternative courses of action to which the Congress should give consideration:

"1. Inclusion of rice in the acreage-reserve program. This will require continuation of production controls and marketing quotas.

"2. Elimination of existing production and marketing controls on rice. Prices could then be supported on a discretionary basis at levels which would permit rice producers to improve their competitive market position.

"If the Congress considers the latter course to serve the long-term best interest of rice producers, it may wish to consider use of the acreage-reserve program to make the transition.

"E. Peanuts:

"The peanut-price-stabilization program has experienced serious difficulties stemming in part from a fixed national minimum peanut acreage. With improving technology this minimum acreage will normally produce more peanuts than the market will absorb at the support price. Consequently, I recommend elimination of provisions for the minimum national acreage allotment.

"F. Sugar:

"The legislation to renew the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, should promptly be completed. The Congress is aware of the need to give producers, as well as foreign suppliers and the entire sugar industry, as much advance notice as possible in planning their operations.

"G. Special school-milk program:

"The special school-milk program provided for in the Agricultural Act of 1954 has met with gratifying success. Approximately 9 million children had the health benefits of this program last year, including children in some 7,000 schools in which milk was not previously served. Consumption was increased by over 450 million half pints of

milk. This is a good example of constructive use of a surplus product to meet a present need. We thus contribute to better health habits and at the same time promote an enlarged market for the future. Several thousand additional schools are participating in the program in the current school year.

"I have been advised that, in some States, milk program funds are nearing depletion. We must see to it that the program is carried forward intact through this fiscal year.

"I recommend that the program be extended for 2 years beyond June 30, 1956, with authorization to use Commodity Credit Corporation funds increased from $50 million a year to $75 million.

"H. Livestock

"For livestock producers, many parts of the program I have already discussed have special significance.

"Establishment of the soil bank will alleviate the undue stimulus to livestock production and the resulting downward pressure on livestock prices which arise from using for feed-grain production much of the acreage already diverted from wheat and cotton. Restrictions against grazing the soil bank acres will safeguard the interests of beef producers and dairymen.

"Periodically livestock markets become glutted and prices disrupted. In such periods, where assistance will be constructive, timely, and vigorous Government purchase and diversion programs are essential to bolster prices and help producers adjust to market demands. Such programs have been undertaken by this administration. The pork purchase program now in progress will shortly be stepped up to supply new and expanded outlets now being developed. Sales promotion and the development of better merchandising methods cooperatively with the livestock trade are part of this effort to meet the impact of heavy marketing.

"Special programs of an emergency nature will be provided to help livestock producers as needed. For example, emergency credit and low-cost feed in the event of drought will be available whenever disaster strikes.

"Increased research on nutrition, disease control, better breeding, more profitable use of byproducts and improved marketing will help lower production costs and facilitate the smooth flow of livestock products into consumption.

"DOLLAR LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORTS

"The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reason of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

"Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.

"I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

"RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

"In my message of January 11, 1954, I pointed out that the chief beneficiaries of our farm programs have been the 2 million larger, more productive farm units. Production on nearly 3 million other farms is so limited that the families thereon benefit only in small degree from the types of programs that heretofore have dominated our activities.

"On April 26, 1955, I transmitted to the Congress recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture for attacking the problems of low-income farm families. The Congress has met only in part these recommendations for legislation and appropriations. Despite the resultant handicaps, the interest in this program has been so great that pilot work is already under way in well over 30 counties widely spread throughout the United States. There is activity now in more than one-half of the States.

"Four Departments of the Federal Government—Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture—are actively at work on this program with State and local leadership to aid low-income farm families.

"Not only the welfare of these families but also of the people as a whole require that this program go forward. Once again, therefore I urge the Congress to enact the full program recommended in my message of April 26, 1955.

"THE GREAT PLAINS PROGRAM

"Between the prairies of the Central West and the Rocky Mountains is a vast area embracing all or part of 10 States, in which erratic climate, wind and water erosion, and special problems of land use constitute a continuing hazard. For more than a year intensive new studies of conditions and problems peculiar to this Great Plains region have been in progress. The work has been carried on cooperatively between the leadership of the 10 States involved, the Department of Agriculture, and the Great Plains Council, which includes technical people from the States of the region. This study will help to define the respective responsibilities of individuals and local, State, and Federal agencies.

"The proposed soil bank, with its acreage-reserve program to reduce promptly production of crops in surplus and with its conservation-reserve program to take less productive lands out of crops, will meet in part some of the conditions especially serious in the Great Plains. Other desirable modifications of existing legislation include—

"1. Provision for longtime cost-sharing commitments under the agricultural conservation program; and

"2. Relaxation of planting requirements to maintain base acreage for wheat allotments.

"Shortly I will transmit to the Congress a report containing certain recommendations for providing a more stable agriculture in this important region.

"RESEARCH

"Scientific research has been the means of fundamentally important developments both in agriculture and industry. It has resulted in improved quality, new and better techniques, new products, new markets, new high levels of material well-being for our people, and new horizons for our future. Most individual farmers are not in a position to carry on scientific investigations. Government has special responsibility in this area—and particularly is this the case since the benefits of research related to agriculture are widely shared by all the people.

"Not only can research provide for the material needs of future generations, but it also can contribute in many ways to the fuller utilization of our present abundance.

"We must look for new uses of agricultural products that can contribute to human welfare, such as livestock byproducts for medicinal purposes or such as coarse fibers for construction materials already have contributed.

"We must find new markets, as we have for tallow in industry or as have followed upon the development of frozen and powdered juice concentrates.

"We must find new crops offering such new opportunities and benefits as are exemplified by soybeans and sorghums.

"We must further improve our marketing mechanism, as already has been done through refrigeration and new processing techniques, so that the benefits of our abundance may be still more widely distributed. Marketing margins have continued to increase, even while farm prices have been declining. Thus the farmer's share of the retail food dollar has shrunk appreciably. Retail prices have changed little, thereby impending desired increases in consumption. We must find ways to lower costs of food distribution. Research is an effective way to help attain that important goal. The Secretary of Agriculture is actively engaged in an expanded inquiry directed toward reducing the costs of distribution.

"Our basic scientific knowledge from which all practical applications of science are made is vitally important and must be expanded. This knowledge is essential also to continue the attack on the ravages of plant and animal pests and diseases. We cannot use or reap benefits from what we do not know. A major frontier of agriculture lies in our laboratories and experimental fields.

"In the budget message I will request the maximum increase in agricultural research funds that can be effectively used next year with the technical manpower and facilities available. This will be an increase of one-fourth, to a total of $103 million.

"CREDIT

"In making the transition from war to peace, and similarly in making the investment adjustments associated with a dynamic agriculture, farmers are experiencing increased need for credit. This is especially true for young men, particularly veterans, who have started farming in recent years.

"Private financial institutions, individuals, and Government agencies are furnishing credit for agriculture. Administrative, budgetary, and legislative changes now being developed in Government all point toward assuring adequate and sympathetic coverage of agricultural credit requirements which cannot be met by private financial institutions.

"Loans made by the Farmers Home Administration have increased gradually during the past 4 years from $212 million to well over $300 million, and can increase further as the new provisions for insured loans become more widely used.

"The Farm Credit Administration has been reorganized to give farmers a greater voice in its operation. Further legislation will be proposed to combine the production credit corporations and the Federal intermediate credit banks. Federal land-bank loans made by the Farm Credit Administration have increased from $237 million 4 years ago to more than $400 million last year.

"The administration is determined to see to it that an adequate supply of credit remains readily available to our farmers at all times.

"GASOLINE TAX

"One of the farmer's operating costs is the Federal tax on gasoline. About one-half of the gasoline bought by farmers is used on the farm. I recommend that legislation be passed to relieve the farmer of the Federal tax on purchases of gasoline so used.

"Historically agricultural policy in this country has sought to foster family-sized owner-operated farms. This has been a sound and wise policy—not only in the development of an efficient agriculture which has become the envy of the world, but also in fostering a sturdy, resourceful, self-reliant citizenry.

"Farm organization and farming operations are undergoing profound change as science and technology rapidly alter the structure of agriculture. Great care must

be exercised that these changes do not result in huge corporation farms on the one hand or in unrewarding subsistence units on the other. The time-proven commercial family farm must continue as the basic social and economic unit of agriculture. Accordingly farm policy must encourage such farms, sufficiently large and productive to provide satisfactions in farm living equal to those enjoyed by other Americans.

"Insofar as the problems of agriculture can best be solved by Government action, Government should accept the responsibility.

"The proper role of Government, however, is that of partner with the farmer—never his master. By every possible means we must develop and promote that partnership—to the end that agriculture may continue to be a sound, enduring foundation for our economy, and that farm living may be a profitable and satisfying experience.

"Assisted by experienced farm people both in and out of Government, I have been earnestly studying this problem for many months. I believe that the nine-point program, set forth in this message, building on our present program, meets the urgent needs of our farmers today and does so in a way consistent with our basic traditions. It offers no nostrums or panaceas. Our farm folk expect better of us than to deal in that kind of specious practice.

"Farmers expect programs that are forward looking, economically sound, and fair.

"This program offers a workable approach to reducing the surpluses, bringing production and markets into balance at fair prices, and so raising the income and advancing the security of our farm families.

"Should this program be enacted, its degree of success will be dependent upon the degree of farmer participation and upon a common determination to work together in ridding ourselves of burdensome surpluses. With such a spirit, this program will speed the transition to a stable, prosperous, and free peacetime agriculture with a bright future.

"Again I urge upon the Congress the need for swift legislative action on these recommendations, in the interest of our farm people, in the interest of every American citizen."

Special message to Congress, March 5, 1957:

"The prolonged drought in a number of the Great Plains and Southwestern States has long since reached disaster proportions. The Federal Government has, for several years, carried forward an active and varied program of emergency aid in those States under provisions of Public Law 875 and other disaster-relief authorities vested in the executive branch.

"The Federal Government should insure that appropriate and effective measures are taken to assist State and local governments in alleviating emergency conditions brought about by prolonged drought and other severe natural disasters.

"It is also a responsibility of the Federal Government to review such programs from time to time, to insure that they are being conducted efficiently and economically. Furthermore it is an obligation of all levels of government, and of all our people, to plan whatever steps may be helpful in preventing or mitigating the effects of future disasters.

"It was for such purposes that I inspected conditions in drought-stricken States in January of this year. It was for those same purposes that the Secretary of Agriculture called a special meeting on drought and other natural disasters in Wichita, Kans., at that same time. I reviewed with those who participated the preliminary results of their deliberations.

"It was of tremendous encouragement to me to find, on my trip and in the report of the Wichita meeting, such a positive approach to these problems and an absence of defeatism. This demonstrates that our people in the drought-disaster area, even in the face of serious physical problems, have the courage and resourcefulness to face hardships and carry forward in spite of them and that they are talking seriously about the long-range solutions that will help keep future droughts from being future disasters.

"There has been consolidated in the attached Report on Drought and Other Natural Disasters the most representative recommendations of the Wichita meeting with many of the suggestions and observations I received in the course of my trip. The result is a comprehensive review of the many aspects of the current drought problem together with the views and recommendations of many different individuals and groups.

"Not all the recommendations summarized in the report, of course, may be feasible. The Secretary of Agriculture has developed from them a list of proposals which he outlines in the letter transmitting the report. Some of them can and are being met by adjustments in existing programs. Certain others require legislative action. Such legislative proposals, together with necessary appropriation requests, will be presented to the Congress directly. I strongly urge their prompt consideration and adoption.

"Although the report deals to a considerable degree with agricultural aspects of the drought, it also contains suggestions and recommendations dealing with responsibilities of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The recommendations relating to the drought disaster loan program for business administered by the Small Business Administration have been implemented by executive action, except one in which legislation is required, and this legislation will be presented for study by appropriate committees of the Congress. The other recommendations will be considered fully in connection with continuing programs and possible new developments. Certainly, many governmental activities can help in preventing disasters and in alleviating the effects when disaster comes to an area. In this connection, the report focuses attention on such matters as—

"Job opportunities through industrial development.

"Adjustment of credit programs for business to better meet needs of disaster areas.

"Role of public works in the disaster areas in times of disaster to provide employment and income.

"Added attention to water use and development, including further investigation of ground water supplies, water storage in multiple-purpose reservoirs, and pollution abatement as it bears on drought problems.

"Research relating to weather.

"Research relating to economic development.

"Provision for vocational training for commerce and industry.

"Facilities that aid farm and ranch people to find supplementary nonfarm employment.

"Adjustments in income-tax laws to recognize problems of sales due to disaster.

"Many of the proposals in the report bear directly upon the current drought situation. I feel strongly, however, that in this appraisal of the Federal Government's participation in emergency drought-disaster programs we have found some important guidelines to more effective and appropriate Federal Government participation in relief aspects of other types of natural disasters that will occur from time to time.

"I draw, in particular, two general conclusions which I want to call to the attention of the Congress:

"The first is that administration of emergency disaster programs must be kept close to the local people.

"The second is that State and local governments should assume a greater part in alleviating human distress and hardships and in meeting other local needs in times of disaster, calling on the Federal Government only to supplement their own resources.

"No single legislative or action program is sufficient to stabilize rural areas subject to natural disasters. It will require advance work on a broad front. There must be full cooperation and sharing of responsibility by individuals, local counties and areas, and local, State, and Federal Governments. This fact was stressed in the many recommendations I received and by the leaders who participated in the Wichita meeting.

"Emergency funds and programs must be kept constantly available for use when disasters occur, but we must continue to emphasize long-range programs as well. The long-range stabilization of the economy of areas subject to severe drought is of course intimately tied to water, its needs, supply, use, and control.

"Through the most efficient and optimum use of its water resources a broader economy could be established which would enable it better to endure a recurrence of such a drought. Appropriate attention can be given to this enormous problem only through coordinated water study, leading to courses of action for present and future water resource development and management.

"As the several departments and agencies further develop their consideration of the many complex problems encountered on the drought tour and at the Wichita meeting any additional recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957:

"AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

"Agriculture is confronted with serious adjustment problems that stem from international as well as domestic agricultural developments. Technological advances in agriculture by other nations are resulting in increased production which in many instances has restricted U.S. export markets. These problems are further complicated by our own improved capacity to produce as well as by the large agricultural inventories held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"The agricultural programs of the Federal Government are designed to meet these problems and to foster longrun improvements and adjustments in the Nation's farm economy. The soil bank legislation enacted last year is helping to curtail crop production and support farm income; it also facilitates the shifting of cropland to uses more consistent with long-term conservation objectives. Other Federal programs are helping to move large quantities of food and other farm products into consumption at home and abroad. Research programs have been enlarged to find ways to reduce marketing and production costs and to develop new industrial uses and other permanent market outlets for our farm products. Educational and credit services have been expanded to help farmers take advantage of the results of research, and special attention is being given in the rural development program to low-income farmers.

"Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: Net price support expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation are expected to be about the same in the fiscal year 1958 as in the current year but substantially below the amount spent in 1956. However, the decrease from 1956 is more than offset by increases in expenditures for the soil bank and other agricultural programs.

"In the fiscal year 1956, retirement of all outstanding certificates of interest used in financing previous price support loans, and curtailed purchases of U.S. cotton by foreign buyers in anticipation of more favorable prices, contributed to the high net price support expenditures in that year.

"In the fiscal year 1957, no funds will be required for the redemption of certificates of interest. In addition, increased sales of farm commodities abroad, particularly cotton, are expected to decrease net budget expenditures for price supports still further.

"In the fiscal year 1958, exports of price supported commodities are expected to be less than in 1957. This factor, which tends to increase net price support expenditures, will be partially offset by the initial effects of crop acreage reductions under the soil bank. The full effects of the soil bank on price support expenditures will come in later years.

"Under the acreage reserve program of the soil bank, farmers are compensated for loss of net income resulting from their voluntary withdrawal of land from crop production. Under the conservation reserve program of the soil bank, they receive rent for other cropland placed in cover crops and reforestation and also receive payments to cover part of the cost of carrying out certain conservation practices. Expenditures for both programs are estimated to total $1.3 billion in 1958, somewhat more than in 1957.

"Under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), substantial quantities of farm products have been disposed of abroad in return for foreign currencies. This title expires on June 30, 1957. It should be extended for 1 year and the present legal limit of $3 billion on the permissible loss under this program should be increased by $1 billion. Extension for a 1-year period will enable the Congress to consider alternative measures that will contribute to a continued development of normal export markets.

"The new obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1958 for price support, supply, and purchase programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation is made up of (1) $1,240 million to restore the capital impairment of the Corporation experienced in 1956, mainly from price-support losses, and (2) $637 million to reimburse the Corporation for costs and losses incurred in 1956 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act."

Special message to Congress, January 16, 1958:

"The people of the United States are living in a world of rapid change. Developments both abroad and at home require reemphasis in some of our efforts, redirection in others. This is true of defense, of education, of industry, and of labor. It is also true of agriculture.

"The rapid changes taking place in agriculture are largely the result of a major breakthrough in agricultural science and technology. In recent years agriculture has been experiencing a veritable revolution in productivity.

"A century ago, an American farmworker fed himself and three others. Today he feeds himself and 20 others. A century ago, our population was 82 percent rural. Today it is only one-third rural and only 12 percent of our population actually live on farms.

"Farm production per man-hour has doubled since 1940. There has been more change in agriculture within the lifetime of men now living than in the previous 2,000 years.

"Changes of such magnitude place great stress on our farm people and on the social, political, and economic institutions which serve them. Far-reaching adjustments are being made which involve the lives and hopes of 20 million men, women, and children on the farms of America.

"The scientific revolution in agriculture is irreversible and is continuing. It cannot be avoided and it need not be feared. In recognition of this basic fact, we must find ways of utilizing more completely the abundance that our farm people are now able to produce; we must find ways of further expanding markets for this increased production, not only among our own citizens but among people all over the world who need the food and clothing we produce in such abundance. At the same time we must help our farm people to cope with the sometimes harsh consequences of their own unparalleled ability to produce, while preserving and strengthening free enterprise and the family farm.

"Those who have fared best during the years of this agricultural revolution are the farmers on the 2,100,000 commercial farms that produce 90 percent of the food and fiber that goes to market. Affected quite differently are the farmers on the 2,700,000 other farms that produce relatively little for sale. To them, the farm is primarily a place to live, with an opportunity to grow products for home use, for about three-fourths of their income is derived from off-farm sources.

"Commercial family farms have their problems. So do small-scale farmers, subsistence farmers, and part-time farmers. The problems, however, are not always the same.

"There is evidence that those farmers who produce the bulk of our farm products are meeting the problem of adjusting their operations to the changes now in progress. Moreover, there are other indications of strength in our farm economy.

"Prices received by farmers on the average are running 3 percent above those of a year ago.

"During the last 2 years, farm net income has stabilized following several years of decline.

"Farm real estate prices are at an alltime high, reflecting a basic optimism in the future earning power and security which farming and farmland ownership offer.

"Three-fourths of our farms are owned by those who operate them, the highest percentage on record.

"Total debt of our farm people equals only 11 percent of total assets as compared with 19 percent before World War II.

"Exports of farm products, assisted by special Government programs, reached an alltime high of $4.7 billion during the year ending last June 30.

"Surplus holdings of farm products in the hands of Government appear to have passed their peak. Government investment in price-supported commodities now stands at about $7 billion, $1 billion below a year ago.

"Substantial progress has been made in programs of education, research, conservation, and other activities of proven merit. Work in all those areas has been substantially expanded.

"With Government help, farm people, in the best American tradition, have gained bargaining power through their own farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives.

"Yet, key problems remain unresolved.

"Rising production costs continue to limit net farm income. Prices of articles farmers buy more than doubled from 1939 to 1952. Since then they have risen 3 percent. Prices received by farmers have not kept pace with their increased production costs. These are hard facts every farmer faces.

"Moreover, acreage controls have failed to bring agricultural production into line, despite the severe restrictions they impose on the individual farmer's freedom to produce and to market his products. And unrealistic price-support laws, some of which date back to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, result, as farmers now realize, in loss of markets.

"Furthermore, there are large numbers of rural people who have not benefited from price supports. Nor have they benefited as they should from the great changes under way in agriculture. In fact, some have been put at a competitive disadvantage by the onrush of farm technology and other economic changes.

"This is true not only in particular rural areas of low income, but for some people in almost every farm community. There are millions of rural people who, for reasons of small farms, poor soils, limited resources, age, inadequate credit, lack of education, poor health, or insufficient managerial ability, have been unable to make the adjustments called for by modern technology.

"Few of the dollars spent on agricultural programs have been of appreciable help to this group.

"Price supports have scant meaning to a farmer with little to sell.

"Reductions in acreage to support higher prices are contrary to the needs of a farmer whose production is already too small to give him a proper livelihood.

"In my special agricultural message 4 years ago, I indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture would give attention to the problems peculiar to farm families with low incomes. As a result, the rural development program was initiated. It is widening opportunities for those rural people on the lower rungs of the economic ladder.

"For underemployed farmers who desire to continue in agriculture, the rural development program, in cooperation with States and localities, offers research, education, supervised credit, and cost sharing by the Federal Government in improving land, timber, and water resources. Farm and home improvements are a major part of the program.

"For those who wish to supplement or replace limited farm incomes with greater income from nonfarm sources, there are being established vocational training programs in trades and skills. Additional industries are being established in farming areas where more employment and higher incomes are needed. Farm families which are interested are also being informed of job opportunities in other segments of the economy.

"Though only about 3 years old, the rural development program has already achieved much, and with the increased emphasis planned for the coming year, progress promises to be more rapid in the future.

"Recommendations:

"Basic agricultural legislation now on the books was originally devised as an emergency effort to cope with a depression, then changed to help fight a war, and subsequently revised again in an effort to meet the needs of peace. It has not been adequately modified to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture. This must now be done.

"It is essential that the following major steps be taken this year to improve the status of rural people in greatest need, to aid agricultural adjustment, provide more freedom, expand markets, and, thereby, to help raise farm family income.

"First. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened, and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop. The conservation reserve has shown promise in retiring marginal acres from crop production, in aiding the cause of conservation, and in taking whole farms out of production. The program is wholly voluntary and must remain so.

"Because of its late enactment, the acreage reserve program was hampered during 1956 in achieving production adjustment. And although the 1957 program succeeded in reducing wheat production by about 175 million bushels, cotton by 2 million bales, and corn by 220 million bushels below what it would otherwise have been, the number of farmers participating in 1958 is likely to be low, in part because of limitations that Congress imposed on the extent of participation by any one farm. So in the future the production adjustment accomplished by the acreage reserve is likely to be small.

"We should now shift the emphasis of the soil bank away from the short-term acreage reserve, aimed at reducing surpluses of

particular crops, to the long-term conservation reserve, aimed at overall production adjustment.

"This change will aid all farmers, especially the low-income farmer, who will, if he desires, be better able to retire his entire farm from production.

"Expansion of the conservation reserve will be an effective instrument of adjustment only if it is accompanied by needed changes in price supports. It must not become merely a means of offsetting the production stimulus supplied by price supports held continually at incentive levels.

"The budget message recommends a conservation reserve program of $450 million for the 1959 calendar year.

"Second. Authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco should be provided. Under present legislation, acreage allotments and price supports for certain of the basic crops are determined by legal formulas. Under these formulas, allotments have already been cut sharply. Allotments for certain crops are likely to be reduced even further, despite growing evidence that acreage restrictions have not brought about needed adjustments.

"Authority should be provided for the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with criteria which the Secretary will propose to the Congress, to increase allotments up to 50 percent above the levels determined by existing formulas.

"The law already specifies that the Secretary may provide price support at levels above those determined by formula, and this authority has been used. The law should also provide authority to increase acreage allotments when the statistical formula yields results clearly contrary to the general interest. But any acreage increases must be related to price adjustments which will permit the growth of markets necessary to absorb the increased production.

"Such liberalization of acreage allotments as is possible would permit greater efficiency and higher incomes for small farmers who now are sharply restricted in the size of their operations.

"Third. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated. The corn program has not worked. Huge surpluses have accumulated. As surpluses rise, present legislation provides that allotments must shrink. As allotments shrink, participation in the corn program dwindles. A year ago, 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn-acreage allotments. In 1957, only about 14 percent of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support. Thus, as allotments shrink participation spirals downward, and price-depressing surpluses spiral upward.

"Fourth. The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished. Provisions now in the law require that price supports be raised as soon as the surplus is reduced. This means that as one surplus is moved, incentives are automatically provided to build another. Until this basic law is changed, farm people can expect to be kept continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

"The soil bank and surplus-disposal programs have already cut deeply enough into our surplus to throw these escalator clauses into action to build more surpluses. Elimination of these escalator clauses is necessary if surplus-disposal programs and the soil bank are to achieve their purpose.

"Fifth. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened. Presently, price supports must be provided by rigid formula for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and dairy products between 75 and 90 percent of parity. This range is too narrow to permit the growth of markets needed to absorb the production which, despite acreage controls, our farms appear certain to produce. Price supports for the above-named commodities should be determined administratively between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity, using the eight guidelines now provided by law for practically all other commodities. This needed change in price-support policy would open the door to market expansion, increased acreage allotments, and greater freedom to produce.

"For commodities like the feed grains, with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture has had wide discretion in the past, price support has been offered at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. This will be the Secretary's practice under the recommended legislation.

"Sixth. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop. For cotton the law specifies that supports must be based on a grade that is far below the average quality. The law should be corrected to put cotton price supports on the same basis as for all other crops.

"Seventh. The membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged and the Board's responsibilities increased. The recommended changes in determining acreage allotments and price-support levels will make additional administrative discretion a necessity. To assist the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising this discretion, the bipartisan Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be increased in number from 5 to 7. Members should be appointed by the President as at present, but with confirmation by the Senate. The Board should advise the Secretary regarding the establishing of price supports, determining of acreage allotments, and related subjects.

"Eighth. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended. This law is one of the major authorities for moving surplus commodities. The law should be extended for 1 year with an additional $1.5 billion authorized for sales for foreign currencies. But it must not, however, be allowed to become a device to postpone needed production and price adjustments. The extension should be limited to 1 year to give Congress the opportunity for annual review.

"Ninth. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded. Our farms and forests are a major source of our raw materials. To a greater degree than at present, these raw materials can be used in industry, thereby broadening markets for our abundant farm products. New uses and new markets can be developed for our surplus crops. To bring this about, increased utilization research is needed and is proposed in the budget message. This will be moving in the direction recommended by the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

"In addition to the nine steps outlined here, the Congress should, as recommended in the budget message (a) extend the National Wool Act, (b) continue the special school milk program, (c) broaden the sources of funds for the Rural Electrification Administration, (d) require State participation in programs to relieve the effects of drought or other natural disaster, and (e) improve conservation accomplishment by restricting cost-sharing to those practices which achieve longer lasting conservation benefits.

"These several recommendations constitute a farm, food, and fiber program which will assist our farmers to adjust to today's rapidly changing economy. It is a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families."

Senate Joint Resolution 160, vetoed, March 31, 1958:

"I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 162. I have given earnest consideration to the many representations made to me both for and against it. It is my judgment that to approve this resolution would be ill-advised, from the standpoint both of the Nation and of our farm families as well. It is regrettable that for the second time in 2 years the Congress has sent me a farm bill which I cannot in good conscience approve.

"Specifically, the resolution would have such consequences as these:

"1. It would pile up more farm products in Government warehouses.

"2. It would restrict the growth of markets.

"3. It would postpone the day when agriculture can be released from the straitjacket of controls.

"4. It would bypass the problems of the small operator who produces so little for sale that price supports have scant meaning.

"5. It would hold up the needed transition to modern parity and would in fact disregard the parity principle.

"6. It would be unfair to those winter wheat growers who signed up under the 1958 acreage reserve program with the understanding that the price supports which had then been announced would be the effective rates.

"This resolution would fix farm price supports and farm acreage allotments at not less than existing levels. The true need is to relate both price supports and acreage allotments to growing market opportunities.

"With regard to Government controls, what the farm economy needs is a thaw rather than a freeze.

"Improvements have been made in farm legislation in recent years. The keys to these improvements have been expansion of markets and greater opportunity for our farm people to exercise their own sound judgment.

"Fears were expressed by some that farm prices might collapse when high rigid supports were abandoned. These fears did not materialize. Instead, farm prices rose. This month the index of prices received by farmers is 9 percent above the level that prevailed in June of 1955 when high rigid price supports were last generally in effect. The parity ratio now stands at 87, up 6 points from a year ago.

"Most of agriculture is without production controls and without price support. This is generally true of meat animals, poultry, and fruits and vegetables.

"There is impressive evidence that farmers stand to profit from less rather than more governmental intervention. Unsupported prices of cattle and hogs are unusually strong.

"Despite these bright spots, many farm problems remain to be solved. The price-cost squeeze continues to harass our farm people. Production restrictions impose a severe burden. Many of our farmers—those on farms not large enough to be profitable—are earning incomes which are below any generally accepted standard.

"Cotton, wheat, corn, and other basic crops have major problems. Progress in solving the problems of these crops cannot be made by going backward. We must continue in the direction which the Congress set in 1954 and endorsed in 1956—changes in the direction of greater opportunity for adjustments made necessary by our ever-changing agriculture.

"I said, prior to the passage of this resolution, that what it proposed would be a turn of 180 degrees in the wrong direction. After reviewing the resolution in its final form, I adhere to this conviction.

"For the 1957 crop, prices were supported, product by product, in accordance with a complex set of legislative and administrative considerations. The same was true in the

establishment of acreage allotments. To carry these forward unaltered, despite changes in demand, in supply, and in surplus stocks, would be contrary to sound legislative procedures and would completely disregard economic fact.

"Now I want to turn to the progress that has been made through programs already in effect. In recent years a many-sided attack on farm problems has been launched. Substantial gains have been achieved:

"Through the rural development program to help those at the low end of the income scale.

"Through market-making exports which last year reached an alltime high.

"Through providing needed credit to family farms.

"Through sharing our abundance with the needy at home and abroad.

"Through market development in cooperation with producer organizations and the food trade.

"Through surplus reduction, which has cut down our stocks by more than a billion dollars.

"Through stepped-up research to find new uses for farm products.

"Through special programs to increase milk consumption.

"Through expanded long-range conservation measures.

"While it is necessary to reject the freeze embodied in this resolution, the Congress and the executive branch can be helpful in other ways.

"A five-point program should be undertaken, involving various separate but related actions. Some of these are the responsibility of the Congress and some are administrative. Some call for legislation, while ample authority already exists for others.

"1. The old basic law should be revised. On January 16, 1958, I sent to the Congress a special message on agriculture which recommended needed changes. Many of the problems will be alleviated if the Congress will act on these proposals in this session:

"Authority to increase acreage allotments up to 50 percent, and to widen the range within which price supports may be provided.

"Elimination of acreage allotments for corn, permitting all corn farmers to plant in accordance with their best management decisions, so that price supports would apply to all corn rather than, as the freeze bill would have it, to only about 1 acre in 7 in the commercial corn area.

"Abolishment of escalator clauses in the law because these rigid provisions keep farm people continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

"Extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, with substantial increased authority to move surplus stocks abroad.

"Shifting the price supports for cotton to the average of the crop, the same as for all other farm products.

"There is opportunity to make these needed changes before fall seeding time if the matter is undertaken promptly.

"2. When these necessary legislative changes have been made, 1959 acreage allotments will be established at levels as high or higher than those prevailing in 1958. Certain statutory provisions which place a floor under acreage allotments for cotton and rice are scheduled to expire after the 1958 crop. Producers face sharp acreage reductions unless the law is changed. When the Secretary of Agriculture has been given the necessary authority to adjust price supports and acreage allotments he will set 1959 allotments at levels at least as high as those in use this year. For cotton and rice these allotments will be substantially above the levels which would otherwise prevail.

"3. When necessary new authorization is provided in keeping with my legislative recommendations, the special export programs for our surplus crops will be enlarged. Opportunities exist to export, both for dollars and through special programs, large quantities of our staple commodities.

"Wheat is becoming better known to consumers abroad. Market development and promotional activities have made more people acquainted with the merits of our many export products. These commodities can alleviate hunger and need, and should be so used.

"4. Dairy products acquired under the price-support operation will be used outside the regular domestic commercial market. These products will not be offered for sale in such markets during the remainder of 1958 at less than 90 percent of parity. While freezing supports would not be a useful step, we seek to help the dairy industry in other ways.

"To strengthen markets, the butter, cheese, and dry milk acquired under price support will be donated to the school lunch program, to charitable institutions, and to needy persons. Exports will be made when this can appropriately be done.

"Such inventory management will serve to bolster the market.

"Meanwhile, the administration will continue to support the special school milk and armed services milk programs. We will also support as a further aid to dairy farmers, the accelerated bruccelosis control program. Stepped up promotional activity will increase consumption.

"Every constructive step available to us will be taken to increase the use of our wholesome dairy products.

"5. An export program for cotton, corn, and other feed grains, similar to the present export program on wheat, will be put into effect. This can be done without legislation. The effect of this program will be to move these products directly from commercial markets to the export trade without running them through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the wheat export program farmers have obtained broader markets and substantial price benefits in the marketplace. Marketing efficiency has been promoted and the amount of wheat which has moved into Government channels has been reduced. The new program for cotton and feed grains is expected to have similar effects.

"To meet the rapidly changing conditions in agriculture, farmers must be able to make their own management decisions on their own farms. They must not have their production and prices frozen in an outmoded pattern. They must not be made the captives of a restricted history; they must be given freedom to build a brighter future. This can be done if farmers and those who serve them will team up in support of sound legislative and administrative action."

Budget message for 1959, January 13, 1958:

"I shall send to the Congress shortly a special message recommending certain changes in existing legislation that will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to establish price supports for basic crops consistent with the increased productive capacity of our agriculture. These measures could not begin to have a significant effect in freeing the farm economy from Government controls before 1960 under a program of gradual adjustment of production to normal market demands.

"Titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 expire on June 30, 1958. Although sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this act do not provide a solution to the basic problem of adjusting agricultural production, they have proved to be an important temporary method of coping with problems arising out of the longtime accumulation of surplus agricultural commodities. This budget proposes extension of titles I and II of this act for 1 additional year, with an increase from the present $4 billion to $5.5 billion in the authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to incur costs and losses under title I. Such an authorization does not constitute new obligational authority, but the resulting costs and losses necessitate new obligational authority in future years to reimburse the Corporation. The budget includes, therefore, an anticipated 1958 supplemental appropriation of $1.3 billion to reimburse the Corporation for the 1957 program. The operations of title I of this act and the uses of the foreign currencies are summarized in the Department of Agriculture chapter of part II of the budget.

"Both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs of the soil bank have been helpful in diverting cropland from the production of agricultural commodities that are in excess supply. After careful consideration, however, I believe that more material and lasting benefits per dollar spent, both in reducing production of surplus crops and in obtaining enduring conservation of the Nation's agricultural resources, will be achieved under the conservation reserve program. This budget, therefore, proposes termination of the acreage reserve program at the end of the 1958 crop year, and recommends a conservation reserve program of $450 million for the 1959 calendar year, an increase of $125 million above the program for 1958.

"I also recommend that the special school milk program be extended after its present expiration date of June 30, 1958, that the National Wool Act be extended, and that legislation be enacted to require a greater sharing by the States in the costs of disaster relief assistance to farmers."

Economic Report for 1958, January 20, 1958:

"The achievements of statutory price objectives has been premised on appropriate adjustments of output by growers. Yet there is little support, among farmers or in the Congress, for controls that would be severe enough to implement current price objectives, except possibly for tobacco. Acreage allotments for corn have become largely inoperative and should be eliminated. Within the limits of general statutory principles, the Secretary should be given discretionary authority to increase allotments of other basic crops now governed by legal formulas.

The acreage reserve program has temporarily contributed to a reduction of output of certain crops, by voluntary means, without loss of net income to growers but at a high cost to the Treasury. This program should be permitted to expire at the end of the 1958 crop season. Longer term contracts under the conservation reserve program promise to be more useful in promoting agricultural adjustments and the conservation of natural resources. If we are to avoid moving toward tighter restraints on production, it is imperative that the stimulus to current output should be less than that now supplied by various Government programs. At the same time that the conservation reserve program is strengthened, consideration should be given to further consolidation of the Federal Government's widespread activities in soil and water conservation.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged; its members should require confirmation by the Senate; and its powers should extend to advising the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of the wider discretionary authority requested for determining both acreage allotments and price support levels, as well as related matters.

"The Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, appointed pursuant to Public Law 540 of the 84th Congress, made a number of useful suggestions for widening the markets for existing farm products and for developing new crops. While unrealizable hopes must be guarded against,

more funds can usefully be diverted to research and promotion in this area within the limits of present statutory authority and without the creation of a new administrative agency in the executive branch.

"The Federal Government assumes certain responsibilities in assisting farm people who are hit hard by natural disaster and those who are handicapped by chronically low incomes. Although drought in the Great Plains is no longer a matter of immediate concern, important recommendations conveyed in the Presidential drought message of March 5, 1957, should be implemented at an early date. In particular, the distribution formula under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act should be revised so as to permit allocation of a larger amount of loan funds to areas in acute need; and States should be required to contribute at least 25 percent of disaster-relief costs in certain emergency programs.

"The rural development program is a long-range program. It enlists private and public cooperation to raise levels of living in low-income rural areas. Among these efforts are improved vocational education, more effective employment and public health services, and the encouragement of local industrialization as well as better farming. The soundness of this approach is widely accepted and the results being attained warrant continued support of this program by the Congress, but it requires no new legislation at this time."

Message from the President of the United States relative to an agricultural program, January 29, 1959:

"There are produced, in the United States, some 250 farm commodities. The law has required that prices of 12 of these be supported at prescribed minimum levels. It is this requirement, together with the level of required support, that has created our farm surplus problems. Farmers who produce cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, vegetables, and various other products the prices of which are not supported—as well as those who produce crops the prices of which are supported at discretionary levels—have generally experienced growing markets rather than a buildup of stocks in warehouses.

"Three of the 12 mandatory products (wheat, corn, and cotton) account for about 85 percent of the Federal inventory of price-supported commodities though they produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

"The price-support and production-control program has not worked.

"1. Most of the dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers.

"Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from production of about half of these farms—the largest ones.

"Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production of about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

"For other supported crops, a similarly disproportionate share of the expenditure goes to the large producers.

"For wheat, cotton, and rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are approximately as follows:

	Per farm
"Wheat	$7,000
Cotton	10,000
Rice	10,000

"Though some presently unknown share of these expenditures will eventually be recovered through surplus disposal, the final cost of the operation will undoubtedly be impressively large.

"Clearly, the existing price-support program channels most of the dollars to those who store the surpluses and to relatively few producers of a few crops. It does little to help the farmers in greatest difficulty. For small operators the rural development program approach, which helps develop additional sources of income, has clearly demonstrated that it is a far better alternative.

"2. The control program does not control.

"Mandatory supports are at a level which so stimulates new technology and the flow of capital into production as to offset, in large part, the control effort.

"Despite acreage allotments and marketing quotas, despite a large soil-bank program and despite massive surplus disposal, Government investment in farm commodities will soon be at a new record high. On July 1, 1959, total Government investment in farm commodities will total $9.1 billion. Investment in commodities for which price support is mandatory will total $7.6 billion, of which $7.5 billion will consist of those crops designated by law as basic commodities: wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. And these stocks are increasing rather than diminishing.

"We already hold such huge stocks of wheat that if not 1 bushel of the oncoming crop were harvested we would still have more than enough for domestic use, export sales, foreign donation, and needed carryover for an entire year.

"3. The program is excessively expensive.

"When the 1958 crops have come into Government ownership, the cost, in terms of storage, interest, and other charges, of managing our inventory of supported crops, for which commercial markets do not exist at the support levels, will be running at a staggering rate, in excess of a billion dollars a year. Unless fundamental changes are made, this annual cost will rise.

"This sum is approximately equal to the record amount being spent in fiscal 1960 by the Federal Government on all water-resource projects in the United States, including power, flood control, reclamation, and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"During the present fiscal year, the net budgetary outlay for programs for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income will be $5.4 billion; $4.3 billion of this is for commodities for which price supports are mandatory. While some unpredictable part of this outlay will be recovered in later years through sales for dollars, sales for foreign currency and through barter, the cost will be great, especially when compared with the net income of all farm operators in the United States, which in 1958 was $13 billion. Budgetary expenditures primarily for the support of farm prices and farm income are now equal to about 40 percent of net farm income.

"Not a bushel of wheat nor a pound of cotton presently is exported without direct cost to the Federal Treasury.

"Heavy costs might be justifiable if they were temporary, if they were solving the problems of our farmers, and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But unfortunately this is not true.

"These difficulties are not to be attributed to any failure on the part of our farm people, who have done an outstanding job of producing efficiently. They have in fact responded to the price incentive as farm people—and other people—traditionally have.

"Our farm families deserve programs that build markets. Instead they have programs that lose markets. This is because the overall standards for the programs that they have are outdated relationships that existed nearly half a century ago. This was before 60 percent of our present population was born.

"At that time it took 106 man-hours to grow and harvest 100 bushels of wheat. In recent years it has taken not 106 but 22. Since then the yield of wheat has doubled. Similar dramatic changes have occurred for other crops.

"It is small wonder that a program developed many years ago to meet the problems of depression and war is ill adapted to a time of prosperity, peace, and revolutionary changes in production.

"The need to reduce the incentives for excess production has been explicit in the three special messages on agriculture which I have previously sent to the Congress. The point has repeatedly been made by the Secretary of Agriculture in his testimony and in his statements to the Congress. The Congress has moved in the right direction but by an insufficient amount. There has been a general tendency to underestimate the pace at which farm technology has been moving forward. Hence there has been a tendency to underestimate the production-inducing effect of the prescribed minimum price support levels.

"Recommendation:

"I recommend that prices for those commodities subject to mandatory supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. The appropriate percentage of the average market price should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at a level not less than 75 and not more than 90 percent of such average in accordance with the general guidelines set forth in the law. Growers of corn, our most valuable crop, have already chosen, by referendum vote, program changes which include supports based on such an average of market prices.

"If, despite the onrush of science in agriculture, resulting in dramatic increases in yields per acre, the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to existing standards, the Secretary should be given discretion to establish the level in accordance with the guidelines now fixed by law for all commodities except those for which supports presently are mandatory.

"Either of these changes would be constructive. The effect of either would be to reconcile the farm program with the facts of modern agriculture, to reduce the incentive for unrealistic production, to move in the direction of easing production controls, to permit the growth of commercial markets, and to cut the cost of Federal programs.

"As we move to realistic farm programs, we must continue our vigorous efforts further to expand markets and find additional outlets for our farm products, both at home and abroad. In these efforts there is an immediate and direct bearing on the cause of world peace. Food can be a powerful instrument for all the free world in building a durable peace. We and other surplus-producing nations must do our very best to make the fullest constructive use of our abundance of agricultural products to this end. These past 4 years our special export programs have provided friendly food-deficit nations with $4 billion worth of farm products that we have in abundance. I am setting steps in motion to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace and the well-being of friendly peoples throughout the world—in short, using food for peace.

"Certain details regarding the needed changes in law, particularly with reference to wheat, are appended to this message in the form of a memorandum to me from the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Difficulties of the present program should not drive us to programs which would involve us in even greater trouble. I refer to direct payment programs, which could soon make virtually all farm people dependent,

for a large share of their income, upon annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury. I refer also to various multiple-price programs, which would tax the American consumer so as to permit sale for feed and export at lower prices.

"To assist the Congress in discharging its responsibility, the administration stands ready, as always, to provide the appropriate committees with studies, factual data, and judgments. Continuation of the price support and production control programs in their present form would be intolerable.

"I urge the Congress to deal promptly with this problem."

Message from the President of the United States transmitting recommendations for three matters requiring urgent consideration and action, May 13, 1959:

"In making my legislative recommendations in January of this year I called to the particular attention of the Congress three matters requiring urgent consideration and action. It is now some 4 months since I made these recommendations and to date the Congress has dealt finally with none of them. On one, it has taken no action at all.

"These recommendations were as follows:

"1. To avert a serious disruption of the Interstate Highway program due to an impending deficit in the highway trust fund, I recommended a temporary increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels;

"2. To avoid the possibility of a serious interruption in homebuilding, I recommended corrective legislation.

"Since these recommendations were made, time has grown steadily shorter and the problems occasioned by the lack of action in the Congress increasingly critical.

"HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

"In setting up the Interstate Highway program in 1956, the Congress provided that it be conducted on a pay-as-you-go basis and, to accomplish this purpose, established the highway trust fund. Motor fuels and other highway user taxes are paid into this fund, and Federal grants, amounting to 90 percent of the cost of building the Interstate Highway System, are paid to the States out of the fund.

"Legislation enacted last year, however, has increased the rate at which money is being spent from the fund and nothing has been done to put more money into the fund. Because the law wisely requires that the fund's expenditures not exceed its receipts, it will be impossible this year, without congressional action, to apportion funds so that the States may make commitments for future highway construction. Apportionments in the following year would also be far below those needed to carry forward the roadbuilding schedule now contemplated by law.

"To keep the highway trust fund on a pay-as-you-go basis and to maintain the planned construction schedule, I recommended a temporary increase of 1½ cents a gallon in the Federal tax on motor fuels, effective July 1 of this year.

"The recent suggestion that receipts from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles be earmarked for the trust fund is an unsatisfactory alternative. The transfer of those receipts, running about a billion dollars a year, from the general fund to the highway trust fund would mean only that the problem would then be to raise new taxes to replenish the loss to the general fund.

"An even more unsatisfactory alternative, proposed by some, would be legislation to waive the pay-as-you-go requirement. This would only be a refusal to face reality—one that the Congress would be hard put to explain. Less than 3 years ago, as a matter of legislative policy, the Congress declared in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 that if it ever appears that the trust fund's total receipts will be less than its total expenditures 'the Congress shall enact legislation in order to bring about a balance of total receipts and total expenditures.'

"Less than 2 months remain for timely, responsible action by the Congress on my recommendation.

"HOUSING

"In January I urged the enactment of emergency legislation to increase by $6 billion the Federal Housing Administration's authority to insure privately extended home mortgages.

"This recommendation has not been enacted. The height of the homebuilding season is upon us, builders must plan ahead, and the agency's insurance authority is in danger of being exhausted.

"The $6 billion increase in authority involves no Federal spending and FHA's operations are self-supporting.

"Because it could see that its authority was running out, the agency late last year, where it could, began issuing agreements to insure in the future provided it then actually had authority remaining. By thus substituting provisional agreements for actual commitments, the agency has been able to avoid an abrupt halt in its operations due to a lack of insurance authority.

"Although the agency may be able to continue on this temporary basis until June 30, the end of the fiscal year, the situation grows more precarious every day. The agency's outstanding agreements to insure in the future now exceed $3 billion, more than twice the amount of the agency's remaining authority to make actual insurance commitments.

"To avoid the possibility of a serious interruption in homebuilding all across America, sound congressional action in this area is urgently needed.

"WHEAT

"I have frequently requested legislation to deliver our farmers and taxpayers everywhere from the mounting failures and staggering excesses of the mandatory farm price support and production control program. Unless this pressing issue is squarely met and resolutely dealt with, the next few years will see the surplus problem, because of its staggering cost to increasingly frustrated and impatient taxpayers, crash of its own weight, carrying with it all that is sound and good in the support of agriculture by the Federal Government.

"The most dramatic failure of all—and the problem requiring the most urgent attention—is the wheat program. Surplus wheat stocks are already 2½ times our annual domestic consumption for food. By July 1 of next year these stocks are expected to reach 1.5 billion bushels and to involve an investment of $3.5 billion by the Federal Government. Wheat storage, handling and interest charges alone will cost the American taxpayers close to half a billion dollars in the next fiscal year. Final proof of the present program's utter failure to control production lies in the fact that the last wheat crop was the largest in history.

"Because the Secretary of Agriculture is required by law to announce a continuation of this thoroughly discredited program by the 15th of May, in January I urgently recommended corrective legislation. The deadline set by law is now only 2 days away. No such legislation has been passed.

"I understand that at this late hour the Congress has elected further to postpone its decision by briefly extending the deadline for announcing next year's wheat program. Having chosen this course, the Congress should use this added time to enact realistic and constructive legislation that will effectively avert the impending disaster in wheat.

"I am compelled once again to call these particular matters to the special attention of the Congress because the orderly and efficient conduct of the people's business so requires. I urge the Congress to act expeditiously in these critical areas."

State of the Union message, January 9, 1959:

"Fourth, action is required to make more effective use of the large Federal expenditures for agriculture and to achieve greater fiscal control in this area.

"Outlays of the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year, for the support of farm prices on a very few farm products, will exceed $5 billion. That is a sum equal to approximately two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the United States.

"By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands surplus farm products worth about $9 billion. And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of $1 billion a year.

"This level of expenditure for farm products could be made willingly for a temporary period if it were leading to a sound solution of the problem. But unfortunately this is not true. We need new legislation.

"In the past I have sent messages to the Congress requesting greater freedom for our farmers to manage their own farms and greater freedom for markets to reflect the wishes of producers and consumers. Legislative changes that followed were appropriate in direction but did not go far enough.

"The situation calls for prompt and forthright action. Recommendation for action will be contained in a message to be transmitted to the Congress shortly."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM IN THE 1960 BUDGET

"Authorize:

"1. A transitional 4-year program of grants for construction of civil airport facilities.

"2. Loans and grants to aid areas of chronic unemployment.

"3. A 6-year program of urban renewal capital grants.

"4. Revenue bond financing for TVA generating facilities.

"5. Statehood for Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia.

"6. Item veto for legislation authorizing expenditures and for appropriation bills.

"7. Revisions in the agricultural price support program.

"8. Widening coverage of unemployment compensation.

"Continue:

"9. Military draft, reserve forces, and related legislation.

"10. Mutual security program with strengthened investment guarantees.

"11. Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

"12. Current tax rates for corporation income taxes and excise taxes which are scheduled for reduction under existing law.

"Strengthen and improve:

"13. Housing mortgage insurance programs.

"14. Minimum wage and 8-hour laws.

"15. Statutory protection in labor-management relations.

"16. Requirements for conduct of labor union affairs, including welfare and benefit plan reporting.

"Repeal:

"17. Limitations on minimum strength of military reserve forces and on disposal of unneeded military real estate."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ADAPT PROGRAMS TO CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE 1960 BUDGET

"Encourage more private financing for credit programs through flexible interest rates and other changes:

"1. Veterans housing loans.

"2. Rental, military, and cooperative housing mortgages.

"3. Rural electrification and telephone loans.

"4. College housing loans.

"5. Maritime mortgages.

"Authorize sale of property:

"6. Surplus military and other real property.

"7. Alaska communications system and related facilities.

"Review and revise operating and benefit standards:

"8. Foreign bidding on certain military contracts.

"9. Agricultural conservation program.

"10. Military service credits for railroad retirement.

"11. Veterans pensions and other programs.

"Expand non-Federal participation:

"12. Urban renewal.

"13. Flood control.

"14. School aid in federally affected areas.

"15. Waste treatment construction grants.

"16. Vocational education grants.

"17. Public assistance.

"18. Feed and seed assistance in disaster areas.

* * * * *

"Continue the adjustments needed for a freer agricultural economy with less reliance on the Federal Treasury.—The agricultural sector of our economy is in the paradoxical situation of having more efficient farms than ever before and yet of being more dependent upon Federal financial aid. During the current fiscal year, budget expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources are expected to reach a peak of $6.8 billion. For the coming year, they are estimated to decline to about $6 billion, mainly as a result of the termination of the acreage reserve of the soil bank.

"About three-quarters of these expenditures are for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and income. Other expenditures for agriculture consist primarily of payments for conservation; loans for rural electrification, telephones, and farm ownership and operation; and research and extension activities.

"Last year, the Congress enacted some changes in price-support laws, but additional amendments are necessary to help our agricultural economy adjust to the continuing revolution in farming technology. Changes are also needed in other agricultural programs. Legislative proposals will be transmitted later which should help our agricultural economy gradually free itself from so much Government support and control."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

"Expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources are surpassed in magnitude in the budget only by outlays for national security and for interest on the public debt. The continuing heavy impact of agricultural programs on the budget is mainly the result of the continued high volume of agricultural production and our long-established and now largely outmoded system of farm price supports. This system of price supports is not suited to the technically more efficient agriculture that has been rapidly developing in this country. The system provides production incentives that impede needed adjustments and encourages the production of surpluses which, in turn, result in increased Government outlays for commodity loans and purchases, and for storage and interest costs.

"Legislation is urgently needed, therefore, to make further revisions in the price support program. Recommendations will be sent to the Congress in a special message on agriculture. In this budget I am recommending extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) and the Sugar Act, major changes in the rural credit programs, and a reduction in the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation program.

"Estimated expenditures for agricultural programs in fiscal year 1960 are $6 billion, which is $779 million less than the estimate for the current year, but $1.6 billion more than was actually spent in 1958. The main part of the decrease expected in 1960 is in the soil bank program, because the acreage reserve portion terminated at the end of the 1958 crop year.

"Total new authority to incur obligations requested for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1960 is $5.1 billion. This amount includes, among others, $2 billion to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from price support losses, and $1.2 billion to reimburse the Corporation for estimated costs and losses under other programs financed through that agency. All of these Commodity Credit Corporation costs and losses are reflected in budget expenditures of 1959 and prior years.

"Price supports and related programs: Expenditures for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and farm income will comprise about 75 percent of total expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1960.

"Because of the many uncertainties with respect to future production, consumption, and exports of farm commodities, it is difficult to estimate the expenditures required for price supports. The budget assumes that crop yields in 1959 will be lower on the average than the record yields of 1958, but that a part of the land that was in the acreage reserve of the soil bank will be used to produce additional price-supported crops in the 1959 crop year. The shift of this idle land to crops will be a factor contributing to continued heavy Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures under existing laws.

"Because of the technological revolution that is still increasing productivity in agriculture, farmers continue to produce more than can be marketed at home and abroad. Under our present open-end price support system, this excess production results in increased Federal loans and purchases and increased carryover inventories. Total loans and commodity inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation on June 30, 1958, amounted to $7.1 billion. This accumulation is expected to rise to $9.1 billion by June 30, 1959, and still further to nearly $10.5 billion by June 30, 1960. To prevent continuation of huge Federal outlays, legislation will be proposed to make badly needed changes in the price support system.

"Titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 expire on December 31, 1959. Sales of farm commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this act and donations of commodities for relief purposes under title II have provided a temporary method of coping with some of the continuing excess production of farm commodities. This budget proposes extension of titles I and II of this act for 1 additional year, with an increase from $6,250 million to $7,750 million in the authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to incur costs and losses under title I.

"The International Wheat Agreement between wheat importing and wheat exporting countries expires on July 31, 1959. The desirability of extending this agreement is currently being studied.

"Although the Sugar Act, which serves to stabilize domestic sugar prices and assure adequate domestic supplies, does not expire until December 31, 1960, it is recommended that the act be extended at this time in order to give sugar producers needed time for production planning."

Economic Report, January 20, 1959:

"AGRICULTURE

"Recommendations will be made to the Congress by the Executive with a view to reducing the cost of price stabilization operations, stopping the increase in surplus stocks, and making progress in the reduction of accumulated supplies. Major revisions are overdue in the legislation relating to these agricultural programs. In their present form, these statutes have the effect of adding many billions of dollars annually to the Federal budget. Net budget expenditures for agricultural price and income support increased from an annual average of $3.5 billion during the fiscal years 1955–58 to an estimated $5.4 billion in the fiscal year 1959.

"What is more, experience has demonstrated that it is very difficult to foretell reliably how much the Federal Government will be required to expend in a given fiscal period under what are essentially open-end commitments for price support, a fact that greatly complicates the management of the Federal Government's fiscal affairs.

"Even these large expenditures have not brought farm output into line with commercial demands at home and abroad while maintaining and stabilizing farm income. Ever since the Korean conflict, the aggregate ouput of our farms has exceeded these demands by substantial amounts. Steps taken to reduce surpluses while protecting farm incomes—Commodity Credit Corporation support of prices at slightly declining minimum levels, retirement of acreage from cultivation, and large exports under loan or subsidy arrangements—have not succeeded in preventing an increase in surplus stocks. By June 30, 1959, there will be a record carryover of 1.3 billion bushels of wheat, the equivalent of more than 2 years of domestic requirements, and a carryover of 1.8 billion bushels of corn. Stocks of cotton remain excessive; stocks of tobacco and rice are large; and if it were not for the surplus disposal program, stocks of dairy products and of fats and oils would be high.

"The investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price supported commodities is expected to rise to more than $9 billion by June 30, 1959, and to almost $10.5 billion by June 30, 1960. To carry out existing commitments on price support activities will probably require use of most of the Corporation's borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. Expenditures of the Federal Government for storage, transportation, and interest on these surplus holdings are estimated at $850 million for the fiscal year 1959 and at $1.2 billion for the fiscal year 1960.

"The recent sharp increase in the cost of our agricultural programs is due in part to exceptionally favorable crop conditions in 1958. But a major part of the increase is due to the programs themselves. These are not properly adjusted to the rapidity with which farm technology is improving. Remedial legislation should be enacted without delay. Even though action taken at this time can become effective only in the fiscal year 1961, steps to bring the price stabilization expenditures of the Federal Government under control and to reduce them materially are urgently needed.

"Actually, the majority of farm people derive little or no benefit from our agricultural price support legislation. Cattle ranchers, producers of poultry and eggs, and growers of fruits and vegetables operate their farms today practically without price supports. Only some 1.5 million of our commercial farmers are the recipients of price support outlays in any material amounts and, within this group, those with the higher incomes are the main beneficiaries. More than 2.5 million farmers—whose annual sales are less than $2,500 and who produce each year only about 9 percent of our marketed farm

products—receive only very small supplements, or none at all, to their incomes from Government expenditures for price support."

State of the Union message, January 7, 1960:

"Our basic farm laws were written 27 years ago, in an emergency effort to redress hardship caused by a worldwide depression. They were continued—and their economic distortions intensified—during World War II in order to provide incentives for production of food needed to sustain a war-torn world.

"Today our farm problem is totally different. It is that of effectively adjusting to the changes caused by a scientific revolution.

"When the original farm laws were written, an hour's farm labor produced only one-fourth as much wheat as at present. Farm legislation is woefully out of date, ineffective, and expensive.

"For years we have gone on with an outmoded system which not only has failed to protect farm income, but also has produced soaring, threatening surpluses. Our farms have been left producing for war while America has long been at peace.

"Once again I urge Congress to enact legislation that will gear production more closely to markets, make costly surpluses more manageable, provide greater freedom in farm operations, and steadily achieve increased net farm incomes."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

"Budget totals

"[In billions]

Expenditures:	
1959 actual	$6.5
1960 estimate	5.1
1961 estimate	5.6
New obligational authority:	
1959 actual	5.4
1960 estimate	5.1
1961 estimate	4.6

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

"(In addition to program extensions)

"1. Further revise agricultural price support programs, and extend with revisions the conservation reserve program.

"2. Strengthen food-for-peace program.

"3. Revise interest rates for rural electric and telephone loans.

"4. Simplify and consolidate loan authority of Secretary of Agriculture for farm ownership and operation.

"5. Require greater sharing by States in costs of farm disaster relief.

"6. Reduce advance authorization for agricultural conservation program.

"In the fiscal year 1961, Federal programs for agriculture will again have a heavy impact on the budget, primarily because of continued high agricultural production and the past unwillingness of the Congress to make appropriate modifications in the long-established price support laws. The longer unrealistic price supports are retained, the more difficult it will be to make the adjustments in production needed to permit relaxation of Government controls over farm operations.

"Last year I proposed to the Congress urgently needed legislation relating to price supports. Very little of that program was enacted. I recommend that the Congress give this important matter early consideration.

"Particularly urgent now is legislation to put wheat price supports on a more realistic basis. Stocks of wheat are continuing to rise in spite of our efforts to move wheat abroad through the International Wheat Agreement, sales for foreign currencies, and grants to disaster victims and needy people. The carryover of wheat stocks is expected to rise to almost 1.4 billion bushels by July 1, 1960, an amount that would provide for more than 2 years of domestic consumption without any additional production.

"The wheat surplus problem has been a long time in the making and cannot be solved overnight. In fact, wheat legislation enacted in this session cannot be made applicable before the 1961 crop. The fact that any significant effect on the budget would be delayed until the fiscal year 1962 underlines the need for prompt action at this session of the Congress.

"Authority to bring additional land into the conservation reserve expires after the 1960 crop year. Legislation is proposed to extend this authority through the 1963 crop year and to expand the program by increasing the basic limitation on the amount of payments that may be made in any calendar year from $450 million to $600 million. Specific authority will be requested for the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration, in allocating conservation reserve funds, to those States and regions where curtailment of production of wheat or other surplus commodities is consistent with long-range conservation and production-adjustment goals. The rental rates needed to induce farmers to withdraw cropland from production under the conservation reserve depend on the income prospects from farming, which in turn are a reflection of the levels of price supports. Therefore, the future authorization for the conservation reserve program should not be increased above the 1960 level unless needed price support legislation is enacted for wheat.

"Estimated expenditures for agricultural programs in fiscal 1961 are $5.6 billion, which is $510 million more than the estimate for the current year but $907 million less than was spent in 1959. Total new authority to incur obligations requested for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1961 is $4.6 billion. This amount includes $1.3 billion to restore, to the extent necessary, the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from previous price support losses and $1.4 billion to reimburse the Corporation for estimated costs and losses through the fiscal year 1960 of other programs financed through that agency."

S. 1968, vetoed, June 25, 1959:

"I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1968, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended.

"This bill seeks to enact temporary wheat legislation. It would require wheat producers to reduce their acreage by 25 percent and at the same time would provide for increases in price supports on wheat to 90 percent of parity.

"On May 15 when I approved the joint resolution for extending the date for announcing the 1960 wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas I said, 'It is my hope that these additional 2 weeks will be used by the Congress to enact realistic and constructive—not stopgap—wheat legislation.'

"The proposed legislation embodied in H.R. 7246 is stopgap. It is not realistic. It is not constructive. It goes backward instead of forward. It is not in the interest of the wheat farmers of America.

"The bill disregards the facts of modern agriculture. The history of acreage control programs—particularly in the case of wheat—reveals that they just do not control production. Under acreage controls in the 1954–58 period, acreage was reduced by over 25 percent but at the same time yield per acre was increased by about 30 percent. The same situation would be likely to happen in 1960 and 1961. The poorest acres would be retired from production and all the modern technology would be poured onto the remainder.

"Hence the bill would probably increase, and in any event would not substantially decrease, the cost of the present excessively expensive wheat program now running at approximately $700 million a year.

"In my January 29, 1959, special message on agriculture, I recommended that price supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. In this message I also stated that if in spite of the tremendous increases in yields per acre the Congress still preferred to relate price support to existing standards then the Secretary should have discretion in establishing support levels in accordance with guidelines now in the law.

"Contrary to the recommendations I made, this bill prescribes for a sick patient another dose of what caused his illness. The proposed return to the discredited high, rigid price supports would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program.

"While the hour is late I feel that this Congress still has the opportunity to adopt realistic wheat legislation beneficial to all segments of our economy."

Economic Report, January 20, 1960:

"Federal expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources in the fiscal year 1960 are expected to total $5.1 billion. Of this amount, some $1.6 billion is for the support of research, conservation, marketing, and similar services, and for loan programs; and $3.5 billion is for price and income stabilization. A sizable portion of the latter amount is absorbed by interest charges, storage and transportation costs, and disposal losses on excess stocks of farm commodities.

"To the extent possible under present legislation, administrative actions were taken in the past year to help bring about a better adjustment between agriculture's greatly expanding capacity to produce and the demand for farm products, to improve farm incomes, and to reduce the heavy cost of agricultural programs to the Federal Government. More emphasis is being placed on the development of markets for farm products at home and abroad, on efforts to support prices at levels that will more nearly balance production with potential demand, on the removal of cropland from production, and on the development of the nonagricultural resources of marginal, low-income farm areas.

"Several actions taken in these directions during 1959 were of special importance. First, support prices for cotton were adjusted as individual producers were given, for the first time, a choice between (1) continuing compliance with tightly restrictive acreage allotments, with prices supported at 80 percent of parity, and (2) freedom to plant up to 40 percent beyond the allotment, with prices supported at 65 percent of parity. Second, under existing legislation, corn producers abolished their acreage allotments by referendum late in 1958 and thereby put into effect a single schedule for price support at 90 percent of the 3-year average market price with a minimum price support level of 65 percent of parity. Third, support prices for several commodities, including rye, oilseeds, dry beans, and feed grains other than corn, were reduced under discretionary authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. A number of these commodities are selling at prices above support levels. The support prices for tobacco were increased under mandatory provisions of the law. Fourth, under the law, efforts were continued for the disposal abroad, without disrupting ordinary commercial markets, of as large a volume as possible of stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This action was aided by a renewal of the International Wheat Agreement and by a lowered price and an increased export subsidy for cotton. Fifth, in accordance with legislation, the acreage reserve portion of the soil bank was terminated after the 1958 season, but the conservation reserve was increased from 9.9 million acres in 1958 to 22.4 million in 1959. Sixth, the rural development program was strengthened with

the establishment, by Executive order, of an interdepartmental committee responsible for the coordination of policies and actions of all participating Federal agencies and for the acceleration of activities under the program. Finally, under a newly enacted law, benefits under price support loans for 1960 were limited for a number of crops to $50,000 per producer, unless acreage is reduced 20 percent below the 1959 amount or the part of the loan in excess of $50,000 is repaid within 12 months.

"Additional agricultural legislation is urgently needed, however, in view of the continuing high program costs borne by the Federal Government and the continuing accumulation of surpluses of farm products. Such legislation should assist an orderly transition toward eventual balance between production and demand for farm products, so that the restrictive limitations to which agriculture is subject under present law may be removed.

"The conservation reserve program should be expanded, provided certain conditions are fulfilled, and adapted to the correction of specific commodity problems on a regional basis. Legislation is proposed to extend through the 1963 crop year authority, which expires after the 1960 crop year, to bring additional land into the conservation reserve; and to expand the program by increasing the basic limitation on the total payments in any calendar year from $450 million to $600 million. It is planned under the proposed legislation to add about 9 million acres to the program during the 1961 crop year, thus bringing the total to about 37 million acres. Together with this expansion in acreage in the conservation reserve, realistic price support programs are needed, especially for wheat.

"Specific authority will be requested for the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration, in allocating conservation reserve funds, to those States and regions in which curtailment of production of wheat or other surplus commodities is consistent with long-range conservation and production-adjustment goals. The future authorization for the conservation reserve program should not be increased above the 1960 level unless needed price-support legislation is enacted for wheat. Federal policy on cost-sharing should be concentrated in the future on conservation measures that foster needed shifts to less intensive uses of cropland; and cost-sharing assistance should be eliminated for practices which increase output of agricultural commodities already in excess supply.

"New obligational authority of $10 million is requested for the Great Plains conservation program, the same as for the fiscal year 1960. Under this program, conducted in designated counties of the 10 Great Plains States, the Federal Government provides technical assistance to farmers who enter into long-term contracts to make needed adjustments of land use on their farms, and it shares in the cost of making such adjustments.

"The Sugar Act, which expires on December 31, 1960, should be extended early in the present session of the Congress.

"Limitation on price support for certain crops grown on newly irrigated or drained land should be extended for another 3 years.

"The Congress should again consider the amendments to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) proposed last year to make more effective the program for surplus disposal abroad.

"Favorable action by the Congress is also requested on pending legislation to place the loan program of the Farmers Home Administration on a revolving-fund basis and to make other improvements in the laws affecting this activity."

Special message to Congress, February 9, 1960:

"I urgently call attention, once again, to a most vexing domestic problem—the low net income of many of our farmers and excessive production of certain farm products, largely due to economic distortions induced by years of Federal interference.

"We are most fortunate that our problem in agriculture is overabundance rather than a shortage of food. But it defies commonsense to continue to encourage, at the cost of many millions of tax dollars, the building of ever larger excess supplies of products that, as they accumulate, depress farm prices and endanger the future of our farmers.

"The wheat situation is particularly acute. Federal funds tied up in wheat approximate $3½ billion. Although this means that well over 30 percent of the total funds invested in inventories and loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation goes for wheat, this crop provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from sales of farm products. The Government sustains a net cost of more than $1,000 a minute, $1,500,000 every day, the year around, to stabilize wheat prices and income.

"Day by day this program further distorts wheat markets and supplies. Its only future is ever higher cost. Inexorably it generates ever larger surpluses which must be expensively stored. Ultimately, if our Government does not act quickly and constructively, the danger is very real that this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation, and thousands of our farming people will be hurt.

"I think the American people have every right to expect the Congress to move promptly to solve situations of this kind. Sound legislation is imperatively needed. We must quickly and sensibly revise the present program to avoid visiting havoc upon the very people this program is intended to help. Every additional day of delay makes a sound solution more difficult.

"I have repeatedly expressed my preference for programs that will ultimately free the farmer rather than subject him to increasing governmental restraints. I am convinced that most farmers hold the same view. But whatever the legislative approach, whether toward greater freedom or more regimentation, it must be sensible and economically sound and not a political poultice. And it must be enacted promptly. I will approve any constructive solution that the Congress wishes to develop, by 'constructive' meaning this:

"First, that price support levels be realistically related to whatever policy the Congress chooses in respect to production control, it being recognized that the higher the support the more regimented must be the farmer.

"Second, that price support levels not be so high so as to stimulate still more excessive production, reduce domestic markets, and increase the subsidies required to hold world outlets.

"Third, for reasons long expressed by the administration, that we avoid direct subsidy payment programs for crops in surplus; likewise, we must avoid programs which would invite harmful countermeasures by our friends abroad, or which, while seeking to assist one group of farmers, would badly hurt other farmers.

"Within these three guidelines, I am constantly ready to approve any one or a combination of constructive proposals. I will approve legislation which will eliminate production controls, or make them really effective, or allow the farmers themselves to choose between realistic alternatives. I am willing to gear supports to market prices of previous years, or to establish supports in accordance with general rather than specific provisions of law, or to relate price supports to parity.

"I recognize that these observations are general in nature. They are intentionally so in order to leave the Congress room for alternative constructive approaches to this problem. If the Congress should so act, I urge an orderly expansion of the conservation reserve program up to 60 million acres, with authority granted the Secretary of Agriculture to direct the major expansion of this program to areas of greatest need.

"In connection with the expansion of the Conservation Reserve, the Department of Agriculture stands ready to assist, if desired, with the development of sound legislative criteria governing the administration of this program in the light of its experience gained through its operations of the past 4 years.

"As part of the Conservation Reserve program, I would be willing to accept an authorization, with proper safeguards, to the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments in kind in whole or in part for the reduction of acreage devoted to crops in surplus and retirement of this acreage from cultivation, provided measures are included to keep production below total consumption while the payment-in-kind procedure is being used. Lacking such safeguards, a payment-in-kind procedure would overload the free market and thereby depress prices.

"My views as regards the price support program for wheat are clear. I prefer the following approach:

"Acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat should be eliminated beginning with the 1961 crop—thus freeing the wheat farmers—and thereupon price-support levels should be set as a percentage of the average price of wheat during the 3 preceding calendar years. The Secretary of Agriculture will furnish the Congress the details of this approach.

"Here I wish to comment somewhat more specifically on corn, a crop tremendously important to many thousands of our farmers.

"Just over a year ago, by a referendum margin of almost 3 to 1, our corn farmers decided upon a new program that liberalizes corn acreage and adjust corn price supports. This program is still new, and I believe it would be wise to give it a chance to demonstrate what it can do. In order to help the producers adjust to this new program, it is intended to use the expanded conservation reserve program to provide a voluntary means of removing substantial acreage of corn and other feed grains from production.

"On the administrative side, I want briefly to mention three programs highly important to agriculture.

"The food-for-peace program, initiated pursuant to my recommendations of last year, has been vigorously advanced. On my recent trip abroad, I saw many constructive results from these efforts and the need and opportunity for even greater use of this humanitarian program. Clearly we should continue to do our utmost to use our abundance constructively in the worldwide battle against hunger. The law we enacted in 1954, known as Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, has been especially helpful to us in waging this battle.

"Next, an aggressive utilization research program is underway to develop new markets and new uses for farm products. The 1961 budget now before Congress recommends additional appropriations for utilization research, and additional local currencies being acquired under Public Law 480 transactions will be devoted to this purpose.

"A coordinator for utilization research will shortly be named by the Secretary of Agriculture with the sole mission of concentrating on finding and promoting productive new uses for farm products.

"The rural development program, to assist rural people in low-income areas to achieve a better living, is also being accelerated.

"This program, initiated in my 1954 message, is now well beyond the demonstration stage and is going steadily forward in 30 States and Puerto Rico. Other States are now starting this important work. I have also recommended more funds for this program in the pending budget.

"Finally, I repeat my conviction that the public, and farmers particularly, are entitled to sound legislative action on the problems I have mentioned. The Congress can act within a broad latitude of proposals and still comply with the recommendations I have made.

"If the Congress wishes to propose a plan as an alternative to the course here recommended, so long as that plan is constructive, as I have indicated herein, I will approve it. The Department of Agriculture will cooperate fully with congressional committees and with individual Members of Congress in helping to prepare such alternative programs as they may wish to have considered.

"The important thing for farmers, and for all other Americans, is for us to act sensibly and to act swiftly.

"I urge the Congress so to act in order that the farmers and public generally may plan accordingly."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"Next is agriculture, a subject on which I have commented repeatedly to the Congress.

"In no domestic area do we have a more obvious need for corrective action. We cannot wonder that the patience of our farmers wears thin. By force of law the Government's surplus holdings, especially of wheat, continually increase. These overhang the market, depress prices, and impose an ever more onerous burden upon all citizens, our farmers particularly. I have offered many recommendations for attacking the problem through bipartisan action. Action there has been on occasion but, in respect to wheat especially, far less than needed or of a kind that would make our farmers' present troubles grow worse.

"In an effort to break the legislative stalemate I recently advised the Congress that, within broad guidelines which I suggested, I would approve any constructive farm bill that the Congress might enact. There is as yet no agreement on the part of the two Houses of Congress on a constructive approach.

"Meanwhile farmers grow more concerned about their future, and our people generally become increasingly unhappy as their Government extends a thousand of their tax dollars every minute on the self-defeating wheat program. Lately I have noted, with deep concern, a growing disposition in certain congressional quarters to favor proposals long ago rejected as unworkable, and which would obviously go beyond even the very broad limits I outlined almost 3 months ago.

"I regret also the continuing tendency to rely, in agriculture, upon Federal controls, which inevitably create interference with the lives of our farm people. I still believe that America's farmers prefer, as certainly I do, the development of legislation which will promote progress for them toward economic equality and permit them the maximum freedom.

"Surely it is time, in the interest of all Americans, for the Congress to face up to the admittedly difficult problems of agriculture. It is constructive results that farmers want and need. Indeed, I believe that all America is looking for this kind of action before this session adjourns.

"Also badly needed is extension of the Sugar Act, soon to expire. At stake are an assured and stable supply of sugar for our people at reasonable prices and removal of the uncertainties now facing this industry. A 4-year extension of the present program, modified to give the President authority to adjust quotas in order to assure America of an adequate sugar supply, is needed to give farmers and processors the time to plan. Appropriate recommendations are before the Congress. The interests of America require that legislation be enacted before the Congress adjourns."

State of the Union message, January 5, 1957:

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT

"We must help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity. Economic changes in recent years have been often so rapid and far-reaching that areas committed to a single local resource or industrial activity have found themselves temporarily deprived of their markets and their livelihood.

"Such conditions mean severe hardship for thousands of people as the slow process of adaptation to new circumstances goes on. This process can be speeded up. Last year I authorized a major study of the problem to find additional steps to supplement existing programs for the redevelopment of areas of chronic unemployment. Recommendations will be submitted, designed to supplement, with Federal technical and loan assistance, local efforts to get on with this vital job. Improving such communities must, of course, remain the primary responsibility of the people living there and of their States. But a soundly conceived Federal partnership program can be of real assistance to them in their efforts."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957:

"Area redevelopment—proposed legislation: Despite continuing high levels of employment and income, pockets of unemployment persist in several areas. Legislation is again recommended to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, with the assistance of other appropriate agencies, to provide loans and other aids to communities which seem to be in chronic economic distress. This aid will help those communities in attempting to solve their basic problems."

Economic Report, January 20, 1957:

"AIDING LOCAL AREAS OF PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"The high employment levels of the last few years have facilitated economic adjustments needed to correct persistent unemployment conditions in various areas. Although the Federal Government makes its greatest contribution to the solution of local unemployment problems by following policies which promote stable growth for the economy as a whole, there are many ways in which it helps local areas with more or less chronic unemployment. In awarding Federal procurement contracts, preference has been given to businesses located in such areas. Also, defense facilities constructed in the areas are accorded special accelerated tax amortization privileges. Increased appropriations for the Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce have made it possible to extend improved and augmented services to many such areas. The Department of Labor, through affiliated State agencies, has expanded community employment programs and services.

"But greater efforts are needed to help certain localities strengthen their economic base. In some cases, the forces responsible for persistent unemployment are so strong and so varied that they will yield only to comprehensive measures taken jointly by private groups, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. To supplement the efforts of local and State groups, which in a number of areas have already achieved marked success in stimulating sound economic development, an enlarged Federal program of aid to areas of persistent unemployment was proposed to the Congress in 1956. The program provided for Federal loans to pay for part of the cost of purchasing and developing land and facilities for industrial usage, for grants for research to help communities evaluate their resources and needs for economic development, and for an expanded program of technical assistance through field consultation. In addition, the proposed legislation would assure better coordination of existing Federal programs so as to make them more useful in the revitalization of areas with longstanding unemployment. Under the proposed legislation an Area Assistance Administration would be established in the Department of Commerce to administer the expanded Federal services. The Congress is urged to enact legislation for this program, including the necessary appropriations."

Economic Report, January 20, 1958:

"Earlier economic reports recommended a Federal program to stimulate sound economic development in areas of persistent unemployment. Legislation previously recommended to provide an Area Assistance Administration in the Department of Commerce, to extend loans, research grants, and technical assistance to such areas, should be enacted."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"Area assistance: In disapproving the area redevelopment legislation enacted in the closing days of the last Congress, I expressed the hope that the next Congress would promptly pass a more soundly conceived program. The revised legislation which this administration is proposing would:

"(a) Place the major responsibility on local citizens;

"(b) Authorize loans to areas where unemployment has been well above the national average for 2 or more years;

"(c) Authorize grants for technical assistance to these areas and to localities dependent upon a single industry or situated in rural low-income areas;

"(d) Place leadership in the Department of Commerce, with the assistance of other Federal agencies.

"To finance this program, I recommend initial appropriations in fiscal 1960 of $55 million. Based on the successful, comparable programs conducted by certain States, these appropriations should be adequate to meet the Federal share for development of all areas expected to qualify under the proposed legislation."

Economic Report, January 20, 1959:

"AREA ASSISTANCE

"Despite the forward economic strides of the Nation since the war, some communities have suffered substantial and persistent unemployment, when measured against national experience. Federal assistance to these communities is required not only to mitigate the hardships of individuals and families but also to provide for the use of underutilized resources, to the enhancement of the national welfare.

"A program of assistance through development loans and through grants for technical studies will be recommended to the Congress in order that these communities may share in the general economic advance. By design and administration, the program would seek to complement and reinforce community efforts to help themselves, to encourage maximum participation by State and local agencies and private investment institutions, and to create new job opportunities instead of merely transferring jobs from one locality to another.

"The program would also provide technical aid to towns heavily dependent on a major industry and to rural low-income areas, to help them achieve greater economic stability through diversification."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"COMMERCE AND HOUSING

"Budget totals

"[In billions]

Expenditures:	
1959 actual	$3.4
1960 estimate	3.0
1961 estimate	2.7
New obligational authority:	
1959 actual	2.9
1960 estimate	3.8
1961 estimate	3.2

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

"(In addition to program extensions)

"1. Strengthen organization and management of outer space programs.

"2. Increase aviation fuel taxes and credit them to general fund.

"3. Remove interest ceiling on Government ship mortgage loans.

"4. Provide additional highway trust fund revenues.

"5. Finance forest and public land highways from highway trust fund.

"6. Increase postal rates.

"7. Increase savings and loan insurance premiums.

"8. Provide flexible interest rates on veterans and military housing loans.

"9. Liberalize authority of small business investment companies.

"10. Broaden exemption of small security issues from registration.

"11. Authorize loans and grants to assist areas with chronic unemployment.

"12. Improve antitrust legislation.

"Area assistance: Despite the rapid economic recovery in the Nation as a whole, unemployment remains high in a relatively small number of local areas. The chronic problems in these communities reflect primarily basic changes in consumer buying habits, production methods, and industry location patterns. Some localities and States have properly taken the initiative in measures designed to meet these problems. In addition, the Department of Commerce, with the cooperation of 13 other Federal agencies, is intensifying existing Federal programs to encourage and support this local initiative. More help is required. Therefore, for the past 4 years, I have requested expanded legislative authority, primarily for loans and grants, to supplement existing Federal, State, and local programs. Prompt enactment of this legislation is important. The budget includes an estimated $57 million in appropriations as the initial amount necessary to provide the proposed additional Federal aid."

Memorandum of disapproval, September 6, 1958:

"I am withholding my approval from S. 3683 the area redevelopment bill.

"Every year for the past 3 years I have strongly urged the adoption of a program of Federal assistance to communities of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purpose of assisting those communities to develop a sounder and more secure economic base. I regret that no action along these lines has been taken by the Congress until this year and, needless to add, I am greatly disappointed that I find myself unable to approve the present bill.

"My disapproval need cause no unnecessary delay in initiating a sound area assistance program. Even the unsound program contemplated by S. 3683 could not be of immediate help to any community because the Congress, before adjournment, failed to provide any money to carry out the bill's purposes. Until the next session of the Congress, the needs of areas of severe and persistent unemployment can be met in part through the new program of loans to State and local development companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which I recently approved.

"The repeated recommendations of the administration recognized that the major responsibility for planning and financing the economic redevelopment of communities of chronic unemployment must remain with local citizens if Federal programs are to be effective. The present bill departs from this principle, and would greatly diminish local responsibility. In doing so, and in including other undesirable features, it defeats any reasonable chance of giving effective help to the communities really in need.

"S. 3683 provides for less local participation in the costs of local development projects than is proper or necessary to stimulate and assure the continuing interest and support of local governmental and private interests. The administration recommended loans, for periods of 25 years, in amounts not exceeding 35 percent of the cost of redevelopment projects. S. 3683, on the other hand, provides for loans for such projects for periods of 40 years, at artificially low interest rates, in amounts up to 65 percent of the total cost of a project.

"S. 3683 proposes in addition a program of Federal grants for public works in redevelopment areas under which it would be possible to have no local participation whatever. Moreover, the criteria for making these grants are so loosely drawn that, without indiscriminate use of funds, administration of these provisions would be almost impossible. This is a field in which, if the Federal Government participates at all, it should be able to rely upon local judgments backed by signficant local contributions.

"S. 3683 is also defective in my judgment because its assistance in certain instances, would be available in areas in which unemployment is traceable essentially to temporary conditions. Federal assistance to communities where unemployment is not clearly chronic would necessarily mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies—an assumption of responsibility that would have the most profound consequences.

"I also believe it would be a grave mistake to establish, as this bill would, an area assistance program in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Such a program should be lodged, not with an agency concerned with residential housing and related matters, but rather with the Department of Commerce which has primary responsibility for business and industrial development and a long experience in extending to local areas technical aid for economic development.

"S. 3683 also contemplates a Federal redevelopment assistance, including loans, in rural areas. There is serious question as to whether Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas would be a proper or effective approach, much less a permanent one, to the problems of surplus labor in essentially agricultural communities.

"It is my intention next January when the Congress reconvenes to request the Congress to enact area assistance legislation more soundly conceived to carry out the purposes which I have repeatedly stressed as being in the national interest. It is my hope that Congress at that time will move with all possible speed to enact such an area assistance program."

Memorandum of disapproval, May 13, 1960:

"I return herewith, without my approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

"For 5 consecutive years I have urged the Congress to enact sound area assistance legislation. On repeated occasions I have clearly outlined standards for the kind of program that is needed and that I would gladly approve.

"In 1958 I vetoed a bill because it departed greatly from those standards. In 1959, despite my renewed urging, no area assistance bill was passed by the Congress.

"Now in 1960, another election year, a new bill is before me that contains certain features which I find even more objectionable than those I found unacceptable in the 1958 bill.

"The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

"S. 722 is seriously defective in six major respects which are summarized immediately below and discussed in detail thereafter.

"1. S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill. In consequence, communities in genuine need would receive less Federal help for industrial development projects than under the administration's proposal.

"2. Essential local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by the excessive Federal participation that S. 722 would authorize.

"3. Federal financing of plant machinery and equipment is unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help.

"4. The Federal loan assistance which S. 722 would provide for the construction of sewers, water mains, access roads, and other public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under an existing Government program. Outright grants for such a purpose, a provision of S. 722, are wholly inappropriate.

"5. The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

"6. The creation of a new Federal agency is not needed and would actually delay initiation of the new program for many months.

"I

"The most striking defect of S. 722 is that it would make eligible for Federal assistance areas that don't need it—thus providing less help for communities in genuine need than would the administration's proposal. S. 722, as opposed to the administration bill, would more than double the number of eligible communities competing for Federal participation in loans for the construction or refurbishing of plants for industrial use—the main objective of both bills. Communities experiencing only temporary economic difficulty would accordingly be made eligible under S. 722 and the dissipation of Federal help among them would deprive communities afflicted with truly chronic unemployment of the full measure of assistance they so desperately desire and which the administration bill would give them.

"II

"Lasting solutions to the problems of chronic unemployment can only be forthcoming if local citizens—the people most immediately concerned—take the lead in planning and financing them. The principal objective is to develop new industry. The Federal Government can and should help, but the major role in the undertaking must be the local community's. Neither money alone, nor the Federal Government alone, can do the job. The States also must help, and many are, but in many instances and in many ways they could do much more.

"Under S. 722, however, financing of industrial development projects by the Federal Government—limited to 35 percent under the administration's proposal—could go as high as 65 percent, local community

participation could be as low as 10 percent and private financing as little as 5 percent. Furthermore, although S. 722 conditions this assistance on approval by a local economic development organization, if no such organization exists one can be appointed from Washington.

"III

"S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment are unnecessary, unwise, and costly. Much more money would be required and unnecessarily spent, much less money would find its way into truly helpful projects, and manufacturers would be subsidized unnecessarily vis-a-vis their competitors.

"IV

"S. 722 would authorize further unnecessary spending by providing both loans and grants—up to 100 percent of the cost—for the construction of access roads, sewers, water mains, and other local public facilities.

"Grants for local public facilities far exceed any appropriate Federal responsibility. Even though relatively modest at the start, they would set predictably expensive and discriminatory precedents.

"With regard to loans for such purposes, exemption from Federal income taxes makes it possible today for local communities in almost every case to borrow on reasonable terms from private sources. Whenever such financing is difficult to obtain, the need can be filled by the existing public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—a program which S. 722 would needlessly duplicate and for which an additional $100 million authorization has already been requested.

"V

"S. 722 would make a minimum of 600 rural counties eligible for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in such areas. The rural development program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low income rural areas. Increasing the impact of these two activities, particularly the rural development program, is a preferable course.

"VI

"Finally, S. 722 would also create a new Federal agency and would, in consequence, mean many unnecessary additions to the Federal payroll and a considerable delay in the program before the new agency could be staffed and functioning effectively. None of this is necessary, for all that needs to be done can be done—much better and immediately—by the existing Department of Commerce.

"Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the administration bill.

"Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

"My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged, and aid to education, to mention but a few.

"Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interests of all our people."

Economc Report for 1960, January 26, 1960:

"AREA ASSISTANCE

"Although the number of labor market areas in the United States with a substantial surplus of labor beyond current requirements has been reduced significantly as economic activity has expanded, many communities continue to suffer from substantial and persistent unemployment. Assistance to these communities is available through a number of Federal agencies, whose activities in this connection are coordinated through an interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Federal Urban Area Assistance Programs, as well as from State and local groups. In 1959, the Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce, which carries the principal responsibility for providing Federal assistance, aided an increasing number of area development groups in their efforts to strengthen the economic bases of their communities. Technical assistance furnished by the Office included counseling on methods used by various communities to solve their development problems, on community industrial foundations and industrial parks, and on State and local financing plans for promoting economic development.

"The Department of Labor aids community organizations in connection with manpower aspects of economic development and with on-the-job training. Financial assistance to business concerns is furnished through the Small Business Administration. The 'set-asides' of defense contracts for concerns located in areas of substantial labor surplus help to bolster economic activity in particular communities.

"Legislation is needed, however, to supplement and strengthen these efforts to help areas of persistent unemployment create new job opportunities. Such legislation should stimulate and complement the efforts of communities to help themselves, should promote maximum participation by private financial institutions and by State and local agencies, should encourage the creation of new job opportunities rather than the mere transference of jobs from one area of the country to another, and should encompass technical aid for the economic diversification of rural low-income areas and single-industry communities.

"A recommendation has already been made to the Congress for a program that meets these specifications. It would provide for Federal participation in loans to business concerns, for financial assistance to State and local development groups, and for technical assistance to local groups seeking to strengthen their regional economies."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term, substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment. With important local efforts to provide new jobs already underway, Federal help must be of a kind that strengthens and supplements rather than displaces or discourages those efforts."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957:

"The Congress is urged to carry out the proposals of the Judicial Conference for additional Federal judges. Also, when a district or circuit court judge who is the senior judge of the district or circuit becomes 70 and chooses not to retire, he should be relieved of his administrative duties. Furthermore, whenever a district court judge reaches 70 and chooses not to retire, the Congress should provide that upon certification by the Judicial Conference of the need therefor, the President would be authorized to appoint an additional judge. When the judge who had reached 70 dies or retires, the vacancy thus created would not be filled."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"I also recommend that the Congress direct special attention to the creation of additional Federal judgeships as proposed by the Judicial Conference, and the strengthening of Federal laws against organized crime."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"GENERAL GOVERNMENT

"Budget totals

"[In billions]

Expenditures:	
1959 actual	$1.6
1960 estimate	1.7
1961 estimate	1.9
New obligational authority:	
1959 actual	1.8
1960 estimate	1.6
1961 estimate	1.9

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

"1. Establish policy for financing civil service retirement.

"2. Charge civil service benefits for certain widows and retired employees to trust fund after 1961.

"3. Make 1958 salary increase for Post Office field personnel permanent.

"4. Revise laws to reflect admission of State of Hawaii.

"5. Provide home rule for District of Columbia.

"6. Create transportation corporation for National Capital area.

"7. Authorize nonvoting resident commissioners for Guam and Virgin Islands.

"8. Amend immigration and nationality laws.

"9. Include goal of price stability in Employment Act.

"10. Enact civil rights legislation.

"11. Create additional Federal judgeships.

"12. Strengthen laws against organized crime.

"13. Increase authorization for Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

"14. Reimburse citizens for certain World War II property damage.

"15. Authorize civilian achievement awards.

"I also recommend that the Congress create additional Federal judgeships, as proposed by the Judicial Conference, and strengthen Federal laws against organized crime."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"First is the urgent need of Federal courts for enough judges to hear the greatly increased number of cases being filed each year. Regardless of expediency, justice calls for prompt action.

"The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended the creation of approximately 40 new judgships. This recommendation is supported by the administration and by virtually every important professional organization concerned with the administration of the courts.

"We who advocate equal justice under law have a duty to make it effective. In certain districts injured people must wait over 4 years for justice or compromise their rights; innocent people who are defrauded are made a laughingstock because the delay in the courts deprives them of an effective remedy; justice is denied the weak because they cannot finance the delay necessary to be heard. Further neglect of this need is heartless. For all our people, I most earnestly urge swift action on the pending measure to increase the number of judgeships."

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

State of the Union message, January 7, 1954:

"National highways

"To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the Interstate Highway System, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

"When the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completes its study of the present system of financing highway construction, I shall promptly submit it for consideration by the Congress and the Governors of the States."

Budget message for 1955, January 21, 1954:

"Highways: Expenditures under the Federal-aid highway program of grants to States for highway construction have been rising during the past year, and will continue to rise in the fiscal year 1955 under commitments made pursuant to the Highway Act of 1952. The 1955 expenditures will be the highest in history. Emphasis in the selection of new projects will be given to the National System of Interstate Highways, which comprises the most important routes for interstate commerce and national defense. Of the $555 million of estimated expenditures under the Federal-aid program in the fiscal year 1955, about $150 million will be spent for projects in the Interstate System. Other construction programs of the Bureau of Public Roads will involve expenditures of $27 million, mainly for direct construction of forest highways and defense access roads.

"We should give increased attention to eliminating the existing inadequacies of the National System of Interstate Highways. Pending development and review of detailed proposals for extension of the Federal-aid highway program, I am including under proposed legislation the $575 million level of the existing authorization. Similarly, I am including the prevailing annual rate of $22.5 million for the forest-highway program. No appreciable expenditures will be made under the proposed authorizations in the fiscal year 1955."

Special message, February 22, 1955:

"Our unity as a nation is sustained by free communication of thought and by easy transportation of people and goods. The ceaseless flow of information throughout the Republic is matched by individual and commercial movement over a vast system of interconnected highways crisscrossing the country and joining at our national borders with friendly neighbors to the north and south.

"Together, the uniting forces of our communication and transportation systems are dynamic elements in the very name we bear—United States. Without them, we would be a mere alliance of many separate parts.

"The Nation's highway system is a gigantic enterprise, one of our largest items of capital investment. Generations have gone into its building; 3,366,000 miles of road, traveled by 58 million motor vehicles, comprise it. The replacement cost of its drainage and bridge and tunnel works is incalculable. One in every seven Americans gains his livelihood and supports his family out of it. But, in large part, the network is inadequate for the Nation's growing needs.

"In recognition of this, the Governors in July of last year at my request began a study of both the problem and methods by which the Federal Government might assist the States in its solution. I appointed in September the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, headed by Lucius D. Clay, to work with the Governors and to propose a plan of action for submission to the Congress. At the same time, a committee representing departments and agencies of the National Government was organized to conduct studies coordinated with the other two groups.

"All three were confronted with inescapable evidence that action, comprehensive and quick and forward-looking, is needed.

"First. Each year, more than 36,000 people are killed and more than a million injured on the highways. To the home where the tragic aftermath of an accident on an unsafe road is a gap in the family circle, the monetary worth of preventing that death cannot be reckoned. But reliable estimates place the measurable economic cost of the highway accident toll to the Nation at more than $4.3 billion a year.

"Second. The physical condition of the present road net increases the cost of vehicle operation, according to many estimates, by as much as 1 cent per mile of vehicle travel. At the present rate of travel, this totals more than $5 billion a year. The cost is not borne by the individual vehicle operator alone. It pyramids into higher expense of doing the Nation's business. Increased highway transportation costs, passed on through each step in the distribution of goods, are paid ultimately by the individual consumer.

"Third. In case of an atomic attack on our key cities, the road net must permit quick evacuation of target areas, mobilization of defense forces, and maintenance of every essential economic function. But the present system in critical areas would be the breeder of a deadly congestion within hours of an attack.

"Fourth. Our gross national product, about $357 billion in 1954, is estimated to reach over $500 billion in 1965 when our population will exceed 180 million and, according to other estimates, will travel in 81 million vehicles 814 billion vehicle-miles that year. Unless the present rate of highway improvement and development is increased existing traffic jams only faintly foreshadow those of 10 years hence.

"To correct these deficiencies is an obligation of government at every level. The highway system is a public enterprise. As the owner and operator, the various levels of government have a responsibility for management that promotes the economy of the Nation and properly serves the individual user. In the case of the Federal Government, moreover, expenditures on a highway program are a return to the highway user of the taxes which he pays in connection with his use of the highways.

"Congress has recognized the national interest in the principal roads by authorizing two Federal-aid systems, selected cooperatively by the States, local units, and the Bureau of Public Roads.

"The Federal-aid primary system as of July 1, 1954, consisted of 234,407 miles, connecting all the principal cities, county seats, ports, manufacturing areas, and other traffic generating centers.

"In 1944 the Congress approved the Federal-aid secondary system, which on July 1, 1954, totaled 482,972 miles, referred to as farm-to-market roads—important feeders linking farms, factories, distribution outlets, and smaller communities with the primary system.

"Because some sections of the primary system, from the viewpoint of national interest, are more important than others, the Congress in 1944 authorized the selection of a special network, not to exceed 40,000 miles in length, which would connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, serve the national defense, and connect with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

"This national system of interstate highways, although it embraces only 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joins 42 State capital cities and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. It carries more than a seventh of all traffic, a fifth of the rural traffic, serves 65 percent of the urban and 45 percent of the rural population. Approximately 37,600 miles have been designated to date. This system and its mileage are presently included within the Federal-aid primary system.

"In addition to these systems, the Federal Government has the principal, and in many cases the sole, responsibility for roads that cross or provide access to federally owned land—more than one-fifth the Nation's area.

"Of all these, the interstate system must be given top priority in construction planning. But at the current rate of development, the interstate network would not reach even a reasonable level of extent and efficiency in half a century. State highway departments cannot effectively meet the need. Adequate right-of-way to assure control of access, grade separation structure, relocation and realinement of present highways—all these, done on the necesary scale within an integrated system, exceed their collective capacity.

"If we have a congested and unsafe and inadequate system, how then can we improve it so that 10 years from now it will be fitted to the Nation's requirements?

"A realistic answer must be based on a study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways, made by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the State highway departments and local units of government. This study, made at the direction of the 83d Congress in the 1954 Federal-aid Highway Act, is the most comprehensive of its kind ever undertaken.

"Its estimates of need show that a 10-year construction program to modernize all our roads and streets will require expenditure of $101 billion by all levels of Government.

"The preliminary 10-year totals of needs by road systems are:

	Billions
Interstate (urban $11, rural $12 billion)	$23
Federal-aid primary (urban $10, rural $20 billion)	30
Federal-aid secondary (entirely rural)	15
Subtotal of Federal-aid systems (urban $21, rural $47 billion)	68
Other roads and streets (urban $16, rural $17 billion)	33
Total of needs (urban $37, rural $64 billion)	101

"The Governors' conference and the President's Advisory Committee are agreed that the Federal share of the needed construction program should be about 30 percent of the total, leaving to State and local units responsibility to finance the remainder.

"The obvious responsibility to be accepted by the Federal Government, in addition to the existing Federal interest in our 3,366,000-mile network of highways, is the development of the Interstate System with its most essential urban arterial connections.

"In its report, the Advisory Committee recommends:

"1. That the Federal Government assume principal responsibility for the cost of a modern interstate network to be completed

by 1964 to include the most essential urban arterial connections; at an annual average cost of $2.5 billion for the 10-year period.

"2. That Federal contributions to primary and secondary road systems, now at the rate authorized by the 1954 act of approximately $525 million annually, be continued.

"3. That Federal funds for that portion of the Federal-aid systems in urban areas not on the interstate system, now approximately $75 million annually, be continued.

"4. That Federal funds for forest highways be continued at the present $22.5 million per year rate.

"Under these proposals, the total Federal expenditures through the 10-year period would be:

	Billions
Interstate system	$25.000
Federal-aid primary and secondary	5.250
Federal-aid urban	.750
Forest highways	.225
Total	31.225

"The extension of necessary highways in the territories and highway maintenance and improvement in national parks, on Indian lands and on other public lands of the United States will continue to be treated in the budget for these particular subjects.

"A sound Federal highway program, I believe, can and should stand on its own feet, with highway users providing the total dollars necessary for improvement and new construction. Financing of interstate and Federal-aid systems should be based on the planned use of increasing revenues from present gas and diesel oil taxes, augmented in limited instances with tolls.

"I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues, to be paid off by the above-mentioned revenues which will be collected during the useful life of the roads and pledged to this purpose, rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations.

"At this time, I am forwarding for use by the Congress in its deliberations the report to the President made by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program. This study of the entire highway traffic problem and presentation of a detailed solution for its remedy is an analytical review of the major elements in a most complex situation. In addition, the Congress will have available the study made by the Bureau of Public Roads at the direction of the 83d Congress.

"These two documents together constitute a most exhaustive examination of the national highway system, its problems and their remedies. Inescapably, the vastness of the highway enterprise fosters varieties of proposals which must be resolved into a national highway pattern. The two reports, however, should generate recognition of the urgency that presses upon us; approval of a general program that will give us a modern safe highway system; realization of the rewards for prompt and comprehensive action. They provide a solid foundation for a sound program."

State of the Union message, January 5, 1960:

"Highway legislation

"Legislation to provide a modern, interstate highway system is even more urgent this year than last, for 12 months have now passed in which we have fallen further behind in road construction needed for the personal safety, the general prosperity, the national security of the American people. During the year, the number of motor vehicles has increased from 58 million to 61 million. During the past year over 38,000 persons lost their lives in highway accidents, while the fearful toll of injuries and property damage has gone on unabated.

"In my message of February 22, 1955, I urged that measures be taken to complete the vital 40,000-mile interstate system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of approximately $25 billion. No program was adopted.

"If we are ever to solve our mounting traffic problem, the whole interstate system must be authorized as one project, to be completed approximately within the specified time. Only in this way can industry efficiently gear itself to the job ahead. Only in this way can the required planning and engineering be accomplished without the confusion and waste unavoidable in a piecemeal approach. Furthermore, as I pointed out last year, the pressing nature of this problem must not lead us to solutions outside the bounds of sound fiscal management. As in the case of other pressing problems, there must be an adequate plan of financing. To continue the drastically needed improvement in other national highway systems, I recommend the continuation of the Federal aid highway program."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"Other changes in tax rates: In order to make highway-related taxes support our vast highway expenditures, excises on motor fuels need to be increased 1½ cents a gallon to 4½ cents. These receipts will go into the highway trust fund and preserve the pay-as-we-go principle, so that contributions from general tax funds to build Federal-aid highways will not be necessary.

"Estimated savings to the general taxpayers from more adequate fees and charges

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1960	Full annual effect [1]
Support highway expenditures by highway-related taxes: [2]		
Finance deficiency estimated under present law	$241.0	$818.0
Transfer financing of forest and public lands highways to trust fund	41.0	41.0
Revise postal rates	350.0	350.0
Charge specifically for use of Federal airways:		
Transfer aviation fuel taxes from highway trust fund to general fund	34.0	34.0
Increase taxes on aviation fuels	51.0	70.0
Revise fee schedule for noncompetitive oil and gas leases	----------	14.0
Raise patent and trademark fees	3.5	3.5
Miscellaneous increased fees and cost recoveries	11.5	20.8
Total	732.0	1,351.3

[1] Net change on annual basis with present workload or first full fiscal year effect.

[2] Trust fund receipts, as distinct from budgetary savings, will be increased by an estimated net amount of $690,000,000 in 1960 and nearly $900,000,000 in subsequent years."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"Highways: The comprehensive highway program enacted in 1956 established the principle that highway users, rather than the general taxpayers, should pay the cost of Federal-aid highways. The larger contract authority enacted in 1958, however, will create a cumulative deficit in the highway trust fund under present law of $241 million by the end of the fiscal year 1960, and about $2.2 billion by the end of 1962.

"To maintain the trust fund on a self-supporting basis, I am recommending a temporary increase of 1½ cents in highway fuel taxes, to become effective July 1, 1959, and to remain in effect through the fiscal year 1964. This increase is necessary to assure availability of the entire 1961 and 1962 Federal-aid highway authorizations without waiving provisions in the basic legislation which limit expenditures to the amounts available in the trust fund.

"Highway trust fund

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Expenditures	Receipts	Year-end balance
Under existing legislation:			
1957	$966	$1,482	$516
1958	1,602	2,134	1,049
1959 estimate	2,553	2,143	639
1960 estimate	3,102	2,222	−241
1961 estimate	3,109	2,291	−1,059
1962 estimate	3,484	2,377	−2,166
After enactment of proposed legislation:			
1960 estimate	3,136	2,912	415
1961 estimate	3,180	3,175	410
1962 estimate	3,558	3,296	148"

Economic report, January 20, 1959:

"Certain actions by the Congress are needed to give effect to the 1960 financial plan. First, changes are required in the laws affecting Federal revenues: the corporate income tax and excise taxes on automobiles and parts, cigarettes, distilled spirits, and wines and beer should be continued at their present levels for 1 year beyond June 30, 1959; a temporary increase in the Federal motor fuel tax should be enacted to continue construction of the Interstate Highway System on a self-sustaining basis; the tax on aviation gasoline should be raised, and a similar rate for jet fuels, now tax free, should be enacted, to help pay the Federal cost of operating the airways; and a revision in postal rates should be authorized."

Special message, May 13, 1959:

"1. To avert a serious disruption of the interstate highway program due to an impending deficit in the highway trust fund, I recommended a temporary increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"I urge the Congress again to increase the highway fuel tax by another one-half cent per gallon and to continue the tax at 4½ cents until June 30, 1964. This will permit the construction program for the Interstate System to proceed at a higher and more desirable level. I request repeal of the diversion of excise taxes enacted last year for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1964. New reports giving estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System and recommendations on the allocation of costs among future highway beneficiaries will become available in 1961. At the appropriate time, further recommendations will be made to the Congress for the ensuing conduct and financing of the program.

"A temporary advance of $359 million from the Treasury to the trust fund was necessary in fiscal 1960 to balance out the monthly flow of revenues and expenditures within the fiscal year, but this will be repaid by June 30, 1960. A similar temporary advance of $200 million will be required in the fiscal year 1961, repayable before the end of that year.

"During this session of the Congress, funds should be authorized for 1962 and 1963 for regular Federal-aid highway programs and for forest and public lands highways. In view of the limited resources available to the trust fund and the priority requirements of the Interstate System, it is recommended that authorizations for the regular programs for each of these years be reduced to $900 million from $925 million provided for 1961. Annual authorizations of $33 million for forest highways and $3 million for public lands highways are also recommended.

"Finally, I again request that the financing of forest and public lands highways be transferred from the general fund to the highway trust fund. Most of these

highways are integral parts of the Federal-aid systems, and they should be financed in the same way."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"We also owe it to America to provide adequate new revenues for the highway trust fund (as my proposal for a gasoline tax increase would do), so that we may keep our very important highway program on schedule; and fiscal responsibility dictates that we not fail to raise postal rates and thus end the heavy drain on general revenues for postal services which Congress has said by law should be self-sustaining. Our other revenue proposals—notably, extension of certain excise taxes and an added tax on aviation fuel—also need to be approved."

AVIATION FUEL TAX

Budget message for 1959, January 13, 1958:

"In the field of aviation, the Federal Government provides a wide range of special services benefiting private users of the airspace. As I have previously pointed out, it is increasingly appropriate that these users pay their fair share of the costs. As first steps toward this end, this budget proposes that a tax of 3½ cents a gallon be levied on jet fuels and that taxes on aviation gasoline be increased to 3½ cents a gallon from the present 2 cents, with increases of three-fourths cent per year for 4 years in both taxes up to 6½ cents a gallon. The receipts from taxes on aviation gasoline, which now go into the highway trust fund, should be kept in the general revenues to help finance the operations of the airways."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"Airway user charges: The magnitude of the burden on the general taxpayers for rising airway expenditures makes it essential that users of the facilities pay a greater share of the cost. To this end, legislation will be transmitted to raise the effective tax on aviation gasoline from 2 cents to 4½ cents in 1960 and to levy the same tax on jet fuels, which are now tax-free. These increased costs should be includible, along with other airline costs, in determining the rates charged the ultimate users of air transportation. Receipts from taxes on aviation gasoline should not be used for highways; they should be retained in the general fund instead of being transferred to the highway trust fund. These changes in revenue laws will increase general fund receipts by an estimated $85 million in fiscal 1960 and by somewhat larger amounts in subsequent years."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Aviation fuel taxes: To help defray the cost of the Federal airways system, the effective excise tax rate on aviation gasoline should be promptly increased from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and an equivalent excise tax should be imposed on jet fuels, which now are untaxed. The conversion from piston engines to jets is resulting in serious revenue losses to the Government. These losses will increase unless the tax on jet fuels is promptly enacted. The revenues from all taxes on aviation fuels should be credited to general budget receipts, as a partial offset to the budgetary costs of the airways system, and clearly should not be deposited in the highway trust fund."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Airway user charges: Consistent with the principle that special beneficiaries of Government programs should pay the cost of those benefits, the users of the Federal airways should ultimately be expected to pay their full share of rising capital and operating costs. Accordingly, the effective tax on aviation gasoline should be raised from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and the same tax should also be levied on jet fuels, which are now tax free. Receipts from all aviation fuel taxes should be retained in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund as at present. These actions will increase revenues to the general fund by an estimated $89 million in fiscal year 1961."

Economic Report, January 20, 1960:

"The Congress has also been requested to make certain corrective amendments in the tax laws applicable to cooperatives; to preclude unintended and excessive percentage depletion allowances for mineral products, if this problem is not satisfactorily resolved through litigation pending before the Supreme Court; to tax as ordinary income any gain realized by the sale of depreciable personal property used in business, to the extent of the depreciation deductions previously taken on the property; to defer the taxation of income earned in less developed countries of the world; to increase the aviation fuel tax to 4½ cents per gallon; and to impose a tax of 4½ cents per gallon on jet fuel. To assure construction of the Interstate Highway System at a high rate and on a self-supporting basis, the Congress has been asked to increase the highway fuel tax by ½ cent per gallon and to continue the tax at 4½ cents per gallon until June 30, 1964."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"We also owe it to America to provide adequate new revenues for the highway trust fund (as my proposal for a gasoline tax increase would do), so that we may keep our very important highway program on schedule; and fiscal responsibility dictates that we not fail to raise postal rates and thus end the heavy drain on general revenues for postal services which Congress has said by law should be self-sustaining. Our other revenue proposals—notably, extension of certain excise taxes and an added tax on aviation fuel—also need to be approved."

INTEREST RATES

Special message, June 8, 1959:

"I am, therefore, asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress today proposed legislation designed to improve significantly the Government's ability to manage its debt in the best interest of the Nation.

"The legislation provides principally for—

"(1) Removal of the present 3.26 percent interest rate ceiling on savings bonds. This, together with other changes, will reinvigorate the savings bond program.

"(2) Removal of the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on new issues of Treasury bonds. The present ceiling seriously restricts Treasury debt management and is inconsistent with the flexibility which the Secretary of the Treasury has on rates paid on shorter term borrowing.

"(3) An increase in the regular public debt limit from $283 billion to $288 billion, and an increase in the temporary limit from $288 billion to $295 billion. These increases are essential to the orderly and prudent conduct of the financial operations of the Government, even with expenditures covered by revenues in the fiscal year 1960, as the budget proposes.

"SAVINGS BONDS

"Removal of the present 3.26-percent maximum limit on savings bond interest, together with certain other changes will permit the Treasury to improve the terms of savings bonds. This will strengthen the contribution of the program both to habits of thrift throughout the Nation and to a better structure of the public debt.

"The Treasury is proposing the following revisions in the savings bond program, subject to approval of enabling legislation: A 3¾-percent interest rate to maturity for all series E and H savings bonds sold on or after June 1, 1959; an improved interest rate on all series E and H bonds outstanding and continued to be held; and improved extension terms for outstanding series E bonds when they mature.

"FOUR AND ONE-QUARTER PERCENT MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE ON NEW BOND ISSUES

"There is no statutory maximum on the interest rate which can be paid by the Treasury for marketable borrowings of 5 years or less (bills, certificates, and notes). The Secretary of the Treasury should have similar flexibility with regard to Treasury bonds (which run 5 years or more to maturity).

"The Treasury always tries to borrow as economically as it can, consistent with its other debt management objectives. But in our democracy no man can be compelled to lend to the Government on terms he would not voluntarily accept. Therefore, when the Government borrows, it can do so successfully only at realistic rates of interest that are determined by the supply and demand for securities, as reflected in the prices and yields of outstanding issues established competitively in the Government securities market.

"I am aware of the fact that many proposals have been made which are designed to produce lower interest rates. However, any debt management device which would seek to interfere with the natural interaction of the competitive forces of our free economy and produce unnatural reductions in interest rates would not only breach the fundamental principles of the free market, but under current conditions could be drastically inflationary. The additional cost to the Government alone from increased prices of the goods and services it must buy might far exceed any interest saving. The ultimate harm to the entire Nation of such a price rise could be incalculable.

"Market yields on a number of Treasury bonds are already above 4¼ percent. With one exception all bonds which have 5 years or more to run to maturity have market yields above 4 percent. The Treasury recently has done substantial short-term borrowing. But it must avoid undue shortening of the public debt and therefore should continue to sell intermediate and longer term bonds whenever market conditions permit. It should not be prohibited from doing so by the existence of an artificial ceiling which under today's conditions makes it virtually impossible to sell bonds in the competitive market."

Special message, August 26, 1959:

"On June 8, I transmitted to Congress a message requesting legislation that would (1) remove the artificial limitation which the law now imposes on the interest rate at which the Treasury is allowed to borrow money for more than 5 years, and (2) remove a similar limitation on the rate the Government can pay on savings bonds.

"Last week, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives voted to suspend consideration of these proposals for the remainder of this session. This action was a grave disappointment to me.

"The American people have a tremendous stake in this proposed legislation. Failure to enact it means that—

"Millions of thrifty Americans cannot be fairly treated, since the Treasury will be unable to pay a fair rate of interest on savings bonds;

"The cost of living may rise further, as the Treasury will be forced to manage our $290 billion debt in a way that adds to pressure on prices;

"Responsible people at home and abroad can only conclude that we have not yet determined to manage our financial affairs as soundly as we should.

"I would like to make two things absolutely clear:

"First, the administration is willing to assume full responsibility for managing the Federal Government's debt if it is allowed to do so free from artificial restrictions and on a parity with other borrowers.

"Second, if the requested legislation is not enacted, those in the Congress who are unwilling to pass it must assume full responsibility for the possibly serious consequences.

"This country's outstanding public debt of almost $290 billion is held by our citizens and financial institutions, and by foreign central banks and investors who have accumulated dollars as part of their reserves. Each investor has his own investment requirements. He buys different kinds of securities in order to meet those needs. Common to all investors, however, is the requirement that the rate of interest paid on the securities be fair and equitable in the light of other investment opportunities and, secondly, that the purchasing power of their invested dollars will not be impaired.

"These considerations apply directly to the way in which the Government handles its debt. There can be no question as to the Government's obligation to deal fairly and justly with the millions of its citizens who invest a portion of their savings, sometimes as a patriotic duty, in Government bonds. And there should be no question as to our determination to manage our debt soundly and in the best interests of all of the people.

"We have worked tirelessly for a balanced budget. We need this balance so that we can avoid the deficits that lead to higher prices, to a rising cost of living, and to an eating away of the value of the billions of dollars that thrifty and farsighted Americans have saved. But congressional inaction on our debt-management proposal could do much to offset the progress we have made toward fiscal responsibility.

"To manage the public debt in a sound manner the Treasury must be able to borrow money for long as well as short periods of time. A 1918 statute now prescribes, however, that we cannot pay more than 4¼ percent for long-term money. So long as the present prosperity contributes to a strong demand for credit, and thus keeps the cost of new long-term borrowing higher than 4¼ percent, we will not be able to borrow for periods longer than 5 years.

"Let me suggest one simple parallel to show why the Treasury should be able to borrow for longer periods. Suppose that an individual had a mortgage on his home that had to be renewed every few months. He would be exposed to every shift in the economy and to every change in financial conditions. Yet, the Congress in effect is forcing the Treasury into this type of exposed position. It is saying to the Treasury, 'When you have any borrowing to do, do it all on a short-term basis.'

"Within the next 12 months the Government must borrow $85 billion to cover maturing securities, redemptions, and seasonal cash needs. This Government, with its great financial resources, can normally carry a sizable amount of short-term debt. But it cannot afford to rely exclusively on borrowing that must be continually renewed. Yet, if the Congress insists that we continue to finance wholly with short-term securities, the whole $290 billion debt will grow shorter and shorter. This will make it even harder to handle in the future.

"The vital interests of all Americans are at stake because excessive reliance on short-term financing can have grave consequences for the purchasing power of the dollar. The issuance of a large amount of short-term Treasury debt would have an effect not greatly different from the issuance of new money. Because these securities are soon to be paid off, their holders can treat them much like ready cash. Moreover, short-term securities are more likely to become lodged in commercial banks. When a commercial bank acquires a million dollars of Government securities, bank deposits rise by a million dollars. This is the same as a million-dollar increase in the money supply. When the money supply builds up too rapidly relative to production, inflation is the result. The piling up of an excessive amount of short-term debt poses a serious threat that may generate both the fear and the fact of future inflation at an unforeseeable time.

"Now, while the Nation is enjoying a period of rapid economic advancement, we want to keep the cost of living steady. And, if we act wisely, we should be able to do so. We must live within our means and we must exercise all the necessary precautions in the use of credit. We have made good progress toward preventing excessive Government spending. But we may fail in our efforts to keep prices from rising if we do not handle our debt in the proper way. This is why the Treasury must have the capacity to finance the Government's requirements in free credit markets without artificial restrictions.

"The need for sound debt management stems not only from domestic considerations. Foreign investors have substantial holdings of our securities, as well as other claims on this Nation. With so large a financial stake in our economy, these foreign central banks and other foreign investors have a very practical interest in the manner in which we handle our affairs. It is essential that they, too, continue to view the American dollar as a strong and stable currency. In a free market economy, confidence is not the simple result of legislation. It is earned by adherence to sound practices.

"Let me state as plainly as I can that this is not legislation to increase interest rates. This administration is not in favor of high interest rates. We always seek to borrow as cheaply as we can without resorting to unsound practices. The Treasury already has the authority to borrow at any rates of interest on obligations up to 5 years. What we are seeking is the authority, already possessed by all other borrowers, to obtain funds for longer periods as well. To prohibit the Treasury from paying the market price for long-term money is just as impracticable as telling the Defense Department that it cannot pay the fair market price for a piece of equipment. The result would be the same in either case: the Government could not get what it needs.

"The need for congressional action with respect to the existing 3.26 percent interest rate ceiling on savings bonds is equally pressing. The Government occupies a dual trusteeship position with respect to the 40 million Americans who own savings bonds and the 8 million people who purchase them regularly. The average holder looks to the Government for a fair rate of return, reasonably competitive with other savings opportunities. The Treasury has announced that when the ceiling is removed, it will immediately raise the rate from 3.25 to 3.75 percent on all newly issued E- and H-bonds, if held to maturity. Whenever legislation is enacted, this rate increase will be made retroactive to June 1, 1959. In addition, the future return to the investor on savings bonds purchased before June 1 and held to maturity would be increased by one-half of 1 percent. These actions would result in fair and equitable rates of return on savings bonds.

"The second part of the trusteeship relationship of the Government with respect to holders of savings bonds involves the purchasing power of the dollars invested in the bonds. The savings bond holder expects the Government to try to insure that the future value of his savings will not be eaten away by progressive erosion of the dollar. To help assure that the value of the dollar will be protected, the whole debt-management proposal should be enacted.

"Each of these trusteeship considerations is vital; the thrifty American is entitled to both.

"The issue with respect to our legislative proposals is whether we are going to demonstrate responsibility in the management of our Federal debt. Ours is the richest economy in the world. We have a large public debt, but we can certainly handle it soundly and efficiently if we remove the artificial obstacles to borrowing competitively in the free market. By adopting the administration's proposals, the Congress would be demonstrating to people at home and abroad that we have the determination to preserve our financial integrity and to protect our currency.

"No issue of greater importance has come before this session of Congress. In the best interests of the American people, I urge the Congress to enact the administration's proposals at this session."

State of the Union message, January 7, 1960:

"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."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Interest ceiling: Effective management of a debt of this size requires a reasonable distribution among securities maturing at different times. Three-fourths of all marketable Treasury securities outstanding today come due in less than 5 years, of which $80 billion will mature in less than a year. As long as the rate that would have to be paid on newly issued bonds exceeds the present statutory ceiling of 4¼ percent, it is impossible to issue and sell any marketable securities of over 5 years' maturity.

"Exclusive reliance on borrowing in a limited sector of the market is an expensive and inefficient way to manage the debt. Inflationary pressures increase as the volume of short-term and hence highly liquid securities mounts, especially if these securities are acquired by commercial banks. Further, effective monetary policy becomes more difficult when the Treasury has to refinance often. To make possible prudent and flexible management of the public debt, to permit sale of a modest amount of intermediate and longer term bonds when market conditions warrant such action, and to keep the average maturity of the debt from constantly shortening, it is imperative that the Congress immediately act to remove the 42-year-old 4¼-percent limitation on interest rates on Government securities maturing after 5 years (p. 9)."

"For a year and a half now, market rates of interest have been increasing, reflecting inflationary pressures, the high level of investment demands in our economy and heavy Federal borrowing required by the 1958 and 1959 budget deficits. The rise in market rates requires the Treasury to pay higher interest on securities issued to refinance the heavy volume of maturing obligations, which were issued when interest rates were lower.

"It is imperative that the Congress lift the present legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates on all Government obligations having maturities of more than 5 years. Otherwise, interest payments could rise even more sharply. The current interest rate on shorter term securities is now higher than on long-term bonds, and the continued need to limit financing to the short-term market tends to raise interest rates more than if the financing could be spread over both the short- and long-term markets (p. 68)."

Economic report, January 20:

"A major proposal has been made to the Congress for legislative action in the field of public debt management. This proposal

is of particular importance in view of the large amount of the public debt, now more than $290 billion, and its heavy cost, involving interest payments in the fiscal year 1960 estimated at $9.3 billion. Specifically, the Congress is requested to remove the 4¼ percent ceiling on the interest rate which can be paid on U.S. Government securities with a maturity of more than 5 years. Events since this request was first made have underscored its importance for minimizing the hazard of creating inflationary pressures through public debt transactions; for giving greater latitude in the conduct of monetary and credit policies conducive to the growth and stability of the economy; and for financing the debt as economically as possible."

Special message, May 3, 1960, page 4:

"Next I refer to my request of last June to remove the statutory prohibition against the Treasury's paying more than 4¼ percent interest on Treasury bonds which are due more than 5 years after issuance.

"The American people have a great deal at stake in this legislation, for failure to remove this interest rate restriction can have many serious consequences, including the forcing of a new upturn in living costs. The Treasury, under this restriction, continually faces the prospect of having to manage the Government's $290 billion debt in ways that would unavoidably increase the upward pressures on prices and on the interest rate for the consumer credit so important to millions of our citizens.

"Again, I stress the need for prompt removal of this harmful restriction."

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

State of the Union message, July 1954, page 10:

"POST OFFICE

"It is apparent that the substantial savings already made, and to be made, by the Post Office Department cannot eliminate the postal deficit. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress approve the bill now pending in the House of Representatives providing for the adjustment of certain postal rates. To handle the long-term aspects of this, I also recommend that the Congress create a permanent commission to establish fair and reasonable postal rates from time to time in the future."

Budget message for 1955, January 21, 1954, pages 91–92:

"Most important, prompt and favorable action by the Congress is needed to increase postal rates. I am recommending increases in rates sufficient to yield as a minimum an additional $240 million in revenues in the fiscal year 1955. These revenues would reduce the 1955 postal deficit to $90 million. Adequate rates, together with further major economies in postal operations, are expected to put the postal business on a self-supporting basis. This will continue to be our policy."

Special message to Congress, January 11, 1955:

"The Post Office Department, in its daily operations, affects the entire life of the Republic from the family home to the great industry. A vast business-type enterprise within Government, the Post Office Department, consequently, requires a continuing vigilance that its methods, practices, and policies assure the most efficient possible service to the public. The measures recommended in this message are designed to that end.

"Last August 23, in announcing my disapproval of H.R. 7774, an act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes, I expressed a purpose to continue to encourage the enactment of legislation to correct obvious distortions in the pay scales of the postal service and to provide for a more proper and effective relationship between pay and work performed.

"I also pointed out the necessity of adequate postage rates in order to check a deficit in the operation of the Post Office Department which, since World War II, has reached the staggering total of more than $4 billion.

"An increase in the average wage of postal employees, along with correction of the serious inequities in the salary structure, is an essential step in bringing the wage scale into line with nongovernmental standards and in furthering the progressive personnel program to which the administration is committed. The increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the wages for postal-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

"In order to accomplish these objectives, the Postmaster General will submit to the Congress a new postal salary plan, along with a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates. This plan will include reasonably detailed descriptions of the series of key positions to which the great majority of postal employees are assigned. A rate range for each of these positions will be recommended and, together this series of rate ranges will make up a related, uniform, and equitable salary schedule.

"The Congress will be asked to include the key position descriptions and their appropriate salary ranges in the legislation, thus assigning specific wage rates to the bulk of the positions common to all offices of the postal service.

"The Post Office Department should then be granted the authority to allocate the remaining positions, held by the relatively few employees whose work is not covered by a key position, to the proper level in the salary schedule on the basis of a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of these positions with the duties and responsibilities of the key positions.

"In the allocation of the positions other than the key positions to the proper salary level an appeal procedure will be provided. Further, to insure that the salary plan will not work to the disadvantage of any employee, the legislation proposed will incorporate a guaranty against reduction of salary so long as the employee occupies the same or a position comparable to that which he held at the time of the installation of the plan.

"This legislation would eliminate the inequities inherent in the present inflexible system which requires assignment of all employees to a limited number of job titles, in many cases having no relation to the work actually performed. The present practice of paying salaries to some employees on the basis of the number of cubic feet in the area they supervise, or solely in relation to the number of employees under their direction, would be replaced by a system requiring that salaries be based on the actual duties and responsibilities of the position.

"Under this plan, postmasters of the Nation would receive salaries commensurate with the volume of work and the level of the responsibility of their offices rather than solely on the basis of cash receipts which presently govern their compensation. This practice results in discrimination against those holding offices where incoming mail represents most of the business volume.

"The total cost of wage adjustments in the postal service is estimated at $129 million a year. I recommend adoption of legislation incorporating these proposals.

"The 83d Congress authorized appropriations to be made for the furnishing of uniforms or the payment of an annual allowance to employees, including those of the Post Office Department, required by law or regulation to wear a prescribed uniform while on official duty. This measure, when Congress makes funds available, will benefit post office employees by an estimated $13,500,000 a year.

"I am recommending in another special message today a health insurance plan to round out the Federal personnel benefits program enacted by the 83d Congress. This program already has provided group life insurance, unemployment compensation, elimination of restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements, adjustment of the statutory limit on the number of career employees, elimination of arbitrary restrictions on accumulation of annual leave, and a liberalized incentive awards system.

"I wish to reaffirm my position that sound fiscal management requires consideration of revenues as well as costs. To this end, I am requesting that Congress also consider legislation to adjust postal rates to provide needed revenue.

"The combined postal deficits of the 156 years of our history as a Nation, up to 1945, are far less than the losses sustained in the last 9 years. The anomaly of this situation is that the period which has witnessed this recordbreaking deficit in the operations of the postal service has also been a decade of unprecedented national prosperity. Employment, production, and use of the mails have been at an alltime high and yet postal deficits have occurred year after year. Clearly it is time to reaffirm the need for sound fiscal management of the Post Office Department and to develop a positive program toward this end.

"In fiscal 1954 the Post Office Department received revenues of $2,268 million for services performed at a cost of $2,667 million, thus leaving a deficit of $399 million in its operation. The services performed by the Post Office Department are of measurable value to the recipients. When the rates of postal services fail to provide sufficient revenues to meet the total cost of the service, the difference must be made up by general tax revenues.

"A practice of this kind is neither equitable nor reasonable; it is neither good business nor good government. Even if a case could be made for regarding the postal patron and the taxpayer as one and the same, prudence and good sense would compel us to face the fact that it is far more efficient to collect the necessary revenues in direct exchange for services at the post-office window than by the more costly methods of general taxation.

"The Post Office is constantly working to reduce the deficit by improving the efficiency of its operations. During the last 2 years substantial progress has been made in organization, mail handling, transportation, mechanization, recordkeeping, and accounting methods. The Postmaster General has also taken the initiative in increasing rates and fees within his jurisdiction.

"As a result of these measures there has been a recent reversal of the postwar trend of ever-increasing postal deficits. These are the operating deficits for each of the last 5 years:

Fiscal year:	*Operating deficit*
1950	$589,500,000
1951	551,500,000
1952	727,000,000
1953	618,800,000
1954	399,100,000

"The large deficits in the postwar years are, in part, a direct consequence of the same inflationary increases in costs which all business operations have faced. Private business has increased prices of goods and services to offset increased costs of production. The Post Office operates in the same economic climate as private business. It must meet rising costs in very much the same way.

"Since 1945, the largest part of the increase in postal expenditures is accounted for by salary increases legislated by Congress as follows:

"Date	Public Law	Annual increase in cost to Post Office Department
July 1, 1945	134	$178,767,000
Do	106	786,000
Jan. 1, 1946	381	190,631,000
July 1, 1946	390	684,000
Nov. 1, 1949	428 500	112,489,000
Do	429	278,000
July 1, 1951	204	248,600,000
July 8, 1951	201	1,100,000

"These wage adjustments, combined with an expansion in the number of postal employees necessary to handle the greater volume of mail, have resulted in an increase in total salary costs from $858 million in 1945 to $2,002 million in the last fiscal year.

"The increases in wages and other costs since the end of World War II have affected all classes of mail. It is desirable that the rates governing each class of mail be advanced in fair proportion. The committees of Congress responsible for postal-rate legislation will, of course, want to consider carefully the specific rates for each class of mail. The Postmaster General will soon submit to Congress, in addition to his views on increases in postal pay, detailed recommendations for raising postal rates to more reasonable levels. I wish to emphasize at this time a few of the major considerations which seem to me important in raising rates.

"1. First-class mail has always provided by far the greater part of postal revenues. In 1933 the revenue contribution of first-class mail was more than 55 percent of total Post Office revenues. In the last fiscal year first-class mail provided only 40 percent of such revenues although the proportion of first-class volume to the total volume was only 3 percentage points lower than in the earlier year. The failure of this type mail to maintain its revenue contribution is a major factor in the present postal deficit. There is, therefore, an urgent need to increase the rate of postage of first-class mail.

"Postal rates are payments made by users of the mails for services received. The rate established for each service should reflect the value of that service in terms of speed, priority of handling, and the privileges incorporated in each class of mail. If these factors are taken into consideration in ratemaking, the revenue contribution of first-class mail is clearly inadequate.

"The privacy, security, and swift dispatch of letter mail; the priority of service at all times, in all places; and the intrinsic value of such mail are factors which are pertinent to postal ratemaking in addition to the cost factor.

"But the present 3-cent rate for first-class letter mail has not been increased in almost a quarter of a century. During this period the costs of all goods and services have almost doubled. I am convinced that the American people will understand, appreciate, respect, and support congressional action to provide for a long-overdue rate increase on letter mail which will go far toward balancing the postal budget.

"2. The revenues derived from second-class mail are clearly inadequate. These rates which apply to newspapers and magazines should be increased until such matter makes a fair and reasonable contribution to postal revenues. The Postmaster General will recommend a two-step increase in second-class rates which will enable publishers to adjust more readily to the proposed rate changes.

"3. Third-class mail consists largely of advertising matter. In fiscal year 1954 the revenue contribution of such mail fell substantially below the cost of providing this service and was a major factor contributing to the postal deficit. The rates of postage on such matter should be increased so that the users of this class of mail pay a proportionately fair share of postal revenues.

"In view of the recurring fiscal problems of the Post Office Department, and of the heavy burden which postal deficits continue to impose on the Federal Treasury, I strongly recommend to Congress the formal adoption of a policy which will insure that in the future the Post Office Department will be essentially self-supporting.

"Certain services which are performed by the Post Office, such as those for the blind, are a part of general welfare services. The cost of such services should not be borne by users of the mails. Expenditures for them, and for services performed for the Government, should be identified and met by direct appropriation.

"If the Post Office is successfully to meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility.

"There are also other advantages. Such a commission, guided by policies laid down by the Congress, would have the time and facilities to make thorough analytical studies before prescribing rate changes. A commission well versed in the economics of modern pricing practices can continuously appraise and reappraise the soundness of the postal-rate structure. Legislation to secure these ends should be enacted by Congress.

"With these views in mind I recommend to Congress the adoption of a temporary increase in postal rates as an interim measure, and the establishment and activation within the interim period of a permanent commission to prescribe future rate adjustments under broad policy guidance of Congress.

"Let me reiterate—the financial problems of the postal service result, in large measure, from lack of a positive program leading toward a well-defined fiscal goal. I am, therefore, recommending to Congress the following five-point program for the Post Office Department:

"1. Approval of the new salary plan and a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates.

"2. Adoption by Congress of the policy that henceforth the Post Office Department shall be self-supporting.

"3. Separation of those postal costs to be paid by the patron from those costs which should be paid by general taxation.

"4. Establishment by Congress of a permanent Commission authorized to prescribe postal-rate adjustments under policy guidance of Congress.

"5. Enactment by Congress of an interim rate bill which will, pending activation of the Rate Commission, provide immediate revenue to meet proposed pay increases and reduce the postal deficit.

"Approval of this program will be in the public interest for it will further assure efficient service by the Post Office Department."

Budget message for 1957, January 16, 1956, page 68:

"Despite these achievements, the Post Office Department cannot be self-sustaining if it pays salaries, transportation rates, and other costs based upon 1956 conditions, but must continue to charge rates which were largely determined before Pearl Harbor. The postal deficit of $467 million estimated for the fiscal year 1957 represents a subsidy averaging more than 15 cents per dollar of postal service. Legislation is again being proposed that would initially increase postal revenues by $350 million a year. Legislation is also being proposed to pay the Department for services to certain groups which it is now required to perform either free or at greatly reduced rates."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957, page 41:

"Postal service: Over the past few years the Post Office Department has introduced major economies in the processing and handling of mail. These economies, however, have only partially offset the rising costs resulting from a larger mail volume, higher salaries, increased prices for supplies and equipment, and especially the extension of city delivery service to unprecedented numbers of new suburban residential developments. As a result, if present postal rates are not adjusted to cover costs, net expenditures of $642 million will be required in the fiscal year 1958 to make up for insufficient postal receipts.

"The adjustments in rates recommended in this budget are designed to increase postal revenues by $654 million in the fiscal year 1958. If this recommendation is approved by the Congress, a supplemental appropriation, tentatively estimated at $70 million will be proposed to permit investment in equipment and facilities necessary for more efficient handling of the ever-increasing volume of mail. The budget figures reflect these recommendations. Also, the Post Office Department should be specifically reimbursed for the cost—estimated at $28 million in 1958—of services it is required by law or international agreement to perform free or at reduced rates for nonprofit associations and other special groups."

Budget message for 1959, January 13, 1958, pages 39–40:

"In view of present and prospective postal deficits, legislation to authorize adequate postal rates has become one of the most urgent items of unfinished business before the Congress. The House of Representatives has already approved changes in rates for letters, publications, and advertising mail which would add materially to present revenues, but still leave a large deficit. To provide revenues which will more adequately meet present needs, the pending legislation should be amended, primarily by establishing a 5-cent letter rate on all except local letters. This is more than the 4-cent rate I recommended last year for both local and other letters, but it is needed to take account of the pay increase and other higher costs. The recommendations I am making should result in a net increase in postal revenues of about $700 million in the fiscal year 1959. With the postal pay adjustments which are being recommended, the postal deficit will still be substantial."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959, pages 20–21:

"9. Reduce the burden on the general public for services to special groups: Certain Government activities confer measurable special benefits on identifiable groups or individuals beyond the benefits to the general public. The cost of Federal services which convey special benefits should be recovered through charges paid by the beneficiaries rather than through taxes on the general public.

"In furtherance of this principle, the recent Congress approved some adjustments in postal rates, and increased the fees for a few other relatively smaller services. On the other hand, it increased postal employees' pay and highway construction grants without providing the additional charges needed to finance such expenditures. As a result of these and other developments, further legislation is necessary to put the postal service on a self-supporting basis and to finance highway construction without drawing on the general revenues.

"This budget recommends legislation to make the activities listed in the following table more nearly self-supporting:

"Estimated savings to the general taxpayers from more adequate fees and charges

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1960	Full annual effect [1]
Support highway expenditures by highway-related taxes: [2]		
Finance deficiency estimated under present law	$241.0	$818.0
Transfer financing of forest and public lands highways to trust fund	41.0	41.0
Revise postal rates	350.0	350.0
Charge specifically for use of Federal airways:		
Transfer aviation fuel taxes from highway trust fund to general fund	34.0	34.0
Increase taxes on aviation fuels	51.0	70.0
Revise fee schedule for noncompetitive oil and gas leases		14.0
Raise patent and trademark fees	3.5	3.5
Miscellaneous increased fees and cost recoveries	11.5	20.8
Total	732.0	1,351.3

[1] Net change on annual basis with present workload or first full fiscal year effect.

[2] Trust fund receipts, as distinct from budgetary savings, will be increased by an estimated net amount of $690,000,000 in 1960 and nearly $900,000,000 in subsequent years."

Economic Report for 1959, January 20, 1959:

"Certain actions by the Congress are needed to give effect to the 1960 financial plan. First, changes are required in the laws affecting Federal revenues: the corporate income tax and excise taxes on automobiles and parts, cigarettes, distilled spirits, and wines and beer should be continued at their present levels for 1 year beyond June 30, 1959; a temporary increase in the Federal motor fuel tax should be enacted to continue construction of the Interstate Highway System on a self-sustaining basis; the tax on aviation gasoline should be raised, and a similar rate for jet fuels, now tax free, should be enacted, to help pay the Federal cost of operating the airways; and a revision in postal rates should be authorized."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"The Postal Policy Act of 1958 established the policy that postal rates should be adjusted whenever necessary to recover postal expenses, excluding the costs of certain public services as fixed by appropriation acts. Over the past 13 fiscal years, 1947–59, the Federal budget has had to finance postal deficits totaling $6.8 billion, which is almost half of the increase in the national debt during that time. At the average rate of interest on the outstanding debt the taxpayers are paying well over $200 million annually in interest for the unwillingness of the Congress to take timely action to increase postal rates.

"For fiscal 1961, a postal service deficit of $554 million is estimated with postage rates now in effect or scheduled, after designating $49 million as attributable to public services. Rate increases enacted in 1958 were substantially less than needed to meet the deficit at that time and made no allowance for the pay increase for postal employees then enacted. Since then, increased railroad rates (up $55 million), costs of modernization (up $80 million), and the new employee health insurance program ($39 million) have widened the gap between revenues and expenditures.

"Accordingly, legislation is again proposed to increase first-class and airmail rates by 1 cent and to raise other rates and fees by enough to cover the postal deficit. I urge the Congress to act promptly on these proposals, which will be submitted in the near future."

Economic Report for 1960, January 20, 1960:

"In addition, favorable action by the Congress has been requested on an adjustment of postal rates. The effect of the recommended rate increases would be to reduce the deficit on postal operations by about $550 million and to contribute, by this amount, toward the attainment of the desired surplus."

Special message to Congress, March 11, 1960:

"In the budget message I urged the enactment of legislation to increase postal rates in order to eliminate the postal deficit. Several facts indicate the urgency of such action by the Congress.

"The Postal Policy Act of 1958 definitely states that postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time as may be required to produce the amount of revenue approximately equal to the total cost of operating the postal establishment, less the amount attributable to the performance of public services. That act directed the Postmaster General to submit to the Senate and House of Representatives no later than April 15 of this year the results of his survey of the need for the adjustment of postal rates and fees in accordance with this policy.

"Because of the existing inadequate postal rates, the Post Office Department is losing $2 million every working day. In the 13 years from July 1946 to June 1959 the postal deficits have been approximately as much as the entire cost of running the Federal Government in 1938. The cumulative $6.8 billion postal deficit for these 13 years represents nearly one-half of the total increase in the Federal debt during this same 13-year period. Interest charges alone on the debt represented by this cumulative deficit are costing our taxpayers some $200 million each year.

"These huge postal deficits are phenomena of the years since World War II. In the years from 1900 to 1940 the losses of the Post Office Department averaged only $33 million a year. Since that time—excluding the war years—these losses have increased astronomically. The tremendous losses incurred since World War II have been due to the increases in cost of everything the Department uses or buys, and to the failure of the Congress to enact postal rate increases to pay for the added costs. For example, since the increase in the first-class letter rate in 1932 from 2 cents to 3 cents, costs have more than doubled, but the first-class letter rate has been increased only one-third. The annual losses on second- and third-class mail, now in the hundreds of millions of dollars, are likewise growing.

"It is imperative that Congress implement the policy it wisely established in 1958 of providing that the Post Office Department shall operate on a self-supporting basis. The Postmaster General is transmitting to the Congress the administration proposals for increases in postage rates on first, second, and third class mail to yield an estimated $550 million of new postal revenues in the 1961 fiscal year. Responsibility in the handling of our public affairs demands prompt action, in this session, to restore the Post Office Department to its traditional posture of budgetary good sense."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960, page 5:

"We also owe it to America to provide adequate new revenues for the Highway Trust Fund (as my proposal for a gasoline tax increase would do), so that we may keep our very important highway program on schedule; and fiscal responsibility dictates that we not fail to raise postal rates and thus end the heavy drain on general revenues for postal services which Congress has said by law should be self-sustaining."

IMMIGRATION

State of the Union message, February 2, 1953, page 13:

"It is a manifest right of our Government to limit the number of immigrants our Nation can absorb. It is also a manifest right of our Government to set reasonable requirements on the character and the numbers of the people who come to share our land and our freedom.

"It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact: We are—one and all—immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants.

"Existing legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate. I am informed by Members of the Congress that it was realized, at the time of its enactment, that future study of the proper basis of determining quotas would be necessary.

"I am therefore requesting the Congress to review this legislation and to enact a statute which will at one and the same time guard our legitimate national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all."

State of the Union message, January 6, 1955, page 13:

"Two years ago I advised the Congress of injustices under existing immigration laws. Through humane administration, the Department of Justice is doing what it legally can to alleviate hardships. Clearance of aliens before arrival has been initiated and, except for criminal offenders, the imprisonment of aliens awaiting admission or deportation has been stopped. Certain provisions of law, however, have the effect of compelling action in respect to aliens which are inequitable in some instances and discriminatory in others. These provisions should be corrected in this session of the Congress."

Budget message for 1959, January 13, 1958, page 55:

"Last year, the Congress enacted legislation to cover some of my most urgent proposals for amending the immigration laws. I urge that legislation on my remaining proposals be promptly enacted."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959, page 77:

"Other recommendations for legislation: The last Congress enacted legislation to cover some of my most urgent proposals for amending the immigration laws. Legislation on the remaining proposals should be promptly enacted, and the expiring authority to issue visas to certain orphans and to aliens afflicted with tuberculosis should be extended."

Special message to Congress, February 8, 1956:

"Throughout our history immigration to this land has contributed greatly to the strength and character of our Republic. Over the years we have provided for such immigration because it has been to our own national interest that we do so. It is no less to our national interest that we do so under laws that operate equitably.

"The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization have made a thorough study of the operation of our present immigration laws, and have advised me concerning the changes and additions which they consider necessary in the national interest. I have carefully reviewed their findings and concur in their conclusions. The recommendations now made are based on those findings and conclusions.

"This message takes up four separate and distinct subject matters respecting our immigration policies: (1) The quota system and use of national origins, (2) the private-relief-bill system of handling hardship cases, (3) unnecessary restrictions and administrative provisions of our immigration laws, and (4) judicial review in deportation. Each such subject matter is treated separately because the problems in each are

wholly distinct from the otherrs. Accordingly, the recommendations as to each subject matter will, I hope, be considered separately and each on its own merit.

"I

"The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was developed essentially as a codification of many separate, and sometimes overlapping and inconsistent, immigration and nationality laws. It was thought inappropriate, in connection with that legislation, to revise our basic immigration policies. Moreover, at that time 1950 census information was incomplete.

"The time has now come to consider those policies. Experience in the postwar world demonstrates that the present national-origins method of admitting aliens needs to be reexamined, and a new system adopted which will admit aliens within allowable numbers according to new guidelines and standards.

"The Congress has traditionally formulated our basic immigration policies, and will doubtless wish to make its decision as to what new system should be established only after its own study and investigation of all possible choices. There are many factors that must be taken into consideration. Among these are: The needs of this country for persons having specialized skills or cultural accomplishments; close family relationships; the populations and immigration policies of countries sending immigrants to this country; their past immigration and trade relationships with this country; and their assistance to the joint defense of the friendly free nations of the world.

"Pending the completion by the Congress of such study and investigation, it is essential that we take interim measures to alleviate as much as possible inequities in the present quota system. Accordingly, I recommend the immediate enactment of the following proposals.

"First, the present quota system sets a maximum annual authorization of 154,657 quota immigrants. This figure is derived from a formula based upon the 1920 population. I recommend that total population as shown by the 1950 census be used as the base for determining the overall ceiling. I believe that economic growth over the past 30 years and present economic conditions justify an increase of approximately 65,000 in quota numbers. I recommend that Congress provide for such an increase by fixing the overall ceiling in terms of a percentage of total population as shown by the 1950 census. The new ceiling recommended would be approximately 220,000 quota numbers annually.

"In order to eliminate some of the inequity resulting from the fact that several countries have large quotas which they do not use while others have small quotas which are usually oversubscribed, I recommend that the additional quota numbers—i.e., those over and above the 154,657 numbers now provided for—be distributed among countries in proportion to their actual immigration to this country since the establishment of the quota system in 1924.

"This method of allocation will help to alleviate the problem of oversubscribed quotas. At the same time no country will have a lesser number of quota numbers allocated to it than at present.

"Second, I recommend that the Congress set aside from the increased annual quota 5,000 numbers to be available for admission of aliens without regard to nationality or national origin. Use of these numbers would enable us to meet some of the needs of this country which develop from time to time for persons with special skills and cultural or technical qualifications.

"The existing immigration law recognizes somewhat similar criteria for quota immigrants by giving a preference to those whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability—and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Our needs and requirements should be determined on the basis of consultation among the various departments and agencies of the Government, and also with the advice and testimony of private organizations.

"This special pool has further value as an experimental plan departing entirely from our present system of distributing quotas on a basis of nationality or place of birth. It also would enable us to give greater assistance to persons abroad who have undergone suffering and hardship resisting Communist aggression, who would make beneficial contributions to this country, and who will not have the benefit of the Refugee Relief Act after that act's termination.

"Third, quota numbers that are unused by countries to which they are allocated should be made available for use elsewhere. Under our present law quota numbers which are unused by any particular country in the year in which they are available become void and may not be used by any other country.

"I recommend enactment of legislation that will permit the utilization of unused quota numbers in the succeeding year. This should be done by pooling the unused quota numbers in each of the following areas: Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Ocean area. These pooled quota numbers would then be distributed during a 12-month period on a first-come, first-served basis among eligible applicants of the area, without regard to country of birth within the area. These quotas should be limited to aliens who qualify for preference status under existing law—persons having special skills or close relatives in the United States.

"There is a further inequity in the quota system by virtue of the so-called mortgage on quotas resulting from the issuance of visas under the Displaced Persons Act and other special acts. The law provides that visas issued under these acts are chargeable against quotas authorized under the Immigration Act. The result is that the quotas of many countries are mortgaged far into the future. For example, 50 percent of the quota for Greece is mortgaged until the year 2017; for Lithuania, until 2090; for Latvia, until 2274. The total number so mortgaged for the year 1955 amounted to about 8,000, and over the total span of years the aggregate could be as much as 328,000. I recommend the elimination of this unfairness. This is consistent with the action of the Congress in enacting the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Congress did not then impose additional mortgages on quotas but provided special nonquota visas for eligible refugees.

"II

"For some time I have considered that undue and largely useless burdens are placed upon the Congress and the President by the avalanche in recent years of private bills for the relief of aliens. The number of these bills is strikingly high in comparison with the number of public enactments. In the 1st session of the 84th Congress private immigration enactments alone accounted for 413 of 880 enactments, public and private; 3,059 such bills were introduced. During the 83d Congress, private immigration enactments accounted for 753 of 1,788 enactments, both public and private; 4,797 such bills were introduced. At the beginning of the present session, there were 2,159 private immigration measures pending.

"The Congress, in the performance of its constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each private immigration bill introduced. The President, in the performance of his constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each bill enacted. The Nation's interest would surely be better served if the bulk of these private immigration claims were handled through suitable administrative machinery and if the Congress and the Executive could thus give their full attention to more urgent national problems.

"Under the private bill system of handling individual immigration cases, many persons fail to obtain the very relief which others have received, because Congress has not had the time to take up and act on the bills introduced for their benefit. Indeed there are many whose plight has not even come to the attention of the Congress.

"For these reasons it is my belief that action is called for to provide the necessary administrative authority to take care of such cases. I hope that such action will be taken without delay so that it may be of help this year. The enactment of such authority, in my opinion, would substantially eliminate the need for private legislative redress in this area. I suggest that there should be vested in the Attorney General limited discretionary powers to grant relief with respect to admission and deportation of aliens. Such discretion should be limited to aliens with close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations, regardless of the technical statutory ground on which the alien is inadmissible or subject to deportation. These classes of cases embrace the great bulk of the hardship cases which appeal to our sense of fairness. However, no relief ought to be accorded aliens whose presence here would be dangerous to the safety and security of the United States. An appropriate charge against the applicable quota would be made in each case where relief is granted.

"It should further be provided by the Congress that there shall be a ceiling on the number of cases in which such discretionary authority may be exercised.

"III

"Experience under the existing immigration law has established that there are a number of changes, aside from the quota provisions, which should be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Some provisions create unnecessary restrictions upon travel to the United States, while others inflict great hardships upon the aliens affected. Consequently, I make the following recommendations:

"Under the present law, every alien applying for a visa must be fingerprinted; and every alien admitted without a visa and remaining in the United States for 30 days or longer, even if here temporarily, must be fingerprinted. Although in our minds no stigma is attached to fingerprinting, it is not a requirement of travel in other countries. We should be the first to remove travel obstacles which hamper the free exchange of ideas, cultures, and commerce. Further, experience over the last 3 years has shown that this requirement does not significantly contribute to our national safety and security. The law should be amended to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive the requirement of fingerprinting, on a reciprocal basis, for aliens coming here for temporary periods.

"We must recognize the tremendous increase in air and surface travel in recent years. Aliens traveling from one country to another often find it necessary to pass through the United States without any intention to remain in or even visit this country. A South American flying to or returning from Europe, for example, will often pass through the United States. He should not be required to meet all of the standards for admission, coupled with inspection and examination, that normally apply. These

requirements result in unnecessary hardships to the traveler, expense to the carrier, and loss of good will, without proportionate benefit to the United States. The law should be amended accordingly.

"The present statute contains a restrictive requirement which makes it necessary for immigration authorities to inspect and apply all grounds of exclusion to aliens seeking admission to the mainland of the United States from Alaska and Hawaii. This requirement results in expense to the Government and causes delays and inconvenience in travel. It must be remembered that, by definition in the law, these Territories are part of the United States, and aliens who have entered or are present in them are subject to all the provisions of the act. If the alien was deportable before he came to the mainland, he remains deportable. I recommend the elimination from the law of this unnecessary restriction upon travel.

"The immigration laws presently require aliens to specify race and ethnic classification in visa applications. These provisions are unnecessary and should be repealed.

"A large group of refugees in this country obtained visas by the use of false identities in order to escape forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain; the number may run into the thousands. Under existing law such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation. The law should be amended to give relief to these unfortunate people.

"The inequitable provisions relating to Asian spouses and adopted children should be repealed.

"The Immigration Act grants special naturalization benefits to veterans of our Armed Forces who have completed at least 3 years' honorable service and who can submit proof of admission for permanent residence. Many have been unable to submit this proof. I recommend that proof of admission be not required in such cases.

"The present statute is unnecessarily restrictive as to aliens who marry U.S. citizens. It forbids adjustment to permanent residence if the alien has been in the United States less than 1 year before the marriage. This disrupts the family and is expensive for the alien who must go abroad to obtain a nonquota visa, without proportionate benefit to the United States. I recommend that the requirement of 1 year's presence in the United States before marriage be repealed.

"The above covers the principal changes which I recommend as a minimum toward amelioration of the immigration laws. Others will be suggested by the Attorney General.

"IV

"Just as the Nation's interests call for a larger degree of flexibility in the laws for regulating the flow of other peoples to our shores, there is at the same time a significant need to strengthen the laws established for the wholesome purpose of ridding the country of the relatively few aliens who have demonstrated their unfitness to remain in our midst. Some of these persons have been found to be criminals of the lowest character, trafficking in murder, narcotics, and subversion. Constitutional due process wisely confers upon any alien, whatever the charge, the right to challenge in the courts the Government's finding of deportability. However, no alien who has once had his day in court, with full rights of appeal to the higher courts, should be permitted to block his removal and cause unnecessary expense to the Government by further judicial appeals the only purpose of which is delay. I am concerned by the growing frequency of such cases involving as they often do the depraved and confirmed criminal. Accordingly, I have asked the Attorney General to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal that will remedy this abuse of legal process.

"I believe that these changes in our immigration and nationality laws, together with the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act which I have heretofore recommended to the Congress, not only will advance our own self-interest, but also will serve as living demonstrations that we recognize our responsibilities of world leadership. I urge their careful consideration by the Congress."

Special message to Congress March 17, 1960:

"I again urge the liberalization of some of our existing restrictions upon immigration.

"The strength of this Nation may be measured in many ways—military might, industrial productivity, scientific contributions, its system of justice, its freedom from autocracy, the fertility of its land and the prowess of its people. Yet no analytical study can so dramatically demonstrate its position in the world as the simple truth that here, more than any other place, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter and establish their homes and raise their children.

"To the extent possible, without dislocating the lives of those already living here, this flow of immigration to this country must be encouraged. These persons who seek entry to this country seek more than a share in our material prosperity. The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts. Their real concern is with their children, and as a result those who have struggled for the right of American citizenship have, in countless ways, shown a deep appreciation of its responsibilities. The names of those who make important contributions in the fields of science, law, and almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which the immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them.

"In the world of today our immigration law badly needs revision.

"Ideally, I believe that this could perhaps be accomplished best by leaving immigration policy subject to flexible standards. While I realize that such a departure from the past is unlikely now, a number of bills have already been introduced which contain the elements of such an idea. The time is ripe for their serious consideration so that the framework of a new pattern may begin to evolve.

"For immediate action in this session I urge two major acts.

"First, we should double the 154,000 quota immigrants that we are presently taking into our country.

"Second, we should make special provision for the absorption of many thousands of persons who are refugees without a country as a result of political upheavals and their flight from persecution.

"The first proposal would liberalize the quotas for every country and, to an important extent, moderate the features of existing law which operate unfairly in certain areas of the world. In this regard, I recommend the following steps:

"1. The removal of the ceiling of 2,000 on quotas within the Asiatic-Pacific triangle;

"2. The basing of the overall limitation on immigration on the 1960 census as soon as it is available in place of that of 1920 which is the present base;

"3. The annual acceptance of one-sixth of 1 percent of our total population;

"4. Abandonment of the concept of race and ethnic classifications within our population, at least for the purposes of the increases in quotas I have recommended, by substituting as the base for computation the number of immigrants actually accepted from each area between 1924 and 1959. In other words the increase in the quota for Italy, for example, would not be based upon a percentage of a so-called Italian ethnic group within our country, but upon a percentage of actual immigration from Italy between 1924 and 1959; and

"5. The unused quotas of undersubscribed countries should be distributed among the oversubscribed countries. This distribution should be in proportion to the quotas of the oversubscribed countries.

"My second major proposal is for authorization for the parole into this country of refugees from oppression. They are persons who have been forced to flee from their homes because of persecution or fear of persecution based upon race, religion, or political opinions, or they are victims of world political upheaval or national calamity which makes it impossible for them to return to their former homes.

"This year has been designated World Refugee Year. The United States and 68 other nations have joined together in an attempt to seek permanent solutions for the problems of these peoples. Nations who in the past have granted entry to the victims of political or religious persecutions have never had cause to regret extending such asylum. These persons with their intellectual idealism and toughness will become worthwhile citizens and will keep this Nation strong and respected as a contributor of thought and ideals.

"I have asked the Attorney General to submit a draft of legislation to implement the recommendations I have made. The administration stands ready to supply whatever information is necessary to permit appropriate action by the Congress during its present session. If, notwithstanding my specific recommendations, the Congress should enact other or different liberalizations of our immigration law that are constructive, I will be glad to approve them."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"GENERAL GOVERNMENT

"Budget totals

"[In billions]

Expenditures:	
1959, actual	$1.6
1960, estimated	1.7
1961, estimated	1.9
New obligational authority:	
1959, actual	1.8
1960, estimated	1.6
1961, estimated	1.9

"LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

"1. Establish policy for financing civil service retirement.

"2. Charge civil service benefits for certain widows and retired employees to trust fund after 1961.

"3. Make 1958 salary increase for Post Office field personnel permanent.

"4. Revise laws to reflect admission of State of Hawaii.

"5. Provide home rule for District of Columbia.

"6. Create transportation corporation for National Capital area.

"7. Authorize nonvoting resident commissioners for Guam and Virgin Islands.

"8. Amend immigration and nationality laws.

"9. Include goal of price stability in Employment Act.

"10. Enact civil rights legislation.

"11. Create additional Federal judgeships.

"12. Strengthen laws against organized crime.

"13. Increase authorization for Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

"14. Reimburse citizens for certain World War II property damage.

"15. Authorize civilian achievement awards.

"Other recommendations: Legislation enacted in the last session of Congress to amend the immigration and nationality laws failed to cover several significant proposals, including modification of the quota system. Prompt action is needed on these remaining items."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960, page 5:

"Additionally, as I recently emphasized by special message to the Congress, we have compelling reasons to liberalize our immigration law during the course of this session. I remind the Congress, also, that this is World Refugee Year. Our country was one of those sponsoring this move in the United Nations. In harmony with the spirit of this resolution, and in keeping with America's tradition of leadership in humanitarian causes, we should press forward, in this session, with the refugee legislation I have recommended to the Congress."

REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY

State of the Union message, February 2, 1953:

"I am determined to meet this responsibility of the Executive. The heads of all executive departments and agencies have been instructed to initiate at once effective programs of security with respect to their personnel. The Attorney General will advise and guide the departments and agencies in the shaping of these programs, designed at once to govern the employment of new personnel and to review speedily any derogatory information concerning incumbent personnel.

"To carry out these programs, I believe that the powers of the executive branch under existing law are sufficient. If they should prove inadequate, the necessary legislation will be requested.

"These programs will be both fair to the rights of the individual and effective for the safety of the Nation. They will, with care and justice, apply the basic principle that public employment is not a right but a privilege.

"All these measures have two clear purposes: Their first purpose is to make certain that this Nation's security is not jeopardized by false servants. Their second purpose is to clear the atmosphere of that unreasoned suspicion that accepts rumor and gossip as substitutes for evidence.

"Our people, of course, deserve and demand of their Federal Government more than security of personnel. They demand, also, efficient and logical organization, true to constitutional principles.

"I have already established a Committee on Government Organization. The Committee is using as its point of departure the reports of the Hoover Commission and subsequent studies by several independent agencies. To achieve the greater efficiency and economy which the Committee analyses show to be possible, I ask the Congress to extend the present Government Reorganization Act for a period of 18 months or 2 years beyond its expiration date of April 1, 1953.

"There is more involved here than realining the wheels and smoothing the gears of administrative machinery. The Congress rightfully expects the Executive to take the initiative in discovering and removing outmoded functions and eliminating duplication.

"One agency, for example, whose head has promised early and vigorous action to provide greater efficiency is the Post Office. One of the oldest institutions of our Federal Government, its services should be the best. Its employees should merit and receive the high regard and esteem of the citizens of the Nation. There are today in some areas of the postal service both waste and incompetence to be corrected. With cooperation of the Congress, and taking advantage of its accumulated experience in postal affairs, the Postmaster General will institute a program directed at improving service while at the same time reducing costs and decreasing deficits.

"In all departments, dedication to these basic precepts of security and efficiency, integrity and economy can and will produce an administration deserving of the trust the people have placed in it.

"Our people have demanded nothing less than good, efficient government. They shall get nothing less."

State of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

"Every citizen rightly expects efficient and economical administration of these many governmental programs I have outlined today. I strongly recommend extension of the Reorganization Act, and the law establishing the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, both of which expire this spring. Thus, the Congress will assure continuation of the excellent progress recently made in improving Government organization and administration. In this connection we are looking forward with great interest to the reports which will soon be going to the Congress from the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. I am sure that these studies, made under the chairmanship of former President Herbert Hoover with the assistance of more than 200 distinguished citizens, will be of great value in paving the way toward more efficiency and economy in the Government."

Special message to Congress, April 1, 1957:

"The Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, under which the President is authorized to prepare and transmit to the Congress plans for the reorganization of executive agencies, states that no provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before June 1, 1957.

"I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to extend the period for transmitting reorganization plans for 4 years.

"The reorganization plan procedure authorized by the Reorganization Act is an essential means by which the President and the Congress can cooperate to assure the timely promotion of better organization and sound management of the executive branch of the Government. Under the act, the President may transmit to the Congress reorganization plans which become effective after 60 days of congressional session unless disapproved by a majority of the membership of one of the Houses of the Congress. This method enables the President, who has direct responsibility for effective administration, to initiate improvements in organization, subject to review by the Congress.

"Extensive accomplishments have been achieved under the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 and under the present statute, the Reorganization Act of 1949. The time for transmitting plans under the latter has been twice extended by the Congress: in 1953 and 1955.

"The current act was adopted following the strong endorsement of the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in 1949, which stated: 'This authority is necessary if the machinery of government is to be made adaptable to the ever-changing requirements of administration and if efficiency is to become a continuing rather than a sporadic concern of the Federal Government.' In December 1954, the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government unanimously recommended further extension of the act.

"Accordingly, I urge the Congress to continue the practical arrangements contained in the Reorganization Act by which the Congress and the President can carry forward their cooperative endeavors to provide the best possible management of the public business."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"To permit further timely improvements in the structure of the executive branch of the Government, I recommend that the Congress extend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which is effective only until June 1, 1959."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Budget and organization improvement—legislative proposals:

"1. Simplify congressional appropriation authorization procedures for continuing programs.

"2. Authorize the item veto for appropriation bills.

"3. Extend appropriation control over use of foreign currencies by Government agencies.

"4. Establish revolving funds for certain business-type activities.

"5. Revise and extend coverage of Government Corporation Control Act.

"6. Remove time limitation from Reorganization Act.

"The Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, under which numerous executive agencies and functions have been reorganized, contains a limitation of June 1, 1959, for the transmittal of reorganization plans by the President to the Congress. Accordingly, this authority is not now available. I urgently recommend that this cutoff date be removed in order to permit continued use of that act by me and by my successor in improving the management and organization of the executive branch."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"The need to carry forward Presidential powers to reorganize the executive branch is acute, in the interest of efficiency and economy in this huge Government. Both of these authorizations are clearly essential. I again urge their approval before this session adjourns."

CONSERVATION (FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS)

Budget message for 1956, January 17, 1955:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the Upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the Upper Basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. The total cost of these major developments is estimated at 1.1 billion dollars, with first-year expenditures of 5 million dollars. Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

State of the Union message, January 5, 1956:

"Resources conservation

"I wish to reemphasize the critical importance of the wise use and conservation of our great natural resources of land, forests, minerals, and water and their long-range development consistent with our agricultural policy. Water in particular now plays an increasing role in industrial processes, in the irrigation of land, in electric power, as well as in domestic uses. At the same time, it has the potential of damage and disaster.

"A comprehensive legislative program for water conservation will be submitted to the Congress during the session. The development of our water resources cannot be accomplished overnight. The need is such that we must make faster progress and without delay. Therefore, I strongly recommend that

action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project; on the John Day partnership project, and other projects which provide for cooperative action between the Federal Government and non-Federal interests; and on legislation which makes provision for Federal participation in small projects under the primary sponsorship of agencies of State and local government.

"During the past year the areas of our national parks have been expanded, and new wildlife refuges have been created. The visits of our people to the parks have increased much more rapidly than have the facilities to care for them. The administration will submit recommendations to provide more adequate facilities to keep abreast of the increasing interest of our people in the great outdoors."

Budget message for 1958, January 16, 1957:

"Work is underway on the comprehensive Upper Colorado River Basin development which the Congress authorized during the past session. Legislation is still needed, however, to permit the Fryingpan-Arkansas multiple-purpose project to proceed. Appropriations which will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate this construction are included under proposed legislation for 1958."

Economic report for 1957, January 20, 1957:

"Except for complex multipurpose projects of paramount national interest, for which local resources are clearly insufficient or in which local benefits cannot be clearly equated with local cost burdens, the partnership principle assures maximum benefits and speed of completion within appropriate limits of Federal participation. One such multipurpose development which the Congress is requested to authorize is the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. This undertaking would provide water, supplemental irrigation, and power in parts of several States."

Budget message for 1960, January 19, 1959:

"In the interest of sound water resources programs in future years, funds are recommended to continue investigations and advance planning and to assemble basic data for future projects. I continue to believe that, as part of sound advance planning, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado should again be considered for authorization, but no appropriation to start construction should be enacted until the overall budgetary situation is more favorable."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Natural resources—Budget totals

[In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Expenditures	$1.7	$1.8	$1.9
New obligational authority	1.7	2.5	1.8

"Legislative proposals:

"1. Authorize Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

"2. Authorize negotiation with Mexico for joint construction of Amistad (Diablo) Dam.

"3. Require non-Federal interests to bear at least 30 percent of the cost of flood protection projects.

"4. Promote greater conservation of helium.

"5. Authorize coal research on a contract basis.

"6. Increase fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases on the public domain.

"7. Transfer from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture certain authority with respect to land and timber exchanges.

"8. Preserve three undeveloped shore areas for public use.

"I again recommend that the Congress authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Before it is too late we should take steps to preserve, for public benefit, part of the remaining undeveloped shore areas. I hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact during this session the legislation proposed in the last session to permit the Secretary of the Interior to select and acquire for the National Park System three areas which would be of national significance because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational advantages, and other public values."

Economic Report, January 20, 1960:

"Intensive efforts are being made to accommodate an ever-increasing number of visitors to national parks, expected to reach 80 million by 1966. In this connection, enactment has been requested of a pending proposal for the preservation of certain undeveloped shoreline areas for public use."

Special message to Congress, May 3, 1960:

"Among these measures I refer as examples to preservation of our priceless seashore areas, establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range, permission to western communities to expand into public land areas, research assistance to the coal industry, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas and San Luis projects. Approval of these and similar pending bills will help to round out the program of natural resources development—now at a record level—which I presented last January in my budget message."

RETIRED PAY

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Major national security—Budget totals

[In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Expenditures	$46.4	$45.6	$45.6
New obligational authority	45.5	44.7	45.3

"Legislative proposals (in addition to program extensions):

"1. Discontinue statutory minimum strength for Army National Guard.

"2. Equalize military retirement pay.

"3. Facilitate sale of surplus military real property.

"4. Authorize sale of Alaska Communication System.

"5. Eliminate certain restrictions on foreign bidding on military supply items.

"Military personnel costs: About 30 percent of the expenditures for the Department of Defense in 1961 are for military personnel costs, including pay for active, reserve, and retired military personnel. These expenditures are estimated to be $12.1 billion, an increase of $187 million over 1960, reflecting additional longevity pay of career personnel, more dependents, an increased number of men drawing proficiency pay, and social security tax increases (effective for the full year in 1961 compared with only 6 months in 1960). Retired pay costs are increased by $94 million in 1961 over 1960, partly because of a substantial increase in the number of retired personnel. These increased costs are partially offset by a decrease of $56 million in expenditures for the reserve forces, largely because of the planned reduction in strength of the Army Reserve components during 1961.

"Traditionally, rates of pay for retired military personnel have been proportionate to current rates of pay for active personnel. The 1958 military pay act departed from this established formula by providing for a 6 percent increase rather than a proportionate increase for everyone retired prior to its effective date of June 1, 1958. I endorse pending legislation that will restore the traditional relationship between retired and active duty pay rates."

OUTER SPACE

State of the Union message, January 7, 1960:

"We have just completed a year's experience with our new space law. I believe it deficient in certain particulars and suggested improvements will be submitted to the Congress shortly."

Budget message for 1961, January 18, 1960:

"Commerce and housing—Budget totals

[In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Expenditures	$3.4	$3.0	$2.7
New obligational authority	2.9	3.8	3.2

"Legislative proposals (in addition to program extensions):

"1. Strengthen organization and management of outer space programs.

"2. Increase aviation fuel taxes and credit them to general fund.

"3. Remove interest ceiling on Government ship mortgage loans.

"4. Provide additional highway trust fund revenues.

"5. Finance forest and public land highways from highway trust fund.

"6. Increase postal rates.

"7. Increase savings and loan insurance premiums.

"8. Provide flexible interest rates on veterans and military housing loans.

"9. Liberalize authority of small business investment companies.

"10. Broaden exemption of small security issues from registration.

"11. Authorize loans and grants to assist areas with chronic unemployment.

"12. Improve antitrust legislation."

Special message to Congress, January 14, 1960:

"I recommend that the Congress enact certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to clarify management responsibilities and to streamline organizational arrangements concerning the national program of space exploration.

"Prior to establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense had been responsible for all of the Nation's space activities, including those of a nonmilitary nature such as the Vanguard satellite project designed for U.S. participation in the scientific activities of the International Geophysical Year. When the new agency came into existence, with the duty of carrying out a program of space exploration, it became necessary to transfer the nonmilitary projects, with their supporting facilities and personnel, to the new agency from the Department of Defense. The act empowered the President to make such transfers. I exercised this authority on October 1, 1958, when I transferred to NASA responsibility for Project Vanguard and certain other space-related projects previously under the direction of the Department of Defense. I exercised it for the second time on December 3, 1958, when I directed the transfer to NASA of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena, Calif. And today I am transmitting a report advising the Congress of my intention to transfer to NASA the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency. The authority granted to the President has thus been used to center in NASA direction of all of the Nation's nonmilitary space activities, and to provide NASA with the facilities and personnel needed to carry out this task.

"The act, however, contains a number of provisions which tend to obscure the responsibility of NASA for planning and directing a national program of space exploration and peaceful space activity. For example, there is inherent in it the concept—which I believe to be incorrect—of a single comprehensive program of space activities embracing both civilian and military activities, and it implies that a multiplicity of unnamed agencies might have responsibility for portions of such a program.

"In an effort to deal with these problems, the act establishes a scheme of organization of considerable complexity. First, section 201(e) of the act imposes upon the President an unusual degree of personal responsibility for developing this 'comprehensive' space program and of surveying its operations in detail. Second, the act established the National Aeronautics and Space Council and gave it the sole function of advising the President with respect to the performance of his statutory duties. Third, it made provision for a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, which was given no other duty than providing a channel of advice and consultation between NASA and the Department of Defense.

"I have become convinced by the experience of the 15 months since NASA was established that the act needs to be amended so as to place responsibility directly and unequivocally in one agency, NASA, for planning and managing a national program of nonmilitary space activities. This requires, first of all, elimination of those provisions which reflect the concept of a single program embracing military as well as nonmilitary space activities. In actual practice, a single civil-military program does not exist and is in fact unattainable; and the statutory concept of such a program has caused confusion. The military utilization of space, and the research and development effort directed toward that end, are integral parts of the total defense program of the United States. Space projects in the Department of Defense are undertaken only to meet military requirements. The Department of Defense has ample authority outside the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to conduct research and development work on space-related weapons systems and to utilize space for defense purposes; and nothing in the act should derogate from that authority.

"I am also convinced that it is no longer desirable to retain in the act those provisions which impose duties of planning and detailed surveying upon the President. We have come to the end of a transitional period during which responsibilities for a broad range of activities were being shifted to NASA from the Department of Defense and NASA's capabilities for discharging those responsibilities were being developed. From now on it should be made clear that NASA, like the Department of Defense in the military field, is responsible in the first instance for the formulation and execution of its own program, subject, of course, to the authority and direction of the President.

"With the repeal of the statutory enumeration of Presidential duties, the National Aeronautics and Space Council should be abolished, since its only function is to advise the President in the performance of those duties. The repeal would not, however, affect another provision of the act which provides that the Administrator of NASA and the Secretary of Defense may refer to the President for decision those matters concerning their respective areas of responsibility on which they are unable to reach agreement. This provision should be retained in the law.

"The Civilian-Military Liaison Committee should also be eliminated. The statute should go no further than requiring that NASA and the Department of Defense advise, consult, and keep each other fully informed with respect to space activities within their respective jurisdictions; it should not prescribe the specific means of doing so.

"Finally, the act should contain safeguards against undesirable duplication by NASA and the Department of Defense in developing the major tools of space exploration. Although a civilian space exploration program is clearly distinguishable from the military utilization of space for defense purposes, both NASA and the Department of Defense may have similar or identical requirements for launch vehicles used to propel and guide spacecraft into orbit about the earth or toward other celestial bodies. I propose that the act be amended to provide that the President shall assign responsibility for the development of each new launch vehicle, regardless of its intended use, to either NASA or the Department of Defense. Responsibility for development of the new vehicle should in no way determine responsibility for its use in space activities.

"Amended as I have recommended, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 would become the organic act of an independent civilian agency having a well-defined statutory responsibility for which it is answerable to both the President and to Congress.

"I have requested the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to transmit to the Congress draft legislation incorporating the foregoing recommendations, and I urge that they be enacted by the Congress at the earliest possible date."

CONGRATULATIONS TO UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA UPON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the fall of 1960 marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Today, the Ukraine—comprised of 42 million people—represents one of the many non-Russian countries inside and outside of the Soviet Union, which are, in effect, captive nations of communistic imperialism.

Fortunately, the nationalistic pride of these people, as Ukrainians—as well as their will for freedom from Communist domination—still burns brightly.

Reflecting the thoughts of a great many people in their ancestral homeland—and the thinking of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, the congress committee, during its lifetime, has engaged in many constructive, worthwhile pursuits designed to ultimately break the chains of bondage.

Among other things, they have been dedicated to the task of serving the national security interest of this country, by: First, advancing the strategic value of all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself; second, informing our fellow citizens about the independence struggles of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; three, exposing the many current myths about Soviet unity in all its alleged ramifications; and fourth, proposing concrete ways and means to defeat imperialist Moscow in the cold war, the chief mode of which is psychopolitical and propagandistic.

Upon its 20th anniversary, the committee, I believe, deserves the commendation of the people of this country, of their ancestral homeland, and of the freedom-seeking people of the world—as the committee carries on efforts aimed ultimately at lifting the control of communism from the Ukraine, as well as further weakening the colonial imperialistic empire constructed under the guise of communism.

A SOUND DEFENSE POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, probably the most important single act by a Secretary of Defense was the decision in December of 1959 of the then newly appointed Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., to sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As a result of this procedure, there has been a continuing increase in JCS efficiency and the speed of the strategic decisionmaking process. However, the military advantages of this policy of Secretary Gates have perhaps overshadowed an appreciation of the very fundamental soundness of the policy from the standpoint of the institutions and philosophies upon which our Government is based.

We are indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for inviting attention to the importance of the civilian Secretary of Defense sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and thus giving realism and meaning to the principle of civilian control. In his brief, but very perceptive, remarks on the floor of the Senate on July 2, 1960, the senior Senator from Minnesota emphasized the importance of maintaining and strengthening the JCS system by pointing out how this highly efficient device for strategic planning at the seat of Government is in harmony with our form of Government and is responsive to our strategic requirements.

I believe that we are frequently inclined to view military institutions—and this of course includes the JCS—in primarily a military sense, and thus fail to relate them to the overall requirements of our governmental system.

Therefore, it was with considerable pleasure that I noted that these important remarks by the senior Senator from Minnesota have been made the basis of a highly informative editorial which appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of Tuesday, August 2, 1960, as well as in other papers of the Copley organization.

Because this editorial points up the importance of our Joint Chiefs of Staff system, particularly—as explained by the senior Senator from Minnesota—in its relationship under our form of Government, I request permission to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, Aug. 2, 1960]

JOINT CHIEFS ARE IN HARMONY WITH OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

With so much of the Nation's attention centered on domestic affairs in this fateful summer of 1960, it is reassuring to know

that our Defense Department, with its awesome global responsibilities, is functioning with such smooth efficiency.

Much of the credit for this situation is due Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and his relations with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Gates initiated a policy of sitting with the Joint Chiefs—a seemingly minor administrative detail, but actually a historic contribution to the defense organization.

The Evening Tribune praised this innovation at the start, a view shared by a wide cross section of the American press and by members of both parties in the House and the Senate.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who has, in his own words, "not been hesitant to criticize the foreign and defense policies of the present administration when I thought such criticism was justified," delivered a Senate speech in praise of Gates' policy.

"The Secretary of Defense's policy of sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff has many beneficial effects," HUMPHREY said.

"It has speeded the decisionmaking processes in strategic planning at the seat of government; it has made the constitutional principle of civilian control of the military realistic and meaningful; it has provided a persuasive demonstration of the ability of our form of government to devise an effective strategic planning system and thus be able to reject the outmoded, discredited, and defeated single chief of staff—supreme high command methods of monarchial and dictatorial regimes."

In this last point, HUMPHREY has touched on a significant philosophical point that all too often is lost sight of in the emphasis on practical effects of the Gates policy.

The concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is in harmony with our form of government. This is essential for an effective and responsive functioning of our military institutions.

An alien and autocratic system as HUMPHREY properly analyzed it, would put us "in the position of undermining the kind of government and endangering the beliefs which, paradoxically, our military effort is designed to protect."

The Minnesota Democrat has commendably associated himself with views that are shared by millions concerned about the best defense of America.

AMERICAN REPUBLICS COOPERATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3861) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on August 8 the President of the United States came before the Congress to reiterate his long-term legislative recommendations. Most of his proposals were old ones, long familiar to the attentive Members of this House. But the President also offered three new programs in foreign affairs to strengthen the position of this country throughout the world. He called for increases in the mutual security contingency fund, a new program for Latin America, and a United Nations program for distribution of surplus foods. The President particularly requested that the Congress give its approval, through an authorization bill, to the Latin American program. Mr. President, I should like to urge rapid passage of that very important authorization.

Relations between this country and Latin America have become a matter of increasing concern for the last few years. The United States has long since abandoned the policy of "dollar diplomacy" which aroused considerable distaste south of the border. The "good neighbor policy" which, incidentally, was the creation of President Herbert Hoover, did much to counteract this latent hostility. But much still remains to be done.

The aftermath of the Second World War has led to a determined effort in all parts of the globe to raise the standard of living an increase productivity. This is about the only policy that the nations of the free world and the Communist bloc have had in common over the last 15 years of conflict.

In the race for riches, the revolution of rising expectations, or whatever you may call it, the United States has played a dual role. First, it has stood as the goal that every other country has sought to reach. Second, it has also been the most generous helper to other nations in the long, hard pull that many must make to reach economic solvency.

Naturally, this has led to divided feelings among the poorer nations, feelings of envy, feelings even of resentment, while at the same time some nations have striven to copy U.S. developments slavishly without due consideration of their own needs. All these tensions have been particularly felt in Latin America—so close to us geographically and in some other ways, but so far from us in economic and historical development. Mr. President, these tensions that have existed between this country and some of our Latin American neighbors—I am not incidentally speaking of Cuba, for I put that country in a completely different category—have been inevitable.

The plan that the President has put forth represents one of the best and shrewdest ways imaginable to help Latin America. The President has called for $600 million, five-sixths of which would be used "for projects designed to contribute to opportunties for a better way of life for the individual citizens of the countries of Latin America." Such a plan will show very clearly to the Latin American people—to all the people—that we have a genuine concern for their well-being and progress. It will show that our generosity and concern is not limited to nations on the other side of the globe, or nations that face an immediate physical threat of communism. It will show that we really feel like neighbors toward our friends to the south.

Mr. President, it is particularly important that we approve the authorization of this money, five-sixth of which, as I have said, will accelerate social development and economic growth, and one-sixth of which will be used to repair the ravages of earthquakes in Chile. Let us act promptly and decisively.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe we have some indication that the request for the $500 million program for Latin America, with no guidelines and no standards to rely upon, is the beginning of a multi-million-dollar program, and the members of the committee cannot tell us what sort of program we are voting for.

We know this is going to cost many, many billions of dollars. It is another Marshall plan, except this one will continue on indefinitely. The Marshall plan at least had a termination date over a period of several years. There is absolutely no limit to the amount that this plan can cost. The program is an open invitation for any nation in South America to come up with any conceivable program which presumably would be financed by the American taxpayers.

While I would favor another well-considered program to assist with the economic development of Latin America, I feel that the proposed legislation is so loose and so lacking in specifications that the entire matter should be postponed until we are in a position to look at a specific program with details to back it up.

I am particularly concerned about certain statements contained in the testimony of Mr. Douglas Dillon in support of this program. Mr. Dillon seems to take the attitude that no relatively poor country can do anything for itself. The truth is that practically everything that we propose to do in this bill for the help of others is something which those countries are already in a position to do for themselves, if they care to make the effort and the sacrifice to do it.

I have looked at a few statements from Mr. Dillon's 9-page prepared text which he presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this program. On page 2 Mr. Dillon said:

> While there has been a steady rise in national income throughout the area, millions of underprivileged have not benefited thereby.

What is that but a declaration that politicians and wealthy families in control of most Latin American countries do not have a sufficient interest in the working masses to see that prosperity is generally shared by all of the people rather than hogged by the privileged few, and how does Mr. Dillon propose to handle the $500 million, and the billions that will follow it to prevent it from going the way of all other income in those countries? No suggestion is made.

Last night the Senate voted for a minimum wage bill, one of the purposes of which was to see that the prosperity of the country would be more generally shared by the people. Nations of South America could do the same thing if they had any desire to do so, and to see that the wealth being accumulated in a few hands in many of those countries is more generally shared. Yet we have no assurance that this program will not be shared in exactly the same way that the income of those countries is now shared. The few get it; the many get little.

That has been my criticism of the program as administered by Mr. Dillon, and such questions arose in my mind even when his name came before the Senate for confirmation some time ago.

The indications were it was a trickle-down program that did not trickle down to the masses, and the masses never saw any benefit of the many billions of dollars of foreign aid that were being spent by the American taxpayers.

To quote from the same page of Mr. Dillon's statement:

> The distribution of national income in many countries has been far from equitable, with the bulk of the income going to a very small portion of the population.

Again I ask how Mr. Dillon proposes to assure us that the $500 million requested and the many billions that will follow it will not also go to the small percentage of the population which is grabbing for themselves most of the income of these Latin-American countries? If we are to assist those Latin-American countries further, why in the name of commonsense should we not insist that our aid be accompanied by economic reforms in those countries?

As much as I deplore the government of Fidel Castro because it is a Communist-controlled government, we must concede that he has been demonstrating how large land holdings can be broken up and income can be spread more evenly.

At this point let me say that prior to the revolution of Mr. Castro in Cuba, Cuba had the highest per capita income of any of the Latin American countries. That did not prevent Mr. Castro from having a successful revolution in Cuba. As a matter of fact, there were fundraising meetings held for Mr. Castro in Florida at the time the revolution was going on, even though the State Department representatives in Mexico were sending memoranda informing the State Department that all the information they had in Mexico, from which country Mr. Castro left to go to Cuba, indicated that Castro was a Communist, and we would be in for a Communist takeover if those who were working for the program to help the Castro revolution were successful in putting his government in power.

So there was no lack of economic aid. Our Sugar Act alone represented $150 million a year economic aid for Cuba and the Cuban people. We gave Cuba economic aid to the tune of $50 million a year. It was not the lack of aid that caused that country to go Communist. It was the fact that no serious effort was made to prevent the Communist-inspired revolution from succeeding, even though we had information that should have led us to know what was happening in Cuba.

Quoting from page 3 of the statement of Mr. Dillon:

> Our purpose is not to finance public housing—the requirements of that are far too great. Our purpose is to stimulate the mobilization of private capital in the other American Republics through the means which have been so successful in this country, such as building and loan associations and similar credit institutions.

This sounds very much like the "trickle down" theory for which we have condemned the Republicans so many times. The trouble is that without firm standards the purpose is seldom achieved. The administration has always resisted any sort of firm Federal standards for foreign aid on the theory that a proper respect for a sovereign country would not permit us even to inquire what happened to our aid money after we turned it loose.

What, if anything, does Mr. Dillon propose to do to assure that the $500 million would not be as ineffectual as the many billions we have already invested fruitlessly in many such undertakings?

Quoting from page 4:

> Many countries still maintain land-tenure and land-taxation systems which date from colonial times and which frequently result in the underutilization or nonutilization of large areas of potentially productive land. These antiquated systems have led to a rising tide of demands for land reform.

It is within the power of every one of these countries to institute land reforms. What are we supposed to do about it? I suppose it would be Mr. Dillon's proposal that this country should buy land with U.S. dollars so that the land could then be distributed among others. It is certainly within the power of every one of these Central and South American countries to seize large land holdings and distribute them among the people. A logical way would be for the Government to issue bonds payable in the local currency of those nations to pay for the land thus taken.

I ask Senators to consider where would the stopping point be if the U.S. Government were to pay for the land taken? Even in our country the cost of right of ways for highways is running far above all reasonable estimates due to 40-percent Federal matching for interstate highways. What conceivable incentive would there be for the Government to hold the price down rather than go whole hog and pay three or four times the current market value of property if we were picking up the check in foreign countries? If the property is purchased on the open market, no one can conceive of the extent to which land values will skyrocket.

What kind of agrarian reform are we talking about? There are only a few words dealing with it in the testimony. The chairman of the committee has pointed to the inadequacy of the record in regard to this point.

The so-called Dillon doctrine states it will tell these countries that the $500 million is a starter, that it is only the beginning, and that we would like to know how they could spend our money. Here are some suggested ideas: Agrarian reform; loans, repayable in local currencies; social development. We say to them, "Write your own ticket. Here is $500 million to start with." Can we imagine authorizing something of that sort for $500 million, with no specifications at all?

The Senator from Alaska has said that we ought to have the same standards in authorizing foreign aid that we have for our own projects at home. Where would we be if a Senator from any of our States could rise and say he wanted $100 million or $300 million or $500 million for a project in his State, without stating what the projects were, and without specifying them in any way and obtain the authorization?

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The fact is that States cannot get worthwhile projects approved by this administration, even when they are fully spelled out, such as resource development, antipollution control, flood control, and other programs. Those projects are labeled by the administration as wasteful and inflationary and as unbalancing the budget. But with respect to foreign countries, we give them a blank check for hundreds of millions, and even billions of dollars. We are told, "Don't question it. Give it without question."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is a request for a $500 million authorization, and a request to the foreign countries to write the program. We do not even know what the program is to be. They are to write the program. We ourselves have no fixed concept of what we are talking about in asking them to write a program for us. We have only the vaguest concept.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will permit me to say so, there is no program. There is nothing we can approve. We are asked to authorize the spending of another half billion dollars. There is no program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But we are going to these people and asking them to write the program. I heard the suggestion made that this program does not cost us anything. We are told that this is a sort of Madison Avenue advertising situation. We are led to believe that we are going to these countries and asking them to vote for us on the Cuban situation. We are trying to get votes. We say, "Here is $500 million, which is our starting point. We know it will require a huge appropriation. We want you to tell us about a program, and here is what we are interested in: land reform."

What does that mean? That does not mean seizing the land and distributing it. That means that Uncle Sam is going to pay for the land at the price the country puts on it, and we will pay for it in dollars.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I notice in Mr. Dillon's statement that there are three purposes set out for this money. First there is an appropriation of $500 million for a new social development program in Latin America. They do not have any program. This is to develop a program. There is no program before us. Number three authorizes $100 million for further rehabilitation and assistance to the Republic of Chile. That may have some merit. I note immediately after that request that it is stated the administration has no intention to seek an appropriation during this session of Congress for either of the first two items.

Why not wait until January? In the meantime let a program be developed, so we can take a look at it.

I know of one instance which came to the attention of the investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations in connection with a project in Bolivia, under foreign aid, in which we have already built an irrigation system, but where there is no water. There are only a great many dry ditches down there.

Does it make sense that we do these things when our fiscal situation finds us deeper in debt than the rest of the world put together? I cannot agree to it. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I have many times taken the position, and I reiterate that position, that I am willing to examine these proposals, and I am willing to vote for some of them whenever a foreign spending program is put on a practical basis, under which there can be responsibility both upon Congress and upon those who administer the program—but first upon Congress to evaluate it, to have something concrete to evaluate, and to evaluate before approving it, as we do in our country with respect to a domestic public works project.

We take testimony about them. We examine into them. We must justify the projects. They go through a process which makes it reasonably certain that there is justification for projects before Congress appropriates the money.

We are not asked to make an appropriation now, but we are asked to approve an authorization which will commit this country at least to that extent, and which, as the Senator describes accurately—and we all know it from past experience, is the beginning of a multibillion-dollar program. After we get started with such a program, we are told, "You cannot quit; you have to continue with it." Each year the expenditures will be increased.

Mr. President, I want to vote money to help the Chilean Government restore and rehabilitate its devastated area. I am perfectly willing to do that. But I shall not vote for an indefinite program. I shall not vote for a proposal which would require this country to be committed to another multibillion-dollar spending spree in South America. As much as I should like to help those countries economically, it will be necessary to make some concrete proposal. I shall not be a party to a blank-check expenditure commitment on the part of this Government.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me, so that I might make these comments. I think the Senator is rendering a great service by the remarks he is making.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, by this vote, we shall also be voting on the extra $100 million for the contingency fund. The $100 million for the contingency fund has been sold to us as though that money has been used up in the Congo. We have not used 5 cents of the contingency fund in the Congo. We have not used a nickel of it. That is simply a Madison Avenue sales talk approach. There is talk about putting up $5 million to be spent through the United Nations for a Congo program. It is conceded that the administration might want $25 million. But they have not used any—not 5 cents of it. The whole contingency fund, of course, comes before us in connection with the mutual aid appropriation bill.

The cost of the airlift in the Congo has come out of the operational funds of the Air Force. As things stand now, it is covered under the operation of the Air Force, just as the Air Force would cover training operations. The foreign aid program has not paid for any of the airlift in the Congo, and it does not need to, unless it is deemed to be desirable to have the foreign aid program share some of the expenses of the Air Force.

Do Senators want to know how the contingency fund has been used this year? France freed two colonies in Africa. Tunisia became independent, and Guinea became independent. When they became independent, they forfeited the economic aid which they got from France. That was the condition on which France turned them loose. The French Government said, in effect, "You can become independent; but if you become independent, you cannot expect to get the money France has been spending in your area."

Unfortunately, those countries found they needed some additional money. They missed the French aid.

So the United States Government was standing by. Without even consulting Congress, the Government rushed in to supply aid to those countries whose aid had been cut off by France when they became independent. This is supposed to be a contingency.

The administration saw an opportunity to give Poland an extra $6 million, and it did. We gave agricultural commodities, made additional loans; we shipped Salk vaccine without payment. Those were supposed to be emergencies. In other words, we found an opportunity to persuade the Poles to accept more money from the United States; yet Poland has a Communist government.

Then it was found that Turkey wanted to have a stabilization program. Thank the merciful Lord we have a law through which this nation is prohibited from paying the national debt of other countries with our aid funds.

Our Government showed up with a new approach. It is called a stabilization program. A country can, in effect, reach out and buy up some of its currency with American dollars. That is stabilizing their currency. It is against the law to retire their national debt with American money. Congress outlawed that, finally, after we had retired $2½ billion of the national debt of the countries who owed us more than $2½ billion, we were told that we must stabilize their currency.

I suppose the largest items did not have anything to do with Taiwan or Korea. We saw, however, that Turkey had run up a deficit and wanted to have some contingency funds. So the Government wanted to supply Turkey with another $32 million. That is the type of thing for which we are being asked to put up money.

We are told that 16 new African nations are expected to become independent this year. As fast as they are separated from the mother country, foreign aid programs are expected to be ready to go into effect for those countries. That being the case, we are supposed to provide an additional $100 million to start foreign aid programs in those 16 countries, plus another $500 million pump-priming operation to finance the beginning of what will be a multi-billion-dollar-a-year Latin American program, if the administration is successful in getting it started in Latin America. Once we begin to see what the pump looks like after it has been primed, we are in for a program that will make $500 million per year look small.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Striking as the comments of the Senator from Louisiana are, he even understates the case. Not only do we rush in to pick up the tab as soon as countries become independent; we go in before they become independent. We have helped a number of colonies in this hemisphere, including British Guiana and Jamaica. We provided aid for the African colonies before they became independent. We were so willing to spend American dollars that we could not wait until the umbilical cord had been separated; we rushed in to help them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the West Indies, the country had not yet become independent when we were spending our contingency money. It was Mother Britain's problem to look after the West Indies; still we managed to get in with our foreign aid program. We had aided Great Britain to the extent of many billions of dollars and found that further aid could no longer be justified. But when the West Indies Federation moved toward self-government, we provided funds for its aid. When we were faced with all the problems of underdeveloped areas, during 1959, negotiations and studies were completed leading to the decision to provide $400,000 for road-building equipment and vocational training. That was before the West Indies became independent. That was while they were still under the wing of Mother Britain.

Mr. Dillon says that we must have a substantial program ready for the West Indies because they will be independent this year, and there will be 16 new countries becoming independent in Africa.

We are supposed to provide this money without knowing what it will lead to or what we will be expected to provide in the future.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana on the argument he is making. I also commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who just interrogated the Senator from Louisiana. I associate myself with the remarks of both Senators.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if the purpose of mutual assistance or foreign aid originally was not on the theory that it was mutual assistance from a national defense standpoint. Was not that the theory?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. The theory was that we would assist other countries, and

in so doing we were helping to maintain freedom in this country and other countries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Has not the program gone far beyond that and included social programs in the various countries, and also, apparently, an effort to buy friendship, which is impossible?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. The Senator knows that at the present time the U.S. Government is directing its activities against the Dominican Republic, more or less supporting the position of Venezuela and other countries. While I myself favor free elections, I also favor people being on our side. As between two dictators, I would much rather favor the one who is on the side of the United States than the one who is on the side of communism.

If I had to choose, for example, I would prefer Trujillo to Castro.

But what has been done in the Dominican Republic, in a great many cases, is the sort of thing that Mr. Dillon says these countries will not be able to do unless the United States picks up the tab for it. In other words, I am told that efforts have been made to improve the welfare of the rank and file of the people of that country—to do things to enable them to have better pay and better living conditions.

Mr. THURMOND. So, if we pass this bill, shall not we run the risk of losing the friendship of the 16 African countries that will participate in the program later on?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. And shall not we also run the risk of incurring very heavy financial obligations of our own?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Certainly there is no limit to what this program could cost.

The chairman of the committee has pointed out that we already have three very good programs in Latin America—those under the Export-Import Bank and the Development Loan Fund and the International Bank. Of course, many of those loans do not have to be paid back in U.S. currency.

Certainly I am willing to support a liberal program of aid to Central America and South America. But I think our program should include a guarantee that the program will be used in ways that will assure us that there will be tangible benefits to the people of those countries, and so that the undertakings will be mutual ones which we will share with those countries, so that the people of those countries will be doing their share.

Mr. THURMOND. And also to proceed in such a way that if an emergency develops, the people of the countries we aid will be on our side, not on the side of communism. Is not that important?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Certainly I think it fair to insist on such requirements.

But this proposal is for a $600 million pump-priming operation; and my fear is that if we embark upon this authorization, we shall find that when the foreign aid bill comes before us next year, it will cost from $1,500 million to $2 billion more, because we are told, in connection with the testimony regarding the program under this measure, that it is desired to institute land reforms and to provide almost all kinds of aid to the people of these Latin American countries.

Furthermore, under the proposal for the $100 million authorization for the contingency fund, the 17 new African countries no doubt will be covered by an additional aid program the following year.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Has our country made with these Latin American countries any agreement that they will contribute any definite parts of the funds to be loaned under this program?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They talk about this program being a "two-way street," but we have heard a great deal of talk of that sort before. However, it is important to know that in the testimony it was stated that these countries are unable to do anything for themselves. Mr. Dillon said that although much has been done heretofore in these countries, the people of these countries have not benefited thereby. Apparently if the millions of people of these countries are actually to be benefited, I assume that the United States will have to send some of its representatives there, to try to see to it that the millions of people in those countries actually are benefited by means of this program.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana whether Shakespeare's statement that "Neither a borrower nor a lender be; for loan oft loses both itself and friend," has lost its validity in these latter days?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Certainly it has not.

Mr. President, never before, to my knowledge, have we undertaken a tremendous program without having any specifics in regard to what the program would be. But this one amounts to an invitation to these foreign countries to write the program after the Congress makes the authorization.

The administration has asked us to make a $500 million authorization, so it can say, at the forthcoming conference, "Here is an act of Congress which commits our country to carry out the program, and you can count on this $500 million to begin with." In that event, the $500 million would be regarded as an absolute promise by Congress to appropriate $500 million; and then the administration would start to talk with these countries about large sums of money in addition. I believe it obvious that under these circumstances the people of those countries certainly would expect that to be the case, and certainly would expect that from us; otherwise they would think us the greatest four-flushers on this continent since the landing of Columbus. In short, this authorization would be only the starting point, and the people of these countries would feel that we were obligated to take action which would enable our representatives to say that this $500 million authorization by the Congress was only the starting point. And in that event, the people of these countries would expect more and more from us, after that.

Furthermore, the step now proposed would increase our grant-aid funds to be used in Latin America by $500 million in a single year; and that would be only the starting point from which the program under this bill would proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Is this an authorization to loan the money in connection with the Inter-American Bank, or is it an additional program, outside of that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is an additional program, in addition to the three programs our country already has established and is using for the aid of those countries. The Senator from North Carolina knows that the Export-Import Bank was for many years probably the soundest and the wisest and the best conceived, in many respects, and the most conservative program of all those we had for the giving of aid to those nations; and it was regarded as a great forward stride, when it was originally begun.

Then we came along with the International Development Association, and with the Development Loan Fund.

So we already have those three major programs; and for the most part they are loan programs, although many of the loans are in local currencies, as the Senator from North Carolina knows, with the result that the people receive the loan in the form of the local currencies which can be spent only in those countries, and cannot be used in the manner intended—in many cases.

At any rate, these programs already are tremendous in size.

I call attention to what the chairman of the committee himself has had to say about this situation. To a considerable degree he shares my doubts about this program, although the chairman differs from me in that, so far as I know, he has never voted against a foreign aid program.

But in his prepared statement, the chairman of the committee said:

> Mr. President, I shall close these remarks in support of S. 3861 with what I hope will be two sobering thoughts. First, I hope that no one will be misled by this bill. None of its sponsors believe that the dangers in Latin America can be eliminated for the price of $500 million. This $500 million is just the beginning. No one can say how much money will ultimately be necessary. No one can say how long the job will take.

The chairman of the committee began his prepared statement—and he was kind enough to send me a copy of it—by pointing out that he personally felt somewhat saddened by the fact that there was so little in terms of specifics to indicate what in the world this authorization and this program would be used for.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In fact, in his statement, which already has been placed in the RECORD, the chairman of the committee said:

> I also lack enthusiasm because of the vagueness of the proposal. No program has been presented to the committee. No details worth speaking of have been offered. There is no country breakdown.

Yet that is the basis upon which we are asked to embark on this multibillion-dollar program.

Mr. President, for those reasons, my conscience requires me to vote against this measure, because although personally I should like to see a soundly developed program for the development of the Latin American countries put into effect, yet in this instance we have no assurance at all about what the program would be, and we have no way at all to estimate either the cost of the program or its potential effectiveness.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Did the Senator from Louisiana observe that the distinguished chairman of the committee said:

> Now at the 11th hour, as the last dying gasp of this administration, we have received a request for a special authorization for economic aid to Latin America.

However, this measure does not call for an appropriation; it requests only an authorization.

Would it be unreasonable for us to defer action until the new administration takes over in January, and then ask the State Department to come forward with something specific about how this initial $500 million and how the subsequent large sums of money will be spent? Would that be unreasonable?

It seems to me it would be logical for us to postpone this proposed action, and to wait until the new administration took over—and we hope the new administration will be much sounder in its foreign aid program than the present administration has been, for the present administration has had a succession of failures and has lost Cuba.

We remember that in 1952 the Republicans charged the Democrats with having lost China. But the Republican administration has lost Cuba and the Monroe Doctrine, and that is a far more serious loss.

Yet it seems that it is now proposed by the administration that we permit the use of more of the same medicine—in other words, that because Cuba has "gone down the drain," we must pour more millions and billions of dollars down the drain, but without knowing what the money will be used for.

I think such proposals fantastic. Certainly we should wait until the new administration comes into office and until we have some specifics in regard to what the proposed program will be and how the money will be used.

I am not opposed to aid to Latin America. I think it would be fine if we had a separate appropriation for the Chileans, who suffered a major disaster, whose homes were destroyed so that many of them are homeless. If this were an appropriation bill—which it is not—for $20 or $25 million for the Chileans, I would be happy to vote for it. But in the case of Chile, it is not that. It is an authorization. There are thousands of homeless people there. Yet the administration does not ask for an appropriation; it wants a general authorization. I do not see how anyone can conscientiously vote for the bill under the circumstances. I know I cannot.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think what the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Louisiana have said needs clarification, if at all possible. In the first place, we have never had Cuba to lose, any more than we had China to lose. We did not lose those countries. But what we have to be fearful of is the effect of the Cuban revolution on the rest of Latin America, because whereas in the days of the Spanish civil war there originated the "fifth column," what we have in Latin America, and even in our own country today, is what might be called the "Castro column." These columns are in there because they are working on the wants, needs, and deprivations of these people. It is because of these columns and those facts—and Senators should not fool themselves that the Communists are not taking full advantage of what is happening—that this program is before us.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee brought to the attention of the Senate this afternoon some of his feelings on this matter. He does not feel wholeheartedly in favor of a program of this kind. He realizes there are many questions, some of which have been raised by the Senator from Louisiana, which must be raised. But, what we have coming up on September 5 is the meeting of the economic ministers of the American states in Bogotá. We are going there with our evidence of good intentions, not to put down the money, but, on a cooperative basis, collectively and together, to try to work out programs which we have tried to develop on a guideline basis in a resolution which is incorporated in the legislation before us, and which has been reinforced because of the action by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and unanimously agreed to by all of the members, when this matter was discussed, in which it was stated, after the authorization was considered:

> Subject to such further legislation provisions as may be enacted, in addition to other funds available for such purposes on such terms and conditions as he may specify, the Secretary of State shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House currently informed about plans and programs for the utilization of such funds.

I do not think anyone can find a stronger measure than the kind which was reported out of the committee unanimously Tuesday.

It is true that it is late, but certainly it is also true the need is great and, collectively, if the Americans do not get together, the cost we are going to pay is going to be a lot more in the long run.

I think, despite any misgivings we may have—and I am sure we all have some—we must face up to this problem, and give this earnest of our intentions to the American who will represent us in Bogotá on September 5, and then collectively and together, for the first time, perhaps, try to work out a program for the Americas that will benefit and give succor to the people who need it, and which need is being recognized for the first time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the difference between my view and that of the Senator from Montana is that my feeling is an authorization bill of this sort should be the result of negotiations between this nation and the many nations who propose to help, and upon which we would come up with a tangible program, and that when we authorize something, we ought to be able to look at it, country by country, and see how much we expect to spend, and the nature of the projects we would finance with this $500 million. But to just go there, as the bill provides, with an authorization of $500 million, just to show them we want the program to be big and that, by all means, do not let it be inexpensive, and, by all means, show it is not going to be inexpensive, before we conduct negotiations, before we arrive at the programs we want—I do not propose to vote for any authorization of that kind.

Even in foreign aid, generous as we have been, except with some of our liberality in the contingency fund, we have not gone that far. We start now by saying, "Here is a $500 million authorization. We want you people to know we propose to be liberal. We are not going to be fourflushers. We are going to draw up a big program." The only reason I can see for it is to encourage these people into believing this is going to be a tremendous program. Then when requests come up for appropriations for the programs, after we start by saying we propose to increase the programs there by 1,000 percent, I suppose we will have to increase it much more in future years.

We have the word of the committee chairman on this. He expresses a heavy heart on this subject in bringing this bill before us. He says this $500 million is just a beginning; no one can say how much money will ultimately be necessary; no one can say how long the job will take.

He could have added, "No one really knows what the job will be."

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator doubt that we will get the countries to accept this money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be greatly surprised if we found a single one that would not be a taker.

As I read the Dillon declaration, it says, "If you want land reform, we are prepared to suggest to you that we will

bring American dollars to pay for all that land. You let the landlords fix their prices and we will let them pay."

When we did not expect roads under the highway program to cost $700,000 a mile, and never dreamed that it would cost that much through farmland we found that when there is 90 percent Federal participation and 10 percent State participation, it results in fiscal irresponsibility.

We are saying, "You governments down there have a way of operating so that the national income is not right. The rich people get all the money and the masses get very little. We are going to fix that."

Those now getting all the money and controlling the government down there are not going to propose to share what they are getting with those of whom they have thought so little that they are not sharing it now. Do Senators think we will get some of the wealthy politicians and landowners to take their share and permit it to trickle down to the poor people? If that is what is being proposed, imagine what the land reform program will cost.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is the suggestion that there should be a land reform program for every nation south of our borders, a thing which those nations can do for themselves.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would the Senator object to having the State of Louisiana made entitled to come under the provisions of such an act?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I must say that this would be a fine thing in Louisiana. Then some of the money would go for the benefit of the people of our State. We would say, "You people set up a program. We will pay for it." They would say, "We would like to have some small farms. We will buy the land from the big farmers." That would be particularly true, if the big farmers controlled the State. Then they could say, "Parcel it out. Let the little fellows settle on the land." We can imagine the prices the farmers would charge.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator think that any Senator from any of the 50 States of the Union who advocated such a program for his State would have any success in getting the Senate to adopt it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He would have no success whatever, particularly if he had nothing specific in mind, but merely said, "This is the type of thing I have in mind," without knowing what the cost of it will be or anything else.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator think it is the obligation of the taxpayers of America, and of their children and grandchildren for many generations in the future, to assume burdens and obligations for other countries which they would not assume for themselves?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; I do not. To me it is fantastic that we should say to those people, "We want to aid the countries of South America. We are so eager to get an aid program going that we will give you a blank check. You people tell us what you want to do. If you want to build community facilities, if you want to redistribute the land at our expense, you can do it. You can do anything you wish which will improve the living standards and improve the welfare of the people of your country, at our cost."

There is one thing which we must keep in mind. This program is proposed as an answer to the successful revolution in Cuba by Mr. Castro. Despite that, this Government never used its influence to prevent Mr. Castro from winning that revolution.

I notice that the Senators from Florida are in the Chamber. Those Senators know as well as I do that meetings were being held, to which the public was invited, in many parts of Florida, for the purpose of helping to raise money to finance the revolution. This Nation cut off aid to Batista, and contributed to his downfall.

There is information in the files of the U.S. Government which placed this Government on warning that Castro was a Communist. It was known that Castro's brother was a Moscow-trained Communist. "Che" Guevara, the next man, was the man who organized the revolutionary Communist regime which took charge in Guatemala under Arbenz. We had every indication that this would be a Communist government, and we did not use our influence in any respect. Quite to the contrary, we permitted the American people blindly to give their money, ignorant of the facts that the State Department had information available to it to show that it was a Communist regime which was taking over.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Has it not been shown that the Ambassador who succeeded Mr. Gardner—Earl Smith, from the State of Florida—was told by the State Department to tell Mr. Batista that the time had come for him to get out, and that the United States no longer approved of him? There is much reason to believe it was upon the basis of that conversation that Batista finally decided to flee the country, and then of course the country was turned over to Castro. Not only did we not use our influence, as the Senator indicated, to stop Castro from taking over, but, on the contrary, we used our influence to help him get into office.

I think it is fair to say that few people knew at that time that Castro was a Communist. Many felt he was a Communist. The Senator from Florida and I believe that the Senator from Louisiana were two of those who warned the people not to take Castro at his face value. For those statements we were condemned very severely by the press and by the State Department, and many stories written about us were put out by the State Department.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I wish to make about this whole idea of spending all this money for economic aid, by which we are supposed to keep these countries from going Communist, is this: The American Sugar Act was a generous foreign-aid program for Cuba. It was one of our oldest foreign-aid programs. That was a $150 million a year subsidy. Of course, that aid went to a government which had the same shortcomings Mr. Dillon criticized. This was a government under which the few got the income and the many received very little. There was a need for reform. There was a need for an honest, sincere revolution devoted to the welfare of the people in a country of that sort, if the people could not achieve any change by democratic elections. It appeared to be impossible, in many such countries, for that to be done.

There was a $150 million a year economic-aid program for the country of Cuba, which had about 6 million people. That is a fantastic economic-aid program. If we tried to provide aid for Latin America on the same scale as we have been aiding Cuba, it would take the entire budget of the U.S. Government to do it. That is the kind of thing we had working for Cuba, yet the country still went Communist.

When we say, "We will provide for these same governments, for these same people, when the government shows no indication of bettering the welfare of the masses, a huge amount of money, literally pouring our money in," I have one question which I should like to ask. That question is, "How do we propose to give assurance that this aid of ours is going to trickle down to the people?" There is not the first indication that that will be done. Time and time again I have tried to pin down Mr. Dillon, and others, about why there was no effort to make this program work for the people of the country, for the benefit of those for whom it is intended rather than starting it with the trickle down program, which for some reason never trickled down.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in response to the question he has raised?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I point out that in the last several months a $2 million loan has been made by our Government to the Government of Peru, for the purpose, through mutual savings banks, of building low-cost housing for the people of that country. Following that, a few weeks ago, a $53 million line of credit was extended to the Government of Peru for the purpose of transporting some of the people who are living on the edge of starvation, hunger, and poverty across the Andes into the fertile valley areas bordering on the Amazon. It appears to me that these are two innovations which are not being forced by us, but which are being done jointly with the government in question. I think the Premier of Peru, Pedro Beltran, and the Peruvian Government are to be commended for doing this in the interest of the people. I believe we are entitled to a little credit for extending a line of credit to Mr. Beltran, so that he can bring better housing to a certain segment of the population, and better means of transportation of the people to more productive areas, on a payment basis.

Those are two things which I think are envisaged in the Dillon declaration as laid down before the committee, as has been mentioned. Those are two tangible things.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At a minimum, there should be some standards in this program to assure that the people will get the benefit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We should not say, "Here is all the money. Go ahead and take it."

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am ready to yield the floor, if the Senator would like to have me do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to ask another question.

As the Senator well knows, our Government exercised a great deal of influence to get the government of Batista out, and the government of Castro in. I am no defender of Batista. He was a dictator. But I am sure the Senator would agree it is now well established that the government of Fidel Castro is completely Communist dominated. Because of that fact, many exiles have had to leave Cuba. They have come to the shores of Florida and to other places. When those exiles seek to have meetings to find ways and means of returning to Cuba and of recapturing their homeland, the U.S. Government certainly should not hire an additional 180 border patrolmen and immigration authorities to break up the meetings of exiled Cubans who want to recapture their country and establish democracy in Cuba.

Would the Senator not agree that is a poor use of our funds and the influence of the U.S. Government?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is saying that we are spending our money to make Castro more secure, yet we were willing to move Batista out.

Mr. SMATHERS. Whether we admit it or not, we are using our own governmental agencies and are spending the taxpayers' money on this task. We are making it possible for Castro and for his government to stay in control of Cuba.

This is ridiculous. I have suggested that, but without success.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, when the bill was ordered to a third reading I advised the majority leader that I desired to ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee so that we might have a clarification of the authorization.

Mr. President, I will make my comments brief leading up to a question.

In the report, reference is made to the need of using a concerted approach to social development comparable to the effort expended in the purely economic field; and then the report states:

> In this latter regard, the United States has not been backward in making capital and resources available to its friends in Latin America. Beyond direct private investment there of approximately $9 billion, the U.S. Government has extended economic assistance to Latin America totaling about $3.8 billion in the period between fiscal years 1946 and 1960. At the same time almost $2.5 billion of the latter sum represents long-term, Export-Import Bank loans repayable in dollars.

I wish to point out that recently we have had some Latin-American development under the so-called Development Loan Fund in the ICA. We had testimony by Under Secretary Dillon before our Appropriations Committee recently, indicating that there should be $150 million added to the House figure of $550 million. Of course, that is exactly what the Appropriations Committee did this morning, presumably because it was necessary to accelerate and expand our aid under the Development Loan Program to Latin American countries.

I recall earlier in this session that we voted for an authorization to enable the United States to participate in the Inter-American Development Bank. Under that program, the United States committed itself to make available $450 million, and it has already advanced a large share of that sum. We now have this third or fourth proposal to establish a new program, and I should like to direct the question to the chairman of the committee as to whether there is any justification for setting up this proposed new program.

Wherein does it differ from the Development Loan Fund and from the Inter-American Development Bank? Do we need another program in order to find ways and means of expanding Federal spending in Latin American countries? We have a high regard for the economic and political welfare of the countries in Latin America, but I wonder whether we can justify proceeding at this time with another program when we already have adequate facilities and machinery to make all the funds available that nations in South America may need. Can the chairman tell us why it is necessary to undertake another program at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In answer to the question I may say that administration officials stated that they do not anticipate setting up new machinery or agencies. The requested funds will be an addition to funds to be administered by existing agencies. I stated in my speech that the Inter-American Development Bank—which is to commence operations on October 1—is probably the agency which will be mainly utilized.

The requested funds are an additional amount of money for purposes that are similar, but not precisely the same, to those that are envisioned by the Development Loan Fund and portions of our mutual assistance program.

I will say in answer, not only to the question of the Senator from Idaho but to some of the other remarks that have been made, that it is obvious we are confronted with a problem generally political in character. What is the alternative to our doing something in this area? I am certain that the administration is very anxious to have these funds because they have been greatly disturbed by what has happened in Cuba. I ask the Senator if he is willing to take the responsibility of rejecting the proposed program. What he would say if, for example, Russia next week extended a loan to Brazil or to Argentina and began the usual process of the subversion of those countries. Would he then complain that we had not done anything to prevent such an occurrence, or would he be willing to accept that contingency?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho would refer to the programs sponsored by the Export-Import Bank and the additional $150 million which was added today to the appropriation bill for the Development Loan Fund in ICA, and I would refer to the newly organized Inter-American Development Bank, through which we are committed already to spend almost another $500 million. Have we utilized those resources in an honest, sincere effort to see whether that program will be adequate to the development needs of the Latin American countries? Why must we have to undertake another one before we have tried out the ones we have already set up?

I do not think we ought to be so pessimistic that we should look into the future and forecast dire failure for those preceding programs and say that we must have another one. Perhaps early in the next session we may come in and ask for a fourth or fifth program. On that basis I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations would agree with me we could not justify any measure of cooperation on the part of the Latin American countries, primarily because we will repeat the mistake which we have made in the foreign aid program during the past decade by refusing to insist upon full mutual participation by the countries which are beneficiaries of the billions of dollars of foreign aid which we have spent. That is my retort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not up to me to attempt to justify the efficiency of the administration of all these programs. Let us remember the complaint that has been made time and again about China, for example, that we did not do what we should have in that country. It may be that we are confronted with a possibility of a similar situation in Latin America; I dare say if we did not do anything, or did not do enough in Latin America, we would have a similar situation.

I think this is a part of the overall struggle against the Communist world as it attempts to gain a dominant influence in Latin America, as are these other programs as they are applied in Asia or Africa. That is what is ultimately involved in this program. It is part of the free world's effort to prevent the countries affected from collapsing and becoming subject to Comunist domination.

There is an economic interest in seeing that our neighboring countries are prosperous. We hope they become prosperous and thereby insure that they remain part of the trading and economic area of the free world. But I say that the dominant interest, at least as to the urgency of the program, is the threat of chaos in some of these countries. These

may become so weak as to be unable to maintain a stable government and their own independence, and may thus fall subject to Communist influence.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I wish to thank the chairman for that explanation. I agree with him in part that we are concerned about the stability of governments in Latin America and their economic solidarity. At the same time I question whether we can pursue policies which prove to be failures in other areas, and set up a program that calls for a very small measure of cooperation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I share the feeling of regret of the Senator from Idaho about the efficiency of this administration. I agree with that. But it is the only administration we have, and as of the moment, at least, we must cooperate with it.

I am unwilling to say, because we have done this or that in other areas, that we should no longer help a country. Certain of those countries are confronted with an emergency situation because of what we know has already happened. It has been very well described here. Representatives of those nations are going to a conference. I think it is too bad that they do not have sufficient strength that they can negotiate without the requested authorization.

In the committee we tried to interest representatives of the administration to accept a resolution that stated we would welcome their development of a cooperative program; we would give it sympathetic consideration when it was returned to us. However, the administration said, "No, we have got to have the authorization." Administration officials insisted on it.

I myself introduced an alternative resolution somewhat similar to that of the Senator from Montana, with a little stronger language perhaps.

The administration representative said, "No, that is not enough." They did not say the following, but my interpretation of what they did say is: "They won't believe us if we go down there. We have given promises so often that if we go down there with nothing but words or promises, they will not believe us and will not do anything. Therefore, we must have the authorization."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Have the countries in question not had more than promises in the past?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have had many promises that have not been fulfilled. I do not wish to minimize the money that they have received. I stated in my speech what they have obtained. They have had economic assistance under the mutual security program since 1946 in the amount of $536,800,000.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very large amount.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is 1½ percent of the total mutual aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is only mutual aid. I would be willing to put the table I have prepared in the RECORD, if the Senator would like me to do so. It shows what has been done under the Development Loan Fund, under Public Law 480, and so on. The grand total is shown in the table. I may say to the Senator that during that period the total amount in loans including long-term loans—some of which are in the process of being repaid to the Export-Import Bank, and most of which are current loans—is $2,455,600,000. The grand total of the economic aid program, including these loans, is $3,791 million.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to direct another question to the chairman, for clarification.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have only one other thought. What would be the impact on our defense program if those countries were Communist, if they fell under communism? It would cost us a great deal more if that were to happen. Would the Senator be any more nervous about that situation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I certainly would be nervous. The United States has rendered exceptional financial aid to Cuba. Notwithstanding that aid and our friendly spirit and cooperation, we did not save Cuba. I wonder sometimes if it is fair to draw the inference that unless we go into other Latin American countries, on a basis that might be construed as involving bribery, in order to get them to stand by our side against Communist aggression, they will go Communist. I have more confidence in the Latin American Republics than to think that they must constantly have access to our American dollars or they will desert our leadership of the free nations of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that dollars alone can solve the problem. It involves wisdom and planning and foresight. Those are far more important than dollars. We must do the best we can.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The other question I would like to ask the chairman is this: Are any safeguards placed upon the use of the $100 million which is to be authorized for the President's Emergency Fund? Before the Senator answers that question I should like to point out that there is some apprehension on the part of some members of the Committee on Appropriations in that respect. We held hearings and we heard Under Secretary Dillon testify that this money was needed specifically to go into Africa, to bail out some of the countries in the Congo. That may be fine. However, I share the apprehension expressed by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Do we go into this program with our eyes open?

Some members of our committee inquired of Secretary Dillon as to whether we shall continue to make blunders in the handling of our foreign aid programs, on a unilateral or bilateral basis, or whether we will profit by those blunders and experiences and, before we go pell-mell into the African areas with this program, whether we will insist on knowing whether we shall have some cooperation and aid from the other free nations of the world, and whether there will be an effort made to channel some of the aid through the United Nations, so that when the programs are initiated in Africa they will have the prestige and the strength of all the free nations who are participating or making funds available, instead of placing the United States in the precarious position of undertaking the aid program under so-called emergency conditions, under which mistakes might be made, with hostility and unfriendliness developing, and finally censure being heaped upon our Government and upon the American people, as has happened in the past.

Secretary Dillon made this comment before our committee, in trying to give us some assurance on this point:

> Certainly in the Congo we wish to operate through the U.N. That is what we told Mr. Lumumba when he was here, and that is what we told the United Nations.

I should like to have some specific assurances, if the chairman can give me any, that we will try to make cooperative arrangements and develop a mutual program of aid for the countries in Africa, instead of initiating a program which will involve a commitment for the United States to carry the full financial burden in trying to develop areas of Africa which may require many billions of dollars and may require 10 or 20 years time.

Has the committee any assurance so far as the $100 million are concerned that we can rely on the cooperation of the other free nations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator referring to the contingency fund?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The $100 million fund.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as the United Nations participation is concerned, the Appropriation Committee placed a limitation in its action this morning that not more than 40 percent of the program administered by the United Nations will be paid for by the United States. In other words, it was provided that we would pay not more than 40 percent. I must emphasize that this fund is a contingency fund. It may be spent at the discretion of the President. He can use it. He does not have to use the United Nations, but may use it through the United Nations.

I am told it is the intention to use it so far as possible through the United Nations. That is the policy. There is no requirement under the authorization to do so. He may use it under the very broad authority that exists in the mutual security program, with which I know the Senator is familiar.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I can assure the Senator that my remarks are wholly impersonal, because the present occupant of the White House will not be there after January. Another person will serve as President. Then we will face this entire situation again. Therefore, I ask the chairman if he is in accord with the comments made by Under Secretary Dillon that we ought to explore all possibilities to insure the assistance of other countries, instead of undertaking this loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely. I must say in support of Mr. Dillon that he has made great efforts in recent months and in the past year or two to enlist the efforts of other countries. He did a fine job in Europe last spring in trying to develop among European nations a new

approach to the program, and in enlisting their assistance. I point out that in the Inter-American Bank the other countries give more than 50 percent, and our part is less than 50 percent.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There is no legislative safeguard provided which will require assistance from the other countries through the operation of the U.N. in the handling of this program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no requirement that I know of. In the normal appropriations for the U.N. we have certain limits that we abide by. However, this program will be what we call a special undertaking, of an emergency nature. We have already provided the major part of the transportation of the U.N. troops to the Congo.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to address my question to the Senator from Idaho. Before I do so, I wish to say this.

I admire his concern to see that we get some results for the money we spend on these programs. It has been my observation that the best policeman we can have in connection with the expenditure of money in foreign aid is a requirement that a country which is to be the beneficiary of a project or a program itself bear a part of the cost of the particular project—a sponsor's contribution, so to speak.

The Senator from Idaho will recall that in the days of the WPA and the PWA there was a requirement for a sponsor's contribution. That was the best guarantee we could get that a project would have value to it.

I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, as was the Senator from Idaho, at the time the Marshall plan was inaugurated. At that time I sponsored a proposal that a certain amount should be put up by a recipient country under the original Marshall plan program. Later we were told by those who administered what became the ECA program that that was a good policeman. I hope something like that may be incorporated in all new programs.

This is the question I wanted to ask the Senator from Idaho: Does he not believe, with respect to the Latin American countries, that the United States, by reason of its historical position with respect to the Monroe Doctrine, has a special obligation? That is, if we tell countries in the Eastern Hemisphere that they must stay out of the Western Hemisphere, that statement carries with it some obligation for us to be concerned about the economic and social problems of Latin America.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I agree fully with the Senator from South Dakota. I point to my vote in favor of establishing an inter-American Development Bank. I thought this country was obligated to cooperate in establishing stability and solidarity in those areas to enable them to withstand the economic pressures which might come from the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.

My point is, Why should we have to undertake another program until we have implemented the first one?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I presume the loan program does not meet the whole need, and the administration wants a program in which it can make some grants. I myself hope they will be grants which will carry with them the requirement of local participation by the recipient countries, in order that we may have the guarantee that those countries themselves regard the program as worthwhile.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota, because only in that way can we insure the success of any program we undertake for the economic welfare of the South American countries.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations a question, relating to his answer to the Senator from Idaho, about how we would feel if we did not vote this aid, and shortly afterward the Soviet Government made a loan to some Latin American country, and then moved in. Did the Russian Government make any loan to Castro or move in there visibly and financially before the Castro government went Communist?

Actually, the United States had been subsidizing Cuba to the tune of $150 million annually through our sugar program. Nevertheless, the Castro government went Communist without any apparent or visible financial advance on the part of the Russians. What evidence is there that if we spend our money in Latin American countries, it will be a guarantee of the exclusion of Communist infiltration? There was nothing in Cuba to prove that that would not happen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no guarantee at all. We do not profess that there is a guarantee. This is an effort to try to prevent such a thing from happening. There were Russian agents in Cuba. A brother of Mr. Castro is generally believed to be a trained Communist. Mr. Guevara, who is the head of Cuba's financial institution and the principal economic director of the island, is considered to be a thoroughgoing Communist.

I said a moment ago that I do not think we can accomplish this purpose by money alone. I think other things are required. The Russians have been very active in supporting, assisting, and sending out trained agents. They were in Guatemala; they are in Cuba. They are in all those countries. They have their cells, or their agents, if that word is preferred, in practically every country. Russia has moved in to supply those countries with oil. They have made a big deal to trade with sugar. The Senator knows about that.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; surely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Usually the operation is preceded by agents, followed by money. It is easier to write a check than it is to send out people.

Mr. GRUENING. Would we not earn great respect from the Latin American nations and the good opinion of mankind if, for our own self-respect, we announced at the coming meeting that we intended to develop a program, and took the time to spell out the program, and put it down, more or less, in black and white after consultation with those countries as to what they needed; after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress; and after consultation with the appropriate loan agencies, instead of rushing in with a blank check for $500 million? The proposal which is before us is fantastic.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Our committee last year advocated a 5-year plan, and it was voted by the committee. Due to circumstances, which all of us know about, it failed to pass. Congress bears a part of the responsibility, due to the fact that the program has been conducted on an annual basis. The administration also bears a part of the responsibility. The administration was split on the question. In my judgment, the Department of State favored such a long-term program and promoted it. Other parts of the Government did not favor it. The Appropriations Committees, particularly the House Appropriations Committee, have been against it. They disapprove of long-term programs.

There is a great body of opinion in both Houses which had hoped that we might get rid of this program next year. Some of us have been willing to put it on a longer term basis. However, others have been unwilling even to support many suggestions as to how to improve the program, in the belief that it could be abandoned. I do not believe the country or Congress has ever accepted the idea that this is a long-term program. This is a long-term program. It will be with us for a long time; therefore, we should make provision for it. I agree with the Senator from Alaska that that is the way the program should be arranged. But as it has been handled, it has been on an annual basis.

We are also confronted with what the administration believes is an emergency situation; and I share in that belief. This is no time to go over all the mistakes of the past made by any administration. I think we are confronted with a demand by the administration which is justified by events which are now taking place, regardless of any faults or mistakes which may have been made in the past.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this subject has been discussed at great length. I wonder if we cannot conclude upon a time arrangement for voting.

How long does the Senator from Texas expect to speak?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not more than 5 minutes. I call attention to the fact that my name has been before the Presiding Officer for more than an hour. One Senator after another asked questions. One Senator would rise, and another would sit down. There was really

a roundtable discussion. So I shall take not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after 10 minutes—the 10 minutes to be equally divided between the minority and the majority—the Senate proceed to vote, because the yeas and nays have been ordered on both bills.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I also have been waiting for more than an hour. I think I can conclude everything I wish to say in about 6 minutes. But I would want 6 minutes before I would agree to the proposal of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have been waiting exactly 56 minutes. I think I shall not speak as long as the Senator from Wisconsin expects to speak. I shall conclude my remarks in 4½ minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be concluded in 15 minutes, 10 minutes to be allotted to the majority side, and 5 minutes to the minority side.

Mr. SMATHERS. After we have spoken?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am simply trying to arrange a time pattern, so that the Senator from Florida may speak for 4½ minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Fifteen and one-half minutes have already been requested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 20 minutes of discussion, the debate on the measures be concluded, and that the Senate then vote; the time for the debate to be apportioned among Senators who have sought recognition, namely, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]—and what about the distinguished Senator from Alaska?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is fantastic that we should now pile Ossa upon Pelion and proceed to vote a blank check with no specifications whatsoever on the ground that it will be useful down at Bogotá and will enable our Nation to say, "We come bearing gifts."

I think the word of the United States that we have this program in mind should be sufficient; that when the new administration takes office, when there we can hope for a far more intelligent and better managed foreign aid program, we could sit down and arrange a series of programs for Latin America which can be presented to Congress and then voted upon intelligently.

Congress has abdicated its constitutional powers for a number of years with respect to the foreign aid program. It has voted blank checks to the administration for foreign aid. Now it is proposing to move headlong in the same direction, only more rapidly.

We are going down hill with a vertiginous rapidity.

I recall very clearly that in his very eloquent speech to the Senate last night, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], said that the people of America understand what was meant when on sacred parchments it was written: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which your fathers have set."

But that is what would be done by means of the measures now before us.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me confess frankly that never before have I encountered the word "vertiginous." Will the Senator from Alaska be so kind as to inform me the meaning of the word? [Laughter.]

Mr. GRUENING. It means headlong, precipitous and catastrophic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Never before have I heard the word used.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that in view of the lengthy debate which already has occurred on these measures, it would be entirely proper for the distinguished Senator from Alaska to defer his additional remarks until tomorrow, and permit the Senate to vote now on these two measures. In that event, he could reserve for himself the right to speak further on these matters tomorrow, but we would be able to take the vote on these measures at this time.

But such an arrangement would not curtail the right or the opportunity of the distinguished Senator from Alaska to manifest his position on these matters so that not only the people in the frozen State of Alaska, but people throughout the whole wide world would understand how he feels about these matters.

Mr. GRUENING. But more than the matter of foreign aid is involved. In addition, there is the unmistakable fact that this administration has followed a double standard—it has refused the necessary domestic appropriations at the same time that it has requested blank check appropriations for use in foreign countries. If the Congress would adopt, in regard to domestic matters, a policy of making appropriations, and insisting on them, in line with the appropriations for foreign aid, that would be different. But so very, very often when Congress attempts to make even a small appropriation for an essential domestic purpose, the administration is opposed, and vetoes are forthcoming; yet the administration insists that blank check funds be provided for foreign aid, for all sorts of programs of the utmost generosity, insofar as the people in other lands are concerned.

If a more reasonable balance were demonstrated and maintained as between domestic programs and foreign programs, I would have less objection. But we find that regularly the administration opposes domestic programs to reduce or end the pollution of streams, to provide aid to education, to provide essential or public housing, to provide vital public works, the orderly development of our forests, needed highways, the rehabilitation of our fishing resources and so forth; and representatives of the administration tell us that such programs and the appropriations for them are unnecessary. Yet the administration tells us, at the same time, that insofar as foreign aid is concerned, the sky is the limit. For instance, in this case, we are not given any specifics in regard to how the money requested would be used.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alaska, that when the roll is called, he indulge in a loud "No," that would be heard all the way to Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks.

Mr. GRUENING. But I do not think this program calls for only a monosyllabic dissent. I think it calls for much more than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has not my friend, the Senator from Alaska, finished his statement? Cannot we proceed to vote in a few minutes?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am prepared to speak for 12 hours on this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tonight?

Mr. GRUENING. No; but we can resume tomorrow. Perhaps I will be more reasonable, then——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not permit the votes to be taken at this time, and then have the Senator from Alaska continue his speech thereafter?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I feel it necessary to expose the iniquity of this administration. We have tried to do so in the past; but I feel it essential that we do so even more clearly now.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor, and I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No, Mr. President; I have the floor. I yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, next week the mutual security appropriation bill will be before us. In view of the fact that we have had the third reading on these two important bills, and have ordered the yeas and nays on the question of their passage, and in view of the fact that the plan is to bring up the "medicare" bill tonight and make it the pending business, and continue with its consideration on tomorrow, I wonder whether the Senator from Alaska will permit us to proceed now on that basis. After all, Senators' minds are doubtless made up by now, and we should recognize that fact.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator from Alaska agree to have the votes taken at 2 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. GRUENING. That would be much better. Certainly this is a very serious matter. At the present time we are going down a path along which we can never return, unless a halt is made definitely and promptly. I think it is an extremely serious matter when the Senate is called upon to vote for a half-billion-dollar authorization which the chairman of the committee says will be only the beginning for this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has the floor and yielded for a brief interruption.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yielded only in an attempt to permit a unanimous-consent request to be submitted, in an effort to have the debate ended within a reasonable time. But I did not yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to appeal to the Senator from Alaska who, I want to say, is consistent in his position insofar as foreign aid is concerned.

But I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in his younger days the Senator from Alaska wrote a very excellent book on Mexico, and I would recommend to all Senators that they read the book, even these many decades after it was written, because what the Senator from Alaska wrote in that book still holds good. At that time the Senator from Alaska indicated a very great personal interest in Latin America.

Mr. President, the pending measures have to do with a cooperative program covering Latin America, one-sixth of the authorization of the Latin American bill is to be used for the redevelopment and rehabilitation of Chile which, as all Senators know, has been damaged very severely and gravely by earthquakes. In fact, the latest one occurred only today, when Santiago underwent another tremor of some severity.

So I urge the Senator from Alaska to save his ammunition until next week, when we shall consider the appropriations for the mutual security program.

But certainly prompt action by us on the pending measures is most important, in view of the fact that at the present time there is under way in Costa Rica the Conference of Foreign Ministers, and in view of the fact that in another 2 weeks there will be the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Bogotá, Columbia.

Prompt action by the Congress on the two measures now before us would give a psychological imperative which many of us think extremely important at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend that my interest in Mexico and in Latin America is undiminished.

But I feel very deeply that the way now proposed is not the way to help either those countries or ourselves.

In town at this time is a very distinguished representative of the Government of Mexico. I shall not name him; but I shall state that only the other day I had lunch with him, and at that time he told me that these loans are doing damage not only to the countries which receive them, but also to the United States of America.

Mr. President, if the specifics of these proposed programs were spelled out in a tangible way, so we could know what we were voting for, I might feel differently about these matters.

But at this time it is proposed that we authorize $500 million as a blank check, without any knowledge in regard to what the money will be used for.

Certainly I would be willing to vote for aid to the people of Chile, where great suffering has occurred because of the earthquakes, and where tens of thousands of the people are homeless. I would be glad to have us vote to aid Chile, for the people there have suffered a great disaster, and I am sure that all of us will be glad to help them or to help other suffering people in other countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield again?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would suggest that the committee has set out guidelines in considering what the procedure should be under this cooperative program.

Furthermore, this time, instead of appropriating the money to the President, the committee proposes appropriating it to the Secretary of State, whom we can hold more accountable; and the committee states, in addition, that it should be subject to such further legislative provisions as may be indicated, and also states that the Secretary of State shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives informed regarding the utilization of such funds.

Furthermore, the appropriations must be acted on by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Alaska that this matter will be looked at very closely, and that before approval will be given by the Foreign Relations Committee, any such proposals will be gone over with a fine-toothed comb; and I feel quite certain that in this area, at least, what will be done will meet with a greater degree of satisfaction on the part of all Senators than is the case now under the mutual security program.

So I appeal to the Senator from Alaska to permit us to proceed now to act on these measures.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to say that if I can have the assurance of the assistant majority leader that in the future he will cooperate in securing some similarity between the domestic programs and the foreign aid programs, I would be more willing to proceed in the way now proposed. But I think it shocking that when it is desired to build only a cabin for a necessary program in one of our national forests, the position of the administration is that the proposal for it must go through all the long, complicated, strict budgetary procedures; whereas in this instance the administration asks of Congress a $500 million blank check for this foreign aid program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator from Alaska that that will have my serious consideration.

But the Senator knows as well as I do that I stood fast with him when the administration proposed to give money for the construction of college classrooms and dormitories in Burma and for the construction of a road between one city in Burma and another city in Burma, whereas at the same time the administration took the position that we could not provide funds for classrooms and teachers or the construction of roads in the United States. I protested most seriously, and stood shoulder to shoulder with the distinguished Senator from Alaska on that point.

So I appeal to the Senator from Alaska to allow us to arrive at a time certain on which to vote.

Mr. GRUENING. Very reluctantly, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I renew my request that at the end of 20 minutes, to be divided between the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senate proceed to vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, is it understood that the Senator from Texas shall have 5 minutes, the Senator from Wisconsin 6 minutes, the Senator from Florida 4½ minutes, and the Senator from New York 4½ minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. The Senator from New York wanted only 3 minutes.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in supporting the passage of S. 3861, I congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations and its distinguished chairman for their action on this measure, and commend them for the statements heard here and the colloquy that has taken place.

I appreciate the mixed emotions with which the chairman of the committee, who has stated his views on it, and the whole committee, must view this unusual last-minute request by the administration to set up a program which many Senators have long advocated.

If this were a political session of Congress, as some of our colleagues across the aisle have charged, I think those Senators would be well justified in postponing consideration of this request until a later date.

However, they have taken this action because here is something that ought to be done, and done now. It is, in fact, overdue. I think Senators on both sides of the aisle can take pride in the fact that they have laid aside political considerations and have moved in this field of responsibility. Senators who have conducted the educational campaign for the program are entitled to credit, as are also the administration, which has perceived its merits, and the committee that has voted for it unanimously.

The mere fact that I lived for 3½ years in a border city at the Mexico-Texas line, and the fact that I go to Mexico every year and know many people who live there, does not give me the right to believe that I am an expert on Latin-American affairs, or even on Mexican affairs. I know I am not an expert merely by reason of these numerous visits, I know the study of Latin-American affairs is a lifetime study, and even then will not make one an expert.

Recent developments in Latin America have reinforced our desire to make concrete our longstanding goal of a true good neighbor policy toward our sister republics.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that, due to our longstanding American policy, beginning with the Monroe Doctrine and extending up to date, we owe special consideration to Latin America. We have a special obligation there. We owe a higher obligation, I think, to the Latin American Republics than we do to any other nations of the world, except perhaps the Philippines, to whom we have granted their freedom.

Just as our revolution and philosophy of freedom inspired the Latin American countries in their fights for independence, so our industrial success and prosperity have created in them the desire for comparable economic independence and freedom. By such a program as is here proposed we can again be on the side of the Latin American Republics, this time in a struggle against poverty and economic dependence, just as we were on their side against their political dependence.

We certainly cannot afford to be cast in the role of the economic oppressor, nor have we any such desire. We can now light the torch of economic freedom for them as we once lighted the torch of political freedom.

One of the greatest apparent defects of this proposal may well also be one of its greatest advantages. I refer to its lack of detail in how the proposed authorization is to be used or administered. As I understand the proposal, these details are to be developed cooperatively by the American Republics, allowing them the maximum possible responsibility in planning for their social development. This seems to be following in the great tradition of the Marshall plan in providing "help for self-help" to these countries.

The needs of Latin America, with its existing need to develop its underdeveloped resources, and its fantastic population growth, which experts have estimated will double ours in 30 years, are nearly as great as those confronting Europe when the Marshall plan was initiated. We all know of the devastation of Chile. The $100 million for aid in the rehabilitation of the economy of those lovers of liberty is a reasonable request. The $500 million to be used in developing the economics for freedom of our good neighbors of the Americas from the Rio Grande to Patagonia will cheer the hearts of all the Americas. It is not charity; it is not exploitation; it is a good neighbor self-help and neighbor-help idea, like the old-fashioned house-raising in our own pioneer days.

With the adoption of this proposal, we may hope for as great a success in meeting the local needs in Latin America as the Marshall plan achieved.

In conclusion, I make a request of the administration. The administration is asking much of Congress in the way of faith. I hope it will respond by inviting the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as a representative of this body, to go to the meeting at Bogotá on September 5. We all know, from the way the chairman has sponsored this proposal, and the student aid program, that he has the capacity to put aside political or partisan considerations and work for the good of the country in the best spirit of our Western civilization and in the best spirit of parliamentary government.

I think it would reassure the Senate and the House if they knew that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was to be invited to go to Bogotá, because they know of his good judgment. He has stated, in his able statement, the fact that we are going to have to take it on faith, and I think we will have more faith if he is invited to that meeting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is with very great regret that I shall vote against this bill. I do so recognizing that Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee who are responsible for it are a fine, able group of men. I trust them. I have faith in them. However, under the circumstances, I cannot bring myself to vote for the bill they report.

I recognize, of course, that it is rarely good politics to favor a foreign aid bill. I realize the kind of sacrifice that men have to make in campaigning for this kind of bill and with what great reluctance they ask for this kind of blank-check authorization.

I think the speech which the Senator from Arkansas put into the RECORD was an excellent speech. I think it explains his position very ably and very well. It is with great reluctance that I take a position in opposition to that of the Senator from Arkansas and to the unanimous recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think the basic idea in the bill is a good idea. I agree with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] that it is good to bring all the nations of South America into this program to work on the problems of South America together. But the fact is that this bill is legislative abdication.

The bill would authorize the spending of money pursuant to no specific, clear, evident guideline at all. This is a completely new precedent. I have just consulted with a distinguished member of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he tells me there is no precedent in his memory for this kind of authorization. There is no precedent for the Senate of the United States to permit money to be authorized to be spent without our first knowing where and when and how and why.

I am a new Member of this body. Members who have been in this body longer than I have recognized the great value of having what the Senate rules require: an authorization process and an appropriations process.

The fact is that we make a radical departure in this bill. We provide that the authorization process shall not fulfill its function. We provide that the legislative policy which must be set forth in an authorization proposal will be skipped.

I think this is an extremely serious departure. I recognize the administration very much desires to have this proposal passed. I recognize that fine members of the Committee on Foreign Relations feel its passage is necessary. However, I think we should not depart from the policy of many years of following the authorization and appropriation policy. I feel it would be a very grievous and unfortunate mistake.

Mr. President, this is more than merely a technical objection or an objection on the basis of procedural form. This is an objection which goes to the very heart of what we are asked to do. As has been said over and over again, almost ad nauseam, we would not make this kind of an authorization for any kind of domestic appropriation. No bank, no corporation, no State, no city, no individual would provide funds for any purpose without having some kind of specific designation as to how the money would be used.

I think we must insist, as U.S. Senators, on being told, before we vote for this kind of bill, in some way, in some degree, with some kind of guidelines, how the money is to be spent. The real question here tonight is whether U.S. Senators are competent enough to act on merits of specific legislation.

I have voted for and against foreign aid legislation in the past. Almost every time I have voted against such legislation it has been primarily because I felt there was not enough information available to know what we were asked to vote for. I refuse to vote for any legislation unless I can reach an informed understanding of what I am voting for. I cannot vote to spend the taxpayer's money on any kind of a program unless it is intelligibly justified.

I cannot bring myself, as a representative of the people of Wisconsin, to vote for a proposal which is so vague. To use the words of the chairman of the committee, the author of the bill:

> No program has been presented to the committee. No details worth speaking of have been offered. There is no country breakdown. There is not even the usual illustrative program. The Department of State speaks of this as "an initial contribution."

Mr. President, under these circumstances I think it would be a dereliction of duty on my part if I voted for the bill.

In the few remaining moments I have, Mr. President, I should like to refer to what appears to be the justification for the bill, on page 2 of the fine statement made by the Senator from Arkansas, when he said:

> The purpose of the bill is to enable the U.S. representatives at that conference to say to the others present that the United States agrees that there is an urgent need for immediate improvement in the living standards in Latin American countries.

I recognize that my time is up, but I say that even the fine answer given by the Senator from Arkansas does not satisfy me at all. I cannot understand why the word of this Government is so bad that our Secretary of State cannot go to South America and convince the countries of South America that we are sincere and honest and will fight for any constructive program that can be rationally justified on its merits.

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

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is recognized.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations. I particularly congratuate the distinguished and able chairman of the committee for the explanation he has made of this legislation. I share with the Senator, as I do with every Member of the Senate who has thus far spoken, regret and some resentment that the administration has made this presentation, with so few specifics involved.

However, Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake, because we do not like the manner in which this is presented, to vote against it. It would be unrealistic, I think, not to recognize that an emergency condition exists in Latin America. One need look only 90 miles beyond the border of my own State to see a country in flames. The whole area is under great stress and is experiencing great change.

We have not done what we should have done in that area in the past. Despite what some Senators said only a few moments ago about billions of dollars being poured into that area, the facts do not substantiate such statements. Since 1946, although many billions of dollars have been going to other areas of the world, Latin America has received only 1½ percent of the total in grant aid and less than 3 percent of the combined loan and grant total. To be sure, there have been expenditures by the Export-Import Bank, but the Export-Import Bank, as Senators who serve on the appropriate committees know, makes money from its operations. It makes commercial loans. This program would be effective in fields where commercial loans cannot be obtained.

In the past we have voted for some of the programs which are here recommended. We voted this year for the housing program, but the Development Loan Fund has not done much to implement it.

In 1956 the Senate voted for an amendment, which I offered, to help in regard to housing, sanitation, roads, and the resettlement of Indians from the highlands to the lowlands. We favored that by some 85 votes as compared to less than 5 votes against it. When Senators say that this proposal is completely new, that is not exactly correct. We have gone over much of this subject previously.

The reason we must vote for the program now is that otherwise the impression would go out once again that the United States has turned its back on Latin America. I happen to believe that the Latin Americans do not wish charity. There is no evidence whatever that the Latin Americans would like to have somebody give them something. Despite the fears of some Senators that the money to be provided will not get to the people, the Latin Americans have not asked for any giveaway. The only thing they have asked is that we make the program available to them so that they can participate in it, putting up their share of the money—money which will be dedicated to the programs—so that they can develop their countries. By developing their countries they can resist the dogma and the teachings of communism which, as we all know, flourish in the areas where there is poverty and ignorance and chaos.

Mr. President, I do not know that we can do anything else. We must support this bill, even though we have grave reservations and dislike the manner in which it has been presented to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall support this bill. My support for it is based upon the rather extensive experience which I have had in respect to the original Marshall plan in Europe, when I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Foreign Economics Subcommittee, and now as the chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians.

I know one thing of particular importance. The dignity and self-respect of the Marshall type plan has been what the South American countries have been searching for all the time. The mere fact that we shall be committed to that principle, which represents a new departure in American foreign policy so far as the other American Republics are concerned, is very important. Let us not forget that the dignity of those countries, the fact that they feel they belong and are being treated on the same parity with the European countries, with which we have had relationships under the Marshall plan since the end of of World War II, is very important to countries like Venezuela, Brazil, Chile, Peru, and all the other countries of Latin America. They will feel that we are putting them on a parity with the German Federal Republic, France, Great Britain, Holland, and Belgium. That is the way they would like to be considered.

Mr. President, we are coming to a new era in American relationships with the other American Republics. We have gone through the gunboat policy; landing Marines. We have gone through the good neighbor policy. We are now coming to the policy of regional alliance. This bill is a recognition of the maturity of these countries and of the maturity of our own point of view with respect to them.

Certainly it is general in nature.

However, I close upon this point. Are there not many Senators who constantly complain that our diplomacy is not resourceful enough, that it is not quick enough, that it is not "on the ball" enough, that it is not flexible enough in order to meet the challenges which face us today in this world? Now that we have an example of resourcefulness, of speed, of flexibility, and of putting our negotiator in the best and not the worst position, we suddenly become very cautious and very careful. We want a full bill of particulars, even though there is no appropriation bill, and we are not going to let them do it.

It seems to me the very ones who complain about alacrity and skill and equipping our negotiators properly should be the first to jump at this kind of opportunity in this kind of tough situation. I believe we ought to compliment the entire Committee on Foreign Relations, and our confidence in the Foreign Relations Committee should be restored. It unanimously voted to report this bill. I shall support it as a step in the highest national interest of our country.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his compliment.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a number of tables bearing upon this question as to the various programs and how they have been administered in Latin America. These were the tables which were supplied to us by the Department of State in the consideration of this bill.

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

U.S. economic aid to Chile, fiscal years 1946–60—Obligations and other commitments

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years 1946–59	Fiscal year 1960 [1]	Fiscal years 1946–60 [2]
Mutual security program, total	26.9	18.9	45.8
International Cooperation Administration	16.6	7.9	24.5
Technical cooperation	15.8	3.1	18.9
Other	.8	4.8	5.6
Development Loan Fund	.3	10.5	10.8
Other MSP economic	10.0	.5	10.5
Non-mutual-security program, total	256.3	24.0	280.3
Public Law 480, total	59.1	7.1	66.2
Title I. Planned Country Use	30.9	1.4	32.3
(Sales agreements)	(38.9)	(3.1)	(42.0)
Title II. Emergency Relief			
Title III. Voluntary Relief Agencies	28.2	5.7	33.9
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	192.1	16.9	209.0
Other U.S. economic programs	5.1		5.1
Grand total, economic programs	283.2	42.9	326.1

[1] Preliminary.
[2] All planned for sec. 104(g) loans for economic development.

U.S. economic aid to Latin America, fiscal years 1946–60—Obligations and other commitments

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years 1946–59	Fiscal year 1960 [1]	Fiscal years 1946–60
Mutual security program, total	464.2	99.6	563.8
International Cooperation Administration [2]	377.6	67.2	444.8
Technical cooperation	203.7	36.1	239.8
Other	174.0	31.2	205.2
Development Loan Fund	65.8	28.6	94.4
Other MSP economic	20.8	3.8	24.6
Non-mutual-security program, total	3,061.1	166.6	3,227.7
Public Law 480, total	417.0	50.0	467.0
Title I. Planned Country Use [3]	277.5	38.0	315.5
(Sales Agreements)	(392.9)	(77.5)	(470.4)
Title II. Emergency Relief	39.0		39.0
Title III. Voluntary Relief Agencies	100.5	12.0	112.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	2,339.0	116.6	2,455.6
Other U.S. economic programs	305.1	[4]	305.1
Grand total, economic programs	3,525.3	266.2	3,791.5

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Excludes worldwide malaria eradication.
[3] All planned for sec. 104(g) loans for economic development.
[4] Expenditure for Latin American highways not available; estimated at about $4,000,000.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Investment position of the United States in Latin America, 1957–58

[Millions of dollars]

	1957	1958 (preliminary)
Private investments	10,534	11,113
Long-term	9,282	9,769
Direct	8,325	8,730
Foreign dollar bonds	123	139
Other foreign securities [1]	37	40
Other	797	860
Short-term	1,252	1,364
Deposits	47	55
Other	1,205	1,309
U.S. Government credits and claims	1,238	1,699
Long-term	1,119	1,559
Short-term	119	140
Total	11,772	12,832

[1] Consists primarily of securities payable in foreign currencies, but includes some dollar obligations, including participation in loans made by the IBRD.

Source: "Survey of Current Business," U.S. Department of Commerce, August 1959.

IBRD loan commitments in Latin America [1]

[Millions of dollars]

Country	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960 (to June 17)	Total, fiscal years 1947–60	Country	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960 (to June 17)	Total, fiscal years 1947–60
Brazil	13.4	84.6		267.1	Mexico	45.0			186.3
Chile	21.8		32.5	106.2	Nicaragua				23.0
Colombia		19.4	42.6	173.2	Panama				6.9
Costa Rica		3.5	2.0	8.5	Paraguay				4.5
Ecuador	19.5	13.0		45.0	Peru		6.6	5.0	52.5
El Salvador		8.0		31.6	Uruguay			7.0	71.0
Guatemala				18.2					
Haiti				2.6	Total	105.2	136.6	89.1	1,007.8
Honduras	5.5	1.5		11.2					

[1] Net after cancellations.

Value of direct investment in Latin America by selected countries and years

[Millions of dollars]

Country	1950	1952	1955	1956	1957	1958 [1]	Country	1950	1952	1955	1956	1957	1958 [1]
Argentina	356	393	447	466	501	517	Venezuela	993	1,174	1,428	1,829	2,683	2,863
Brazil	644	1,013	1,115	1,218	1,301	1,345	Central America, Dominican Republic, and Haiti	432	487	563	630	674	737
Chile	540	623	639	676	702	736	Other countries	86	103	119	132	161	173
Colombia	193	232	274	298	297	289							
Cuba	642	686	736	777	840	861	Total	4,445	5,443	6,233	7,059	8,324	8,731
Mexico	414	490	607	690	765	781	Oversea territories [2]	131	158	179	314	339	395
Peru	145	242	305	343	400	429							

[1] Preliminary figures.
[2] British Guiana, British Honduras, British West Indies, Jamaica, Trinidad, the Bahama Islands, Bermuda, French Guiana, French Islands in the Western Hemisphere, Netherlands West Indies and Surinam.

Source: "Survey of Current Business," U.S. Department of Commerce, August 1959.

U.S. economic aid to Latin America, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1960 [1]*—Obligations and other commitments*

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala
Mutual security program, total	563.8	26.3	131.8	37.8	45.8	11.0	11.0	2.8	2.0	28.9	7.2	69.3
International Cooperation Administration, total [2]	444.8	1.5	127.8	37.6	24.5	11.0	10.7	2.8	2.0	18.9	7.2	63.9
Technical cooperation	239.8	1.4	21.3	35.2	18.9	11.0	8.6	2.8	2.0	14.2	7.2	13.7
Other	205.2	.1	106.6	2.4	5.6		2.1			4.7		50.2
Development Loan Fund	94.4	24.8	4.0	.2	10.8		.3			10.0		5.4
Other mutual security program economic	24.6				10.5							

See footnotes at end of table.

U.S. economic aid to Latin America, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1960 [1]*—Obligations and other commitments*—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala
Non-mutual-security program, total	3,227.7	425.7	58.5	1,196.6	280.3	198.8	51.6	38.0	.6	35.6	2.8	45.9
Public Law 480, total	467.0	34.8	23.6	164.4	66.2	60.8	1.0	[3]	----	8.7	1.0	4.6
Title I country use (local currency loans for economic development)	315.5	34.8	----	148.1	32.3	40.1	----	----	----	6.6	----	----
(Sales agreements)	(470.4)	(62.4)	----	(178.4)	(42.0)	(69.9)	----	----	----	(9.4)	----	----
Title II	39.0	----	17.4	----	----	----	.2	----	----	----	----	3.2
Title III	112.5	----	6.1	16.3	33.9	20.8	.8	[3]	----	2.1	1.0	1.3
Export-Import Bank	2,455.6	390.8	24.3	986.8	209.0	135.4	21.0	37.5	----	23.2	----	6.2
Other [4]	305.1	.1	10.6	45.4	5.1	2.6	29.6	.5	.6	3.7	1.8	35.1
Grand total	3,791.5	452.0	190.3	1,234.4	326.1	209.8	62.6	40.9	2.7	64.5	10.0	115.2

	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Paraguay	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela	Overseas territories	Regional
Mutual security program, total	39.2	21.7	7.0	9.5	13.0	22.1	28.2	10.6	1.2	8.2	29.2
International Cooperation Administration, total [2]	31.6	13.9	7.0	6.4	13.0	15.0	23.7	1.8	1.2	8.2	15.1
Technical cooperation	11.0	9.9	7.0	6.1	11.0	13.5	21.6	1.7	1.2	5.3	15.1
Other	20.6	4.0	----	.4	2.0	1.5	2.0	.2	----	2.9	----
Development Loan Fund	7.6	7.8	----	3.1	----	7.1	4.5	8.8	----	----	----
Other	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	14.1
Non-mutual-security program, total	37.5	12.7	457.9	31.4	45.2	16.2	242.8	27.7	15.4	6.2	----
Public Law 480, total	7.5	2.4	14.8	----	5.2	3.2	40.5	21.9	----	6.2	----
Title I country use	----	----	10.6	----	----	2.2	19.1	21.7	----	----	----
(Sales agreements)	----	----	(28.2)	----	----	(3.0)	(33.9)	(43.2)	----	----	----
Title II	3.5	.2	.2	----	----	----	13.9	[3]	----	.3	----
Title III	4.0	2.2	4.0	----	5.2	1.0	7.5	.2	----	5.9	----
Export-Import Bank	27.0	3.5	343.5	12.1	16.8	10.1	191.7	2.6	13.9	----	----
Other	3.0	6.8	99.6	19.3	23.2	2.9	10.6	3.2	1.5	----	----
Grand total	76.7	34.4	464.9	40.9	58.2	38.3	271.0	38.3	16.6	14.4	29.2

[1] These data include preliminary figures for fiscal year 1960.
[2] Excludes worldwide malaria eradication program.
[3] Less than $50,000.
[4] Fiscal year 1960 data not available; expenditures for Latin American Highway estimated at about $4,000,000.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think this debate has been quite helpful. Many viewpoints have been expressed, and everyone who has spoken on the subject has believed in what he stated. I trust that Senators will give the statements the attention due them. I am happy to note that there is unanimous recognition in the Senate of the need for funds for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Chile, which has suffered a tremendous earthquake.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on Calendar No. 1910, Senate bill 3861, to be followed by a vote on Calendar No. 1908, Senate bill 3855.

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

The question is, Shall the bill S. 3861 pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 302]

YEAS—54

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Hartke	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Morton
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Holland	Muskie
Carlson	Hruska	Prouty
Carroll	Humphrey	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Smathers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith
Church	Keating	Sparkman
Clark	Kennedy	Symington
Dirksen	Kuchel	Wiley
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Williams, Del.
Engle	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGee	Yarborough
Frear	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young, Ohio

NAYS—19

Bible	Gruening	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Cannon	Jordan	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	Moss	
Ervin	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—27

Bartlett	Curtis	Lausche
Beall	Dodd	McCarthy
Bridges	Goldwater	Magnuson
Burdick	Green	Martin
Butler	Hart	Murray
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hill	Pastore
Cooper	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Schoeppel

So the bill S. 3861 was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR PRESIDENT'S MUTUAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to increase the authorization for appropriation for the President's mutual security contingency fund for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] were present he would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 303]

YEAS—59

Aiken	Bennett	Carroll
Allott	Bush	Case, N.J.
Anderson	Byrd, W. Va.	Case, S. Dak.
Bartlett	Carlson	Church
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Dirksen	Keating	Randolph
Douglas	Kennedy	Robertson
Dworshak	Kuchel	Scott
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Fong	Lusk	Smith
Fulbright	McGee	Sparkman
Gore	McNamara	Stennis
Hartke	Mansfield	Symington
Hayden	Monroney	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Morse	Williams, Del.
Holland	Morton	Williams, N.J.
Hruska	Moss	Yarborough
Humphrey	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Jackson	Muskie	Young, Ohio
Javits	Prouty	

NAYS—14

Bible	Ervin	McClellan
Cannon	Frear	Russell
Chavez	Gruening	Talmadge
Eastland	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Ellender	Jordan	

NOT VOTING—27

Beall	Dodd	Long, La.
Bridges	Goldwater	McCarthy
Burdick	Green	Magnuson
Butler	Hart	Martin
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	Murray
Capehart	Hill	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Kefauver	Pastore
Cotton	Kerr	Saltonstall
Curtis	Lausche	Schoeppel

So the bill S. 3855 was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator make that 10 o'clock?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been asked to make it even later, and have compromised by making the hour 10:30.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be prepared to speak at 10 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will change the hour to 10 o'clock.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1928, H.R. 12580, the social security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have spoken with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and the ranking majority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the author of the bill, who has reported an amendment relating to a medical plan. I am informed that they will be prepared to present the bill, the report, and the discussion on the merits of the bill, as they see it, tomorrow. They do not anticipate that there will be any yea-and-nay votes tomorrow. We do not expect to have any yea-and-nay votes tomorrow.

It is planned to have the Senate convene early on Monday; and if further discussion is desired before a vote, very well. It is, however, hoped that we may reach a vote as early as possible consistent with a thorough consideration of the bill.

I desire all Senators to be on notice that we shall discuss the bill tomorrow. It is not expected that there will be any yea-and-nay votes, but Senators who desire to speak may do so.

It is planned to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock on Monday morning. We will come in early and stay late every day next week, in the hope that we may conclude action on the bill as expeditiously as possible.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made definite that there will be no votes, rather than to say that no votes are anticipated. A good many Senators have already left the city; others will be leaving. I think there should be definite assurance that under no circumstances will there be a vote on any amendment tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot go that far, because I do not control that procedure. However, so far as the majority leader can control the procedure, there will be no votes.

If 10 Senators decided now that they wanted to vote, and the Senator from from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] moved to adjourn and asked for the yeas and nays, and if I asked Senators not to hold up their hands. but he was successful in having them ordered, I would be completely powerless to prevent a vote. I say that so far as the majority leader is concerned, there will be no votes, and I will do everything I can to resist them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, let me say I hope he will not object if I make an alternative suggestion; namely, ask unanimous consent that no votes be taken on Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will try to guarantee that, but I would not want to enter into a unanimous consent agreement on it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope that, whatever the course on tomorrow, Senators will not have to be bothered with apprehension or fear that a vote will be taken then—because, after all, that can be avoided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to allay any Senator's apprehension or fear. But I endure it all day long, every day. Certainly I shall do my best, and I think I have done reasonably well in these 10 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course the Senator from Texas has. But I think it important for Senators to know that no votes will be taken tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] for his patience and cooperation in helping the Senate transact very important business today and for withholding his speech until this late hour. It is a precedent which I should like to see more of our colleagues emulate, because thus we were able to proceed with important business of the Senate, by taking action on two important measures. I owe a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Texas. I have been glad to postpone my remarks until this point.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS AND THE POSITION OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that in doing so I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me express my indebtedness to the Senator from Utah, who many times has shown himself to be extremely courteous in postponing or deferring his own remarks. I really apologize to him, for I wish to make some comments about the votes taken a few minutes ago and about the tactics of the administration in the past and the ones which I am afraid are being used at present by the Republican Party in connection with these foreign aid programs.

I voted with great reluctance for these two foreign aid authorizations. I think the administration has slept too long on the problem as regards Latin America. I believe the administration was galvanized into action only after the disastrous events in Cuba, and was unprepared for the developments in Africa. In fact, only this year did the administration establish the position of special assistant Secretary of State in connection with aid programs for the countries in the Sahara; and in the past the administration has shown no real interest in the problems of the countries of central Africa or Equatorial Africa. It was only when disaster faced us and when the house started to fall down around our ears that the administration asked for congressional action.

The President demanded that we authorize the $700 million, and said that unless we did, dire things would happen. It may well be that that is true.

The President is asking that not one dime be cut from the $4,800 million of the standard foreign aid bill; he is asking that every penny of that amount be provided by Congress, without the slightest reduction. But all this comes at a time when the administration is reluctant to appropriate funds for health, for education, for distressed areas, for housing, or for any of the other manifold needs of the American people.

Mr. President, I have been a supporter of this foreign aid program, both under the Truman administration and under the Eisenhower administration.

I well remember the day in 1954 when I saw on the bulletin board that my Republican opponent in Illinois for election to the Senate, had made a speech attacking foreign aid; and the next day, as we came to vote on foreign aid, I saw on the bulletin board a statement that the President of the United States, who was demanding that the foreign aid program be supported, had endorsed my opponent and had asked for my defeat. I must admit that I was tempted, in reprisal, to vote against the foreign aid program. But I came into the Senate Chamber and cast successive votes for the foreign aid program, because I believed it was in the best interests of the people of the United States.

But when I returned to my State, I found myself under heavy attack from the Republican Party and from the administration, on the ground that I had voted for big expenditures and on the ground that I was "a big spender"; and on the stump, in the fall, I was frequently attacked by the Republicans because I had voted for the foreign aid appropriations for which the President has asked. The President even paid me the honor of going into Illinois and asking for my defeat. But the voters rejected his request.

Ever since then I have, in the main—with a few exceptions—voted for foreign aid appropriations. But every fall, when I return home, my Republican opponents and people in the audiences read from books which have been prepared, and refer in detail to the votes I have cast on foreign aid authorizations or appropriations, and openly state that I am a "big spender." I have reason to believe that the memorandums from which they have read have been prepared by the Republican National Committee or by the Republican congressional committee or by the Republican senatorial committee.

I have no illusions as to what will happen to me and to the other Senators on this side of the aisle, the other Democratic Senators, who this evening have voted for these foreign aid authorizations. Undoubtedly, we will be attacked by the Republicans; undoubtedly they will charge us with being "one-worlders" and "big spenders" and Senators who

favor wasting the people's money and pouring the taxpayers' funds down a rathole.

Let me hasten to state that I am sure that is not the tendency of all the Republicans; surely it is not the tendency of the distinguished whip on the Republican side, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who is the soul of gentlemanliness and fairplay. But I imagine that the Republican strategists really must be chuckling to themselves at the fix in which they put us tonight, as on other occasions. The President, in the name of the welfare of the Nation, asks us to vote for this measure. We do so, and then the Republican Party, of which he is the titular head, attacks us because we do so vote. We find this little trick played. It was not an appropriation we passed tonight; it was an authorization. We will be attacked because we voted for the authorization, but the administration, since there was no appropriation, will say, "Well, we have not spent the money." So they have an escape hatch on that.

Friends of mine have told me many people who come down here to persuade us to vote for these appropriations are double agents who, on the one hand, ask us to vote, in the name of the welfare of the Nation, for these authorizations and appropriations, and then, when they have won our support, telephone to the appropriate political committee and say, "We have hooked that fellow. Give him the works out in the State."

These are comments of friends of mine. I personally do not believe that it is quite as bad as that. I think the men in the State Department—and I suppose there are some in the galleries tonight; there always are—probably are sincere in what they suggest. As frequently happens, the Republicans use two sets of treatment. They will get sincere idealists to plead for authorizations and appropriations in the name of the national interest, and then turn loose the roughhouse boys to beat us up politically when the time comes.

I am informed confidentially that the Republicans have a memorandum which will be circulated to all their speakers and candidates, labeling the Democrats as the "Spendocrats." Publication of it may well be withheld for a day or two, until a separate page is added to it charging the Democrats who voted for this authorization bill tonight with authorizing the expenditure of $700 million, and possibly, if the appropriation for Chile is included, $800 million. This will be cited as a demonstration of the fact that Democrats are lavish with the people's money, when we carry out the national interest as represented to us by the Republican administration.

I wish there were more Members present on the Republican side of the aisle. I may, in a sense, be preaching to the converted, those who would not practice such tactics themselves; but I wish to remind them, with their sense of fairplay, of what happens to those of us who have tried to place the national interest above party interest.

I also ask the State Department to consider whether they are playing an ethical game, whether they are really defending the national interest, or whether they are lending themselves to being covert agents of a political party that is trying to punish those of us who try to defend the national interest.

This is a very serious question. If this issue is to be raised above politics, the Republican Party should not have a dual program. It should not be for foreign aid in Washington and against foreign aid in the States. It should not with one hand demand authorizations and appropriations to defend the national interest, and, with the other hand, it should not be feeding information and propaganda to those orators in the field who attack those of us who follow the advice of their President.

I hesitated for a long time as to whether I should vote for the bill, because I know how these tactics have been carried on in the past, and I know how they are being carried on at this very minute. I was tempted to vote against the bill, but I decided, whatever the cost to me, whatever the unfair tactics against me and my party—and I resent the unfair tactics against my party even more than I do against myself—nevertheless, I would put the national interest first. I think it is the glory of the Democratic Party that, in the main, it has done so, but the costs and penalties of doing this are many.

I know there are few Republicans to listen to this, I know my advice may fall on deaf ears, but I hope there are some who may read the RECORD; and I trust the members of the administration who are responsible for the strategy of the campaign will observe the elemental rules of fair play and will not follow this double policy of temptation, enticement, seduction, betrayal, and attack that has been so constantly followed in the past.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, if the Senator from Utah will permit.

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank both Senators. The first thing I want to do is associate myself very completely with the statement made this afternoon by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on S. 3861, the special aid authorization bill for Latin America. I have studied this measure carefully. I heard the Senator's presentation of it. I think it is fair for me to say that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in presenting this Latin American aid bill, did so with heavy heart and with reluctance, but out of a sense of national duty, in light of the expressions of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Under Secretary of State, who testified before the Foreign Relations Committee.

I am a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I try to take my duties there in a very responsible manner. I do not believe that we can afford to play what we call politics with the foreign policy of the Nation, and, therefore, today despite my misgivings—and I have serious misgivings about the timing of this proposal, and, indeed, the substance of the proposal—I voted for it.

A week ago I appeared on a television broadcast in this city known as the College News Conference. At that time I was asked a question by one of the college students about the $600 million Latin American aid proposal. I expressed doubt about it, and indicated I might very well oppose it.

I listened to the speech of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] the day after we convened—I believe it was on August 9—one of the most moving and persuasive and brilliant speeches I have heard on the subject of our foreign policy as it relates to Latin America. I was very much touched by that speech and considered it to be a document that establishes guidelines for American foreign policy considerations in Latin America.

I agreed with the basic message of the speech, namely, the while aid programs were required in Latin America, as elsewhere, there should be preliminary planning, cooperative planning, with the recipient nations; that this was not a responsibility merely for the United States of America; that we ought to look ahead and have a goal that we seek; that we should utilize the instrument of the Organization of American States, and possibly the United Nations, in working toward an economic development program in Latin America; that we needed a regional approach.

All of this has not been done. All of this has not been—I will not say ignored, but not fulfilled. We have bilateral aid, the Export-Import Bank, the Development Loan Fund aid to Latin American countries in small amounts; but no overall programing has been devised.

The Marshall plan success in Europe was not merely in the amount of money we provided, but in the fact that there was an organization, there was the Office of Economic Cooperation for Europe in Paris, wherein all of the needs of the respective Western European nations were considered, one against the other, in cooperation with one another, so that there was a kind of integrated, cooperative economic development throughout the entire free area of Western Europe. That is what we need in Latin America. We are not getting it.

I, as a member of the committee, who has interested himself in Latin American affairs, will say that the legislative history, as established by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], is very clearly stated. The authorization will require specific details when the appropriation comes to us. While the Appropriations Committee is not a committee which is supposed to engage in legislation, I know the Appropriations Committee will insist upon detailed plans as to how the money is to be expended. I will say now, if it does not and if the proposal comes before the Senate from the Appropriations Committee without those plans, I, for one, will not see it in my power to vote for the proposal.

I believe this business of writing out a check every time we get in trouble is but a further example of a rich man trying to pay for his grief and trouble

with a checkbook. One cannot solve the problems of the world with money. One cannot do it by writing checks in every emergency. A nation is like a family, and requires care and consideration for the future as well as for the present. Those of us who are parents know we cannot solve our problems in the family by a monetary gift to the children. Generally we solve our problems with love, understanding, consideration, cooperation, faithfulness, and a real sense of affection. I think this is required among nations, in terms of the political lives of people.

Mr. President, I thank the Senators for yielding to me. I know I shall be branded a spender. I am already so branded. In my State not a week goes by without an attack on me as being a spender. Let the record be clear. I have voted with the majority of my colleagues in this body and on this side of the aisle many times to reduce what I thought were unessential or nonessential expenditures. We have cut budgets when we thought budgets ought to be cut. We have increased budgets when we thought budgets ought to be increased. The record is quite clear throughout the recent years that this Congress and the previous Congresses have not appropriated as much money as the administration has requested. If the charge of "spender" is to be made, let it be applied to those who have sought the most. Let it be applied to those who have exercised fiscal irresponsibility. I shall expect the same attacks, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, that he will undoubtedly receive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am already receiving them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am receiving them in generous quantities. We shall be able to stand up to them.

The people of my State have good judgment and know the difference between falsehood and truth.

MODIFICATION OF ORDER—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered, for the Senate, when it concludes its business today, to stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, be modified to provide that the Senate recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

RECAPTURE OF SPACE CAPSULE EJECTED BY DISCOVERER XIV IN MIDAIR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I learned a few moments ago that a space capsule ejected by Discoverer XIV over our 49th State, Alaska, has been caught in midair by an Air Force C–119, 360 to 370 miles southwest of Honolulu in our 50th State.

The capsule was caught in the trapeze of the aircraft at 7:05 p.m., at 7:23 p.m. was reeled aboard, and is now winging its way to Hickam Air Force Base, where the plane will land at 10 o'clock Washington time.

I understand General White has authorized the immediate award on the plane's arrival of the Distinguished Flying Cross to the commander of the C–119 and the Air Medal to all members of the crew.

Mr. President, the pilot was Harold E. Mitchell, of Bloomington, Ind. I am proud to know that the copolit was a fellow Hawaiian, Capt. Richmond A. Apaka, of Kailua, Oahu, State of Hawaii.

Mr. President, with the recovery in midair of the space capsule the United States again has demonstrated our amazing progress in the conquest of space.

Ours is a program of great scope and depth, designed to produce scientific knowledge about the universe over a broad spectrum. It is a well-planned, orderly program which has already produced many space "firsts" of which all America can be proud.

Today's recovery of a second space capsule, coming only 8 days after the first recovery, confirms the gathering momentum of our space effort, which is paying increasingly handsome dividends in terms of knowledge and confidence.

America has the manpower, the brainpower, and the resources to unravel the mysteries of science and technology. With the encouragement and solid backing of the American people, our space team is doing just that. Our congratulations and our thanks go out to all the dedicated men and women who are contributing their talents to the urgent space effort.

Only 2 days ago President Eisenhower expressed the Nation's pride in recent accomplishments in space science and technology, stating:

> The United States leads the world in the activities in the space field that promise real benefits to mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the President's statement in which he enumerates six outstanding space achievements of 1960.

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

> The events of the past weeks have demonstrated beyond all doubt the vigor, capabilities, and leadership of the United States in the conquest of the frontiers of science and technology, in particular in the exploration and utilization of space. The entire Nation is proud of the impressive array of successful experiments carried out by the United States this year:
>
> Pioneer V, the sun satellite, which continued to receive and transmit radio messages over a period of 3 months and to a distance of 22 million miles from earth.
>
> Tiros I, the meteorological satellite which took 23,000 cloud cover pictures during its operating life of 3 months and provided increased assurance that revolutionary improvement of weather forecasting will be achieved.
>
> The success that has attended the efforts in the satellite-based navigation program called Transit I.
>
> The orbiting of Echo I, the 100-foot balloon which circles the earth at a distance of approximately 1,000 miles and a speed in excess of 15,000 miles per hour, serving as a reflector of radio signals from one point to another and distant points on the surface of the earth.
>
> The recordbreaking flights of the X–15 research airplane.
>
> And, finally, the spectacular recovery of the data capsule of the Discoverer XIII satellite.
>
> All these are the results of a well-planned and determined attack on this new field—an attack that promises very real and useful results for all mankind. Each of these satellites is destined to play an important role in broadening man's understanding of the cosmos in which he lives. While no one of them has been undertaken solely in an effort to achieve a spectacular first in the eyes of the world, each has resulted in just such a spectacular first in support of the desires of mankind for greater knowledge and understanding.
>
> The United States leads the world in the activities in the space field that promise real benefits to mankind.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief summary of our civilian space programs.

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

SPACE EXPLORATION—PAST AND FUTURE

In the advancement of civilization, the universal key to the major accomplishments and progress of the Western World has been the unrestricted curiosity and undaunted courage of free men. This combination characterizes today the efforts of U.S. scientists and engineers in what may be known in future years as the greatest adventure in the history of nations—the exploration of outer space.

In 1955, the Government approved the Vanguard program as a part of this country's space contribution to the International Geophysical Year. The launching by the Soviet Union of the world's first satellite, Sputnik I, 2 years later, confronted us with the realization that we were trailing in space technology and that the Communists intended to propagandize this advantage as demonstrating a superior scientific and technical capacity for their political system.

The measure of our people to respond to challege was put to perhaps its most critical peacetime test and now, some 3 years later, may be an appropriate time to assess our programs and progress.

In the interests of the international character of science and a world free of suspicion, the United States is dedicated to a policy of space for peaceful purposes and the furtherance of scientific knowledge for all men everywhere. Our activities, successful or unsuccessful, have been and will continue to be an open book for all to see, and our research data is made available to all nations. The world knows nothing, however, of Russian failures in the past or future schedules since an iron curtain of secrecy surrounds the Soviets' motives in space as in all its other activities. We do not know, for example, whether a human was included in the test of Sputnik IV, which after being launched on May 15, 1960, failed to respond to signals and went off into space instead of returning to the ground. The Soviet Union holds a temporary advantage in this game of "heads they win, tails we lose," but despite this drawback, the U.S. program is receiving widespread and enthusiastic acclaim.

Since the Russian satellite of 1957, 33 satellites have been launched and the United States has launched all but 7 of these. And of the 18 satellites still in space, this Nation's insignia is on 15.

More important than what has gone up into space, however, is what has been returned to earth. Information about our

universe is the key to our progress and is the return on the investments we are making. The first satellites to orbit the earth and the moon and the first satellite to hit the moon and take pictures of its far side have been accomplished by the U.S.S.R. But only the smallest amount of information has been released to the world on any data acquired through their accomplishments in space.

The first satellite to gather early weather information through photographs of cloud formations, America's Tiros I; the first to demonstrate the feasibility of a communications system using satellites, America's Echo I; the first to discover that the earth is pear-shaped, America's Vanguard; the first to discover the Van Allen radiation belt, America's Explorer; and the first to send radio signals over 22 million miles back to the earth, America's Pioneer, the first to eject a space capsule from its orbit around the earth to its target recovery area, America's Discoverer—these are just a few of the important accomplishments of U.S. scientists, working in a free environment. The results of these successful experiments have been submitted to scientists everywhere.

The advancements already made promise great economic benefits to the farmer, the businessman, and our people in all walks of life.

This 3-year period saw the establishment of a new Government agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the pulling together into one team of the outstanding scientific and technical personnel, facilities and organizations, to carry out the national space exploration effort. While this effort was being organized and implemented, funds were requested from the Congress in increasing amounts. At the present time, over $1 billion is being spent annually for our space activities which represent a 700-percent increase in the last 3 years.

A worldwide tracking and data acquisition network has been developed to accelerate our exploration. New launching complexes have been constructed and joint international space programs have been cooperatively entered into with other countries. And most important of all, a new family of high thrust space vehicles is under development. By 1964, we will have the most powerful rocket in existence, with 1½ millon pounds thrust, the Saturn. So much for the developments over the last 3 years. What about the future?

A detailed program of space exploration for the next 10 years has been established and a broad and exciting challenge to conquer the unknown has been outlined which leads to manned expeditions to the Moon.

Within 2 years: Project Mercury will send the first man into orbit around the Earth—27,000 miles in less than 2 hours; a vehicle will be launched to impact on the Moon; a vehicle will go into orbit around the Moon to send back vital information of conditions on the planet.

Within 4 years: An orbiting astronomical laboratory will be launched; a vehicle to orbit the Moon and return to Earth will be launched; the high powered Saturn vehicle will be available for our space launchings to give us the ability to send payloads of 20,000 tons into space.

Within 6 years: Launchings will be made to explore the planets Mars and Venus, the first launchings of the manned vehicles which will lead to expeditions to the Moon will take place.

The horizons to our space program are as unlimited as the Universe itself. The Soviet Union will continue to use its space program as a method of convincing the world of the superiority of the Communist system. We have accepted this challenge with an addition which expresses the confidence we have in our ability to compete successfully. The addition is that we have told the world about our future program, we will continue to reveal our failures as well as our successes and we will make free men in other nations our partners in this noble endeavor—by sharing the information we obtain in the Universe with them and cooperating with them in the international effort such an endeavor deserves.

SPECIAL LATIN AMERICAN AID AUTHORIZATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the hour is late. There are few Senators yet remaining on the floor and few occupants of the galleries. However, I think it is fair for me to say that the Senate, on an American basis, earlier this evening approved the recommendations of our President, acting as an American and not as a party leader, for legislation to provide for the authorization of specific assistance to the nations in the Western Hemisphere south of the border.

This was progress, in my judgment, on a completely nonpartisan basis, in regard to the hope of the people of the United States to strengthen the ties of amity, good will, trade, culture and friendship between the free peoples of North and South America. It follows, if I may say so, a constructive action taken by the administration and the Senate only last year.

Mr. President, during the session of the Congress of 1959 the President, after a carefully and successfully negotiated multilateral treaty sent to the Senate, with a request for advice and consent, a treaty providing for the creation of the Inter-American Bank. The present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], a Democrat, and I, a Republican—indeed, almost all of us, on both sides of the Chamber—not as partisans but as Americans stood together and overwhelmingly approved the Inter-American Bank and our participation in it.

I recognize that Senators may and certainly should have divergent views politically and governmentally on problems as they arise to plague us, but I think it is fair for me to say on this occasion that it was in the interest of the country for this administration and for Dwight Eisenhower to recommend to the Senate last year that action be taken to cement and to strengthen the bonds among the free nations of the Western Hemisphere, and that the Senate then did so. In this special session, by reason of the exigencies of the situation, the President has asked for and the Senate has again approved legislation to strengthen further the ties among the free nations in the Western Hemisphere. I have no doubt that the House of Representatives will do likewise.

I admit there are different points of view on this side of the aisle, but they are not any greater—indeed, I sometimes think different points of view are fewer on this side than on the other side of the aisle, not in one area alone but perhaps in many.

Is it too much on this occasion for me to express the hope, not as a Republican, but as an American who temporarily has the honor to sit in the Senate, that our fine nonpartisan record in the U.S. Senate in the field of foreign policy may continue, after full, free, and honest debate, as vigorous as I and other Senators would wish it, on a nonpartisan basis in the interest of what the American people believe is best for the perpetuation of our liberty?

I believe that ideal is not too much to ask. I believe that what the Senate did today under the leadership of a Democrat from Arkansas, and what the Senate did a year ago under the same leadership in approving the Inter-American Bank, were splendid actions.

By the same token, if I may say so, it was a splendid step for the Chief Executive in the White House—not as a partisan, not as Republican, but as the Chief Executive of all our people—to sponsor in the last Congress the treaty to which I referred and to sponsor in this session additional assistance to our beloved friends south of the border, who like ourselves, cherish freedom. I believe I can say they mean to make the necessary arrangements to preserve freedom for themselves, for us, and, God willing, for the globe. I thank my friend from Utah.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to talk about our blessed land. We who have inherited the great natural resources contained within America owe our success as a democracy, in part at least, to the abundance nature has provided us. These resources, combined with a temperate climate, account for much of our development. As are few other nations, America is indeed a blessed land.

Other nations have fertile soils, great forests, rich mineral deposits, and water, but nowhere are these found in such fortunate combination as in our land. Not even the Soviet Union, with its great untapped resources, has at its disposal the resources with which this Nation is endowed.

Our industrious and resourceful people truly have developed this America. But without our verdant earth, our temperate skies, our great stocks of organic fuels, our great rivers and lakes, there would have been no great inflow of peoples, no booming industry, and possibly not even the American democracy as we know it.

Great though the natural resources of the land may be, they are not—as we are painfully finding out—limitless. The pressures of population against land, water, and other resources call for a hard look at where we stand, and the development and implementation of policies to conserve and rebuild before it is too late.

History has shown that national glory all too often is a transient thing. Today, in a burst of prosperity and in the sweet glow of freedom, we outshine the glory that was Greece, while the splendor that was Rome is small in the shadow of our material accomplishments.

Whether our glory will persevere may well depend upon what we do with our natural heritage. Barring atomic war and the horrible destruction of our mod-

ern civilization, our ability to continue to lead in the world now unfolding may be determined not by our new model automobiles, our modern plumbing, or some new kind of split-level living, but by our ability to prevent the further pollution of our streams and the leveling of our forests.

We cannot turn back the course of history, but by conscious effort arising from a deep appreciation of our predicament we can halt the heedless depletion of our precious resources. And by a conscious effort we can remedy much of the damage already done.

During the last 25 years there has been much talk of the heritage we shall leave to the generations that follow ours. Many who view with alarm the fact that every American child is born with some liability for payment of our national debt seem to give little or no thought to the other side of the ledger—the credit side. I submit it is time that we begin to think of our children and our grandchildren's heritage in terms of the assets and the resources we leave them. If we leave them fertile soil, clean water, timber, healthy wildlife and livestock, uncontaminated air and oceans, food and fiber, minerals and recreational areas, and some of nature's wonderful scenic attractions, we will have left them wealth unending.

It is apparent that the Eisenhower administration looks at our children's heritage principally in dollar terms—balanced budgets, the Federal debt, our hard currency, with little concern for our heritage of natural resources. I believe that America needs and can achieve balanced budgets and a stable price level, but we dare not achieve them through the further destruction of forests and farmland, by further waste or pollution of our rivers and lakes, or by neglecting to provide park lands and play space.

To the buffalo hunter of only a hundred years ago, the herd looked limitless. To the homesteader who broke the prairie sod, the land looked permanent and plentiful. To the woodsman of yesteryear, the forest appeared to have no end. The senseless destruction of the buffalo herds, the spoilation of our rivers and forests, and the building of private fortunes at the expenses of natural balance are now history.

The heritage left to this generation has dwindled, although we have reversed some of the destructive tide. To restore most of the damage that has been done is expensive all right, but unless it is done soon, we may well find it is too late to reestablish the natural balances we need no matter how great our dollar expenditure.

Should we let destruction of the land and water continue at the present rate we would be well advised to count our blessings while we may. The beautiful forests and lonely shores which still are here may, with us, retreat into history. The hourglass has already begun to run low. It is time to take alarm and to revive the great conservationist movements of yesteryear—of Gifford Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt.

Let us examine the present status of some of our priceless resources:

THE OCEAN

A short time ago, I read an account of depletion of ocean resources that should have caused international anxiety. But in this day of the H-bomb, only the threat of the mushroom cloud seems to excite us, and this is an excitement of terror rather than of promise.

The seas around us are man's last great frontier. We have always looked upon the restless oceans with the hope that they will some day supply all the resources that we need.

In the course of our scientific achievement, the probability is that this dream can come true. But unless we take heed of what we are doing, the dream may turn into an ugly nightmare.

Already we are dropping atomic wastes into the ocean, seemingly heedless of the consequence. Radioactive waste is a million times more toxic than industrial waste, and is more subtle because it cannot be detected by human senses. It is absolutely ineradicable except by a process of natural decay that probably would take centuries. Unless we are careful, therefore, we may find ourselves marooned upon the shores of radioactive seas in which we dare not fish or swim, and on which we dare no longer travel.

The danger is not yet imminent, but the oceanographers are warning that we may destroy the delicate balance by which the living things within the sea survive. I do not say that we ought to halt atomic development. But such development had better proceed only as we find ways to dispose of the wastes incident to it without poisoning the earth, the rivers, and the sea around us.

However, we may find that we have succeeded in destroying the ocean's potential as a source of food and water even before we have poisoned it with the atom. Just as we have permitted wanton excesses with our natural heritage upon the land, so are we permitting excesses at sea.

Oceanographers warn that we are overfishing and destroying our fishing areas. They have warned that coastal pollution with human and industrial garbage may have equally dire consequences and that the time may be near when there may not be "lots more fish in the sea."

Fishermen from Gloucester, Mass., to Osaka, Japan, are now learning to their sorrow that nature will not be abused. Each year, fishermen the world over seek out new grounds farther and farther from home because once dependable areas have been fished out.

In 1958, only 78 million pounds of haddock were landed in Boston where 30 years before the annual catch was 200 million pounds. Prior to World War II, 600,000 tons of sardines was the average annual catch on the west coast. By 1953, the grounds were fished out and the catch was down to 5,000 tons. Today, the west coast sardine industry is threatened with extinction.

The cycle of life in the seas is delicately balanced, just as is life on the earth's crust. If we eliminate one species of sea life by overfishing, other species that live off it may also perish. If we poison or otherwise destroy the plankton upon which all sea life ultimately depends, we are inviting disaster. And ordinary pollution of our offshore waters may yet accomplish this catastrophe even before we succeed in doing the job with atomic garbage.

It is time to take a look at what we are doing in this area and to awaken to the potential danger that threatens all of us. The seas have lent a new dimension to our conservation problem. We need a policy for the sea as well as for the land. While we do not own or control the high seas, the least we can do is to make sure that infection does not spread from our shores or from our actions upon the seas.

OUR LAND

The population explosion in the United States has been so often examined by the experts that it needs little comment here. This year's census figures show that there are almost 180 million of us. Even if birth rates level off as some experts predict, there will be 230 million of us 15 years hence.

People have always been our greatest national asset. But population growth does not automatically bring prosperity. Unless there is an advancing technology and supporting resources for that technology, more people can mean a lower standard for everybody.

Mr. D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, tells us that to feed our growing population we must develop a technology equivalent to the projected need for 400 million additional acres of land by the year 2010. This will require improvement in farm practices at a rate 160 percent as great as the phenomenal improvement of the past two decades.

Granted—

Williams says—

that there is no visible limit to the ingenuity of man, cannot suppose that improved agricultural technology can bear fruit without the land and water to which it can be applied. Those resources which do have definite limits must be kept intact for the successful exploitation of man's ingenuity.

The Soil Conservation Service reports that remaining arable land amounts to only about a fifth of our 2 billion acres. More than a million acres of our best farmlands have already been buried under concrete and steel. From the start of World War II through 1957, a twentieth of our cropland heritage gave way to housing developments, industry, and highways.

Population trends indicate present day farm surpluses are only temporary. For every four people who sit down to to a meal this year, there will be six in less than three decades. Even were this not the prospect, we would be fools indeed not to seek means to halt the constant chewing up of our best farmlands.

The Eisenhower administration has refused to recognize where the real wealth of this Nation lies. It has permitted our conservation policies to deteriorate into confusion. It has neglected our river valleys. It has let urban sprawl take its course until the possibility for

essential recreation and water purpose areas around our major population centers is nearly exhausted.

Twenty-five years ago under Franklin D. Roosevelt, this Nation established the Soil Conservation Service. Today, thanks to this New Deal measure, there are 2,865 soil conservation districts. But we have starved this Service and we leave it entirely up to the tiller of the soil to do the job of conservation, providing only technical help through SCS.

Under the impetus of the SCS, some 20 percent of our arable land has received full conservation treatment. We have built some 900,000 farm ponds and 32,000 larger reservoirs for flood control and irrigation. We have built 34,000 miles of windbreak, 1.1 million miles of terracing, and 36 million contoured acres, and we have planted 6.3 million acres to trees.

The SCS program shows what we can do if only we create the will and appropriate the essential funds. Some 300 million acres of farmland still require this kind of treatment for survival as first-class soil. Another 13 million acres of Dust Bowl land must be retired from crop production.

OUR WATER

If our programs of soil conservation are lagging behind our needs, our water resource programs are even more appallingly shortsighted.

It has been my good fortune these past 2 years to serve as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. In this capacity, I have attended hearings on water resource development in all parts of the country.

A comprehensive summary of the state of the Nation's water resources is now under preparation by the committee staff. It will stake out a red flag. Unless our water development programs are reshaped to meet our rising new problems, this Nation will face a national water crisis within a comparatively few years. The crisis could come gradually—or should there be a drought—it could hit us with the suddenness of summer lighting.

Five trillion, five hundred billion tons of water are precipitated upon the United States every year. Of this, only about 30 percent actually remains on or under the land surface, while the rest of it evaporates into the atmosphere.

This 30 percent should be plenty for us, but we are using, misusing, polluting, and generally wasting it as though there were no tomorrow. I am confident there will be a tomorrow—and a long and satisfactory one. We must, therefore, face the fact that we can no longer take water for granted.

We are now consuming about 280 billion gallons of water a day in irrigation, industry, and in our homes. Demands are expected to double by 1980, soaring to about 600 billion gallons daily. This is close to the ceiling on the total supply engineers tell us can be made available, as a practical matter, with present engineering knowledge and techniques.

This means we must start immediately employing new and revolutionary techniques of water resource development, conservation and reuse, if on some not-too-distant day our faucets are not to run dry, our crops turn brown, and our wheels of industry slow down and stop.

Among other things, we must discard our thinking that water resource projects must be limited mainly to the construction of dams and reservoirs to regulate the flow of water. We must justify projects on the basis that they will better conserve the water we now have or find new sources of water we are not now developing or using. We must think in terms of projects to expand the reliable use of ground water, to reuse water as many times as possible, to clean up the contamination in our lakes and streams, and to develop techniques for opening up new supplies.

Current progress in the development of one new technique offers real hope. There is nothing in the least visionary or impractical about the proposals to convert saline or brackish water into fresh water which can be used for agricultural purposes and for industrial needs.

Nearly 8 years ago the Congress established a research program in the Department of the Interior to find cheap ways of converting saline water into fresh water. It has been gratifyingly successful. Already it has helped bring down the cost sharply. About 10 years ago the cheapest we could make usable water from the sea was $4 a thousand gallons. Now, some plants can do it for $1.75 a thousand, and a Texas plant under construction for Government research is expected to convert water for about $1 a thousand.

This is not low enough, of course, to fit into most city budgets when you realize that municipal water in the United States costs on the average about 30 cents a thousand gallons. But continued intelligent research can and will lower the saline conversion costs well below their present point. Israel is showing remarkable progress in this field.

During this last session the Senate passed a bill to greatly increase the scope of the saline water conversion program. I was one of its strongest supporters. I am hopeful that the House will act favorably on this bill before adjournment. Saline water conversion could hold the key to this Nation's future and to the future of the whole world.

I wish I could tell you we were making such heartening progress in cleaning up the contamination of our streams and lakes as we are in desalting our water—but we are not. One of the most discouraging developments of this past session was President Eisenhower's veto of the water pollution bill which would have added $40 million annually to the present grants for cleaning up our polluted waterways. The President said he acted on the grounds that water pollution is uniquely a local blight despite the fact that about 2,000 of the Nation's rivers are interstate in character.

Funds sought under this year's water pollution bill were seed money in the best sense. Our municipalities have welcomed the aid given under the original act which provided $500 million over 10 years. The $163 million of Federal funds so far expended have helped to finance $963 million worth of water treatment projects and some 14,000 miles of our waterways have been cleaned up in whole or part. I cannot understand philosophy that would slow down this work.

Our waters are now receiving approximately twice as much pollution from municipal systems alone as was considered allowable in 1955. Unless we wake up and take drastic action, 20 years hence, they will be carrying nearly three times the allowable pollution. Despite the fact that many new sewage plants are going up, the rate of construction is pitifully inadequate. This is not just my view; it is shared by virtually every organization of conservation, health, State, and municipal officers in the country.

President Eisenhower has talked about a partnership concept in our river development for purposes of power generation. If the partnership concept is good for power development, it ought to be just as acceptable for cleaning up our rivers, which, after all, do cross State lines. Clean, cheap, and plentiful water is as worthy of a Federal-municipal partnership as electric power for profit is worthy of a Federal-corporate partnership.

The Supreme Court recently ruled that private companies that clog our rivers with industrial garbage are obligated to take steps to keep the rivers navigable. All manufacturing establishments should halt industrial pollution of our rivers. I am sure that this can be done without hurting industry. Industry benefits from clean water and it seems to me that clean rivers are as important as navigable rivers.

Americans cannot afford to be placed in the position of the ancient mariner. We cannot just sit by while our streams are polluted by raw sewage, industrial waste, and now, even by atomic garbage. Pollution is today a national disgrace.

Over the last 8 years there has been no significant national water policy except that authorized under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. Through this act some progress has been made in eliminating floods and developing irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies. But in the face of the need, the pace is slow indeed. We have spent $175 million of Federal funds in 6 years on 216 small projects involving a total of only 12.6 million acres.

With the exception of the Colorado River storage project, a great basin project which was planned and launched by the Democrats, not a single new major river development program has been authorized for 8 years. We have even used up the last of the funds approved in previous authorizations. From the Potomac to the Snake, there is a need for comprehensive river valley development to end floods, to conserve water, to develop water supply and to revitalize our great watersheds.

I am most hopeful that the report of the Senate National Water Resources Committee will blueprint State, local, and national responsibilities for the type of water resource development we must have if we are to quench the fast growing thirst of our Nation. Surely a nation which can afford $9 billion each year for

alcoholic beverages can afford whatever funds are necessary to purify, to conserve, and to make the best use of every drop of its most precious commodity—water.

OUR MINERAL RESOURCES

The protection and conservation of America's vast and incalculable mineral resources present a very different challenge. Our lead, our zinc, our silver, our coal, and even our underground pools of oil and gas will remain essentially as they are if they are not used—they will not be washed or wasted away by neglect. The debate on the extent to which these resources should be used or reserved is clouded by conflicts in interest and by the recognition that international trade is a mighty tool of peace and that trade must be a two-way street.

Should we erect a high fence around our mineral reserves so they will be preserved for posterity—so they will not be exhausted before those of competitive nations? Or should we use them up, and trust that scientific ingenuity will provide us with substitutes? These are highly explosive questions which I do not want to try to deal with here.

There is no doubt, however, that a sturdy and strong domestic mining industry is essential to American security in peace and war. It becomes then a problem of protecting America's ability to produce the metals and minerals we need. It becomes a problem of keeping in operating condition those mines producing the sinews of defense.

A mine is not like a store—it cannot be closed up for a few years and then dusted out and reopened. Once closed, it may take many months and many dollars to pump out the water, replace the decayed timbers, and get a mine in operating condition again. Usually the mine cannot be reopened at all. Both decay and complete loss could be catastrophic in an emergency.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, one of the Senate's greatest realists, and one of the best friends the mining industry has ever had in Congress, has a bill which meets this problem headon. It provides that when a mine owner finds it impossible under current market conditions to operate a mine which the Secretary of Interior holds contains minerals essential to our national defense, the Secretary may help financially in order to keep the mine in standby condition. The legislation deserves thorough consideration.

OUR FORESTS

I am told that in the East supplies of soft woods are virtually exhausted and that our pulp mills are fast chewing up stands of hardwoods. When these supplies come from properly managed tree farms, there is no problem. But wanton cutting without regard for tomorrow is the rule more often than not. In the West millions of acres of forest land are still being despoiled by those who seem to care little about the "mining out" of this essential resource.

I do not intend to dwell here upon forest policies and timber needs. There has been marked improvement in practices on the part of some big companies which now view trees as a valuable crop. This is one of the few plus signs on the conservation horizon. But millions upon millions of acres need reforestation and hundreds of millions need timber stand improvement. There is a need to extend fire protection to other millions of forest acres, especially in our new State of Alaska. More of our still unused timber lands must be set aside now as national forest holdings to assure resources for the future.

OUR RECREATIONAL AREAS

No better investment has been made for the people of the United States than in the areas set aside as national parks. Millions visit these parks each year and they are already overcrowded. There is a need for more parks—both Federal and State—and for better facilities in those parks.

Recreation is America's fastest growing industry, and in the future world of automation more Americans will turn to recreation for employment as well as for enjoyment. No better investment can be made by the Federal Government than to set aside areas for recreation while there is still time. Tomorrow may be too late, because potential park land is fast disappearing.

Our beaches are a case in point. America was blessed with thousands of miles of beautiful shoreline which has been sadly mismanaged. We have treated this heritage with contempt, and even today we are doing little or nothing to restore what was given so freely.

Only 240 of the 3,700 miles of east coast oceanfront are still open to the public. More and more, the lovely vistas of Cape Cod are being blighted by commercial encroachment. It is no wonder that the National Park Service entitled a study of a few years back "Our Vanishing Shorelines."

In my home State of Utah the shorelines are threatened by neglect of a lake which is unique among American bodies of water—Great Salt Lake. Because this area is unduplicated in any of our other national parks, and because, if even a portion of the shoreline is to be utilized for the wonder and enjoyment of generations to come, it must be saved now. I have introduced a bill to set aside a portion of the lake as the Great Salt Lake National Park. Its salt-embedded beaches, heavy green water, and windswept islands have a strange compelling beauty which must not be lost to the world.

In all of America up to now, we have set aside only one beach area as a national shore, and this was done a quarter of a century ago, when Congress voted $2 million to establish Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a depression-fighting measure.

No better investment has ever been made by the people of the United States. Nowhere are there finer stretches of public beach. Each year, more Americans visit and use these awe-inspiring shores. The National Park Service has done a magnificent job of providing camping areas, bath houses, and other modern facilities. The local population has enjoyed great economic benefit from the incoming tide of tourists and vacationers.

We need many more national seashores and the object of the save our shorelines bill, which has been before Congress for the last 2 years, is the creation of 10 national shores. I am proud to be a sponsor of this measure. I urge haste in its passage, for every year that goes by sees more of our shoreline vanish beneath the flood of commercial decay and speculative promotion, while other areas are spoiled by pollution and erosion.

OUR WILDLIFE

Much of our western rangeland is still within the public domain. These lands can be saved as a source of meat production and for future development by a program of brush clearing, water spreading, and revegetation in large parts of the 200 million acres in Federal grazing districts and Forest Service lands.

So much of our wildlife faces total or partial extinction in the years ahead that we must once more examine our fish and wildlife policies. We need more protected wildlife habitats. We need to improve present Federal and State wildlife and bird refuges. We must expand wildlife cover development on private land where the cooperation of owners can be obtained. There is a need for expansion of wildlife research programs, since these mean a greater possibility for survival for many species.

I need not multiply examples further. It is evident that we are using up our resources at a prodigal rate. What will it cost to begin to reverse this trend, to begin to do the job of making our material future more secure?

Resources for the Future, a private organization, has studied America's conservation policies thoroughly. It has estimated that a total Federal expenditure of $17.5 billion for resources and conservation is essential over the next 10 years.

In view of what is at stake, such an expenditure would not be excessive. An average annual expenditure of less than $2 billion for good housekeeping practices would build a far stronger America. In the longer pull, survival as a first-class nation may be as much dependent upon what we do with our resources as upon what we do about our military defense. There is no need to neglect either in our $500 billion economy.

But we have been neglecting both under this administration. Despite our growing needs and our expanding population, we have actually been spending less on our natural resources in the past 8 years than we did under President Truman, and we have spent less during a time when inflation has reduced the value of each resource dollar. While the administration's own Department of Commerce has stated in a water development report that we must spend at least $3 billion a year to meet our minimum resource needs, the administration's budget has annually asked for less than half—not much more than a third—of that amount.

The slowdown in the development of this Nation's natural resources becomes even more serious when stacked up alongside of the accelerated rate at which the Soviet Union is developing

hers. As you know, last fall I headed a Senate subcommittee which inspected Russian power projects. The U.S.S.R. possesses the largest water resources in the world, about 10 percent of the earth's supply, compared with about 3 percent for the United States. We learned that Russian electric production is now being built at a rate which may make it possible for them to catch the United States in about 15 years. At least that is the Russian prediction, and we did observe most impressive progress. Of course, we have no way of knowing how long this Russian rate of growth can be sustained; but unless they slow down or we speed up, Russia may be able to produce more electric power in 1975 than does the United States in that year.

None of us can help but be alarmed when this fact burst upon us, because we in America know that even more than missiles and rockets and hydrogen bombs, the wealth and world power of a nation rests upon its resources and the status of the development of those resources. We know that modern industry requires large quantities of electric power, and that there is a close correlation between the amount of electricity a country develops and its gross national product.

There was no doubt in my mind that what we saw in Russia was not only an example of a nation developing its water resources for the benefit of its people, but of a nation building the foundation of a great industrial empire with which to challenge the supremacy of the Western World.

For the past 7 years in place of parks, forests, river valley development, land and forest reclamation, and pollution control, we in America have been given classic fiscal policy and hard money. I would remind those who have shaped today's indifferent conservation policies that the hardest currency cannot restore resources once they are depleted.

Much of America is awake to these forceful developments abroad and the contrasting neglect, the foot-dragging and easy-sailing attitude at home. Many Americans realize that the preservation of self-government depends upon our meeting the Soviet challenge, and that this cannot be done unless we preserve the water and the forests and the soil that make up this blessed land of America. These Americans are looking for leadership that combines faith in America's future with the boldness and the imagination to make the necessary decisions and to take the necessary steps.

Traditional policies are no longer adequate, and the breakdown of policy that has marked recent years spells future tragedy unless there is quick remedial action. As a first step there is a need to develop an integrated resource policy by law.

A Resources and Conservation Act of 1960 has been introduced into the Senate and hearings have been completed. Although conservation groups have earnestly pleaded for enactment of this bill, it has been met with hostility and indifference in the administration.

This measure would simply establish and coordinate the Federal responsibility in conservation matters. Its purpose is the conservation, development, and utilization of the "natural resources of the Nation to meet human, economic, and national defense requirements, including recreational, scenic, and scientific values" and to enhance "the national heritage for future generations."

The act requires the President to transmit to the Congress each year a "Resources and Conservation Report" setting forth the condition of the soil, water, grazing, wildlife, recreational, and other natural resources "with particular reference to the attainment of multiple purpose use." This alone makes the measure worthwhile, since it would give us a running inventory on our resources.

The measure would also create in the executive department a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, which would help to coordinate resources policies. Establishment of such a council is essential if we are to end the bureaucratic warfare among agencies charged with the conservation of our land, waterways, and forests.

Passage of this act is the first logical step in creating an up-to-date, integrated resources policy. I plead that this measure receive the attention it deserves.

But, above all, what America must have is a new realization of the necessity of preserving our resources. We must understand that money wisely spent on conservation yields direct returns in timber, forage, and other products, and at the same time establishes an inventory for future use.

We must disenthrall ourselves of the attitude that when a private corporation takes steps to improve plant and facilities the action is good business; but when the commonwealth makes similar investments in more basic natural resources, it is waste and unnecessary spending.

Nancy Newhall, one of our poets, recently compiled some of her verse under the title "This Is the American Earth." In a particularly moving poem, she had this to say:

In the centuries to come
Always we must have water for dry land,
Rich earth beneath the plow,
Pastures for flocks and herds,
Fish in the seas and streams,
And timber in the hills.
Yet never can man live by bread alone.

The poet goes on:

Reckless, we tore at the last great virgin resources.
What did it matter what we wasted or exhausted?

And she concludes:

Too few of us aware that to any beauty
We must come as lovers, not destroyers;
Come humbly, softly, to look, listen,
Learn to cherish and to shield.

This blessed land is ours to cherish, or to destroy; ours to abuse or to guard; ours to develop and beautify or to neglect and despoil. Let me be counted as one who is willing to act today in the interest of those who on a not-too-distant tomorrow will inherit our blessed land.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator on a great speech. I agree with what he has to say about natural resources and what the effects have been and what the effects will be if certain measures are not adopted. He has shown sound judgment and good leadership in bringing to the attention of the Senate tonight the aspects of the speech which he has just finished delivering.

I assure him that I will be most happy to do all I can to be of assistance in the endeavors which he has set forth as representing his goal.

I wish also to compliment him for his patience and courtesy in waiting to make his fine speech until our business had been concluded. He was very helpful in showing such understanding, and because of it we were able to pass some fine legislation and, in effect, bring our calendar fairly up to date.

Again I commend and congratulate the Senator from Utah upon his good speech and on his sound judgment and on his good leadership, as well as on the courtesy and patience he has shown today.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom were referred the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act, reported the same with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1857) thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO A NATIONAL PRIMARY—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the majority whip, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as cosponsors of my measure providing for a constitutional amendment for a national primary; it is Senate Joint Resolution 177. I also ask that the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added to that joint resolution, as a cosponsor.

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

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate

took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Saturday, August 20, 1960, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 19, 1960:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, 10A, (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Lillian T. Biggers, Hampton, Ark., in place of W. A. Biggers, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Merrill I. Walstad, Bell, Calif., in place of Harry Bergseid, retired.

O. James Bergman, Buena Park, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.

Laura B. Morgan, Clayton, Calif., in place of J. D. Blocking, resigned.

Maxwell M. Jamieson, Dana Point, Calif., in place of L. G. Jamieson, deceased.

William C. Buckley, Greenfield, Calif., in place of Guido Berti, resigned.

Henry C. Peterson, Ridgecrest, Calif., in place of E. E. Fowler, retired.

George K. Ingham, San Bruno, Calif., in place of D. P. Morrison, deceased.

George R. Fortney, Standard, Calif., in place of O. O. Wiseman, transferred.

Barry D. Duncan, Summerland, Calif., in place of Opal Lambert, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Julia A. Wharton, Colebrook, Conn., in place of B. M. Turbarg, retired.

Raymond S. Manning, North Franklin, Conn., in place of R. R. Browning, retired.

FLORIDA

Marvin O. Boone, Barberville, Fla., in place of M. V. Biggs, retired.

T. Grayson Screws, Fellsmere, Fla., in place of H. E. Kesler, deceased.

GEORGIA

Fred Daves, Jr., Calhoun, Ga., in place of Bernard Franklin, retired.

John C. McCrary, Hardwick, Ga., in place of E. B. Willis, retired.

Charles L. Strickland, Jesup, Ga., in place of W. D. Burke, resigned.

Rodolph Broach, Putney, Ga., in place of G. S. Broach, retired.

IDAHO

Anna G. Bailey, Grand View, Idaho, in place of H. S. Bailey, deceased.

James E. Jensen, Shelley, Idaho, in place of H. T. Leavitt, removed.

ILLINOIS

Billy D. Elkins, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.

Robert J. Ertmer, Elizabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny, deceased.

Gordon R. Bartman, Lansing, Ill., in place of W. E. Erfert, retired.

Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe, Ill., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.

Eugene R. Serrot, Rushville, Ill., in place of H. F. Markell, retired.

Charles D. Allen, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.

INDIANA

Gerald E. Esarey, Decker, Ind., in place of R. M. Cornett, retired.

IOWA

Leo J. Truhlar, Ely, Iowa, in place of F. W. Elias, retired.

Thelan A. Elthon, Fertile, Iowa, in place of A. M. Eikenbary, retired.

Maryellen J. Beaver, Harvey, Iowa, in place of M. M. Bennett, retired.

Joe G. Panzi, Lehigh, Iowa, in place of R. E. Whipple, deceased.

Chester L. Watts, Mondamin, Iowa, in place of D. M. Beaman, retired.

Gale C. Eggland, Roland, Iowa, in place of C. M. Fatland, retired.

Donald F. Deeny, Waucoma, Iowa, in place of M. J. Biong, transferred.

KANSAS

Myron W. Miller, Attica, Kans., in place of L. F. Heath, transferred.

Henry M. Miller, Galesburg, Kans., in place of I. L. Magner, transferred.

Walter W. Johnson, Harper, Kans., in place of W. W. Nye, transferred.

Kenneth N. Kahle, Hoxie, Kans., in place of E. V. Hedge, retired.

Max A. Johnson, Jamestown, Kans., in place of S. E. Murray, retired.

Daryl G. Thornton, Republic, Kans., in place of M. J. Gardner, retired.

KENTUCKY

Clara P. Norris, Guthrie, Ky., in place of E. R. Paine, deceased.

Laura P. Smith, Sebree, Ky., in place of Milton Ashby, retired.

MAINE

Wallace H. Campbell, Fort Fairfield, Maine, in place of F. E. Glew, retired.

Marion P. Davis, Hebron, Maine, in place of D. L. Needham, retired.

MARYLAND

Donald M. Sturtevant, Landover, Md., in place of R. S. Rowe, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Helene V. Schwartz, East Sandwich, Mass., in place of J. R. Raymond, retired.

Bennett W. Boynton, Rowley, Mass., in place of S. F. Knowles, Jr., retired.

Phyllis D. Bellavance, West Mansfield, Mass., in place of E. E. Chaffin, retired.

MICHIGAN

Robert C. Mason, Augusta, Mich., in place of J. B. Woodrow, Jr., transferred.

Jack S. Paul, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of G. A. Stahl, deceased.

Paul A. Racheter, Pigeon, Mich., in place of F. A. Buerker, retired.

Robert E. Flaherty, Watervliet, Mich., in place of J. R. Crumb, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

James P. Allen, Fayette, Miss., in place of E. M. Huttenlocher, retired.

MISSOURI

Ida W. Summa, Gentry, Mo., in place of F. L. Summa, deceased.

Harold E. Becker, Palmyra, Mo., in place of D. H. Sosey, retired.

NEBRASKA

Eugene W. Hicks, Western, Nebr., in place of C. S. Haddix, transferred.

NEVADA

Kenneth W. Swallow, Boulder City, Nev., in place of M. W. Wagner, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Frederick P. Rees, Lawrenceville, N.J., in place of F. B. Harker, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Lawrence D. Clawson, Bluewater, N. Mex., in place of W. L. Clawson, retired.

Levi Martinez, Tierra Amarilla, N. Mex., in place of P. J. Martinez, retired.

NEW YORK

George L. Mapes, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.

Robert J. Auborn, Cleveland, N.Y., in place of E. A. Westcott, Jr., retired.

Mildred L. Brannon, Hadley, N.Y., in place of V. B. Hawk, retired.

Ethel M. Hare, Limestone, N.Y., in place of M. G. McCarthy, retired.

James S. D'Agostino, New Hartford, N.Y., in place of B. F. Green, retired.

Hubert F. McMaster, Nunda, N.Y., in place of J. P. Doyle, retired.

Robert N. Wolverton, Trumansburg, N.Y., in place of B. L. Wixom, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Daniel H. Autry, Autryville, N.C., in place of B. B. Jaynes, transferred.

John T. Eastridge, Warrensville, N.C., in place of A. O. Ashley, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Reinhart Stradinger, Mercer, N. Dak., in place of B. C. Hjelle, retired.

OHIO

Robert H. Cassel, Aurora, Ohio, in place of M. P. Mowl, retired.

Charles H. Davis, Bethesda, Ohio, in place of A. H. Bolon, retired.

C. William McFarland, Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of F. G. Schalmo, retired.

Clifford O. Shell, Columbiana, Ohio, in place of S. E. Tidd, retired.

Harry E. Munson, Mesopotamia, Ohio, in place of L. L. Ford, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Leon J. Mattox, Howe, Okla., in place of J. A. Deaton, retired.

OREGON

Kenneth P. Lanning, Lebanon, Oreg., in place of M. V. Smith, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Elmer B. Herman, Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.

Frank H. Marshall, Fairview Village, Pa., in place of A. M. Young, retired.

J. Gomer Saul, Kutztown, Pa., in place of G. R. Frey, retired.

Frank A. Santone, Jr., Malvern, Pa., in place of C. P. Kennedy, retired.

Blaine E. Klingman, Milton, Pa., in place of E. M. Crawford, retired.

Frederic H. Barth, Philadelphia, Pa., in place of R. A. Thomas, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

David A. Arnott, Shannock, R.I., in place of C. E. Cornell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carlisle E. Hammett, Converse, S.C., in place of E. S. Drake, retired.

David J. Hoffman, Sharon, S.C., in place of W. S. Gibson, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Edna C. Forsyth, Northville, S. Dak., in place of M. E. Van Houten, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Norma L. Clement, Ellendale, Tenn., in place of T. S. Peek, retired.

Beatrice W. Norris, Ramer, Tenn., in place of C. L. Majors, retired.

Lillian C. Boyd, Rossville, Tenn., in place of W. J. Frazier, retired.

TEXAS

Russell W. Smith, Floresville, Tex., in place of E. W. Franklin, retired.

Robert M. Gring, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.

Ross D. Gunn, Gilmer, Tex., in place of E. R. Knowles, retired.

Waunita A. Lynch, Highlands, Tex., in place of C. L. Hill, retired.

Clara J. Loesch, Industry, Tex., in place of E. A. Raeke, resigned.

LaVona E. Worley, Malone, Tex., in place of G. M. Mann, transferred.

Charlie Scaff, Matador, Tex., in place of E. F. Springer, retired.

Eugene L. Mickey, Sweeney, Tex., in place of H. B. Vezey, retired.

Gustave C. Cooper, Windom, Tex., in place of J. R. Burras, deceased.

UTAH

Glen P. Kunzler, Willard, Utah, in place of L. J. Baird, retired.

VERMONT

Wilmer E. Bowen, Derby, Vt., in place of M. E. Boucher, retired.

Carroll E. Brown, East Ryegate, Vt., in place of R. G. Franklin, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Oscar E. Wooldridge, Huddleston, Va., in place of M. J. Turner, deceased.

Aubrey C. Marshall, Woodstock, Va., in place of J W. Bailey, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Ralph E. Delemos, Kingshill, V.I., in place of I. A. Hansen, retired.

WASHINGTON

Paul C. Alvestad, Gig Harbor, Wash., in place of T. W. Tait, retired.

Albert A. Novick, Kelso, Wash., in place of S. M. Lord, retired.

Gaines B. Seefeldt, Toppenish, Wash., in place of P. D. Wilson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hagan P. Riggs, Gary, W. Va., in place of W. M. Boardman, retired.

Ruby E. Blevins, Hemphill, W. Va., in place of P. J. Groseclose, retired.

Mildred D. Moore, Lesage, W. Va., in place of L. M. Galford, resigned.

Troy O. Harden, McConnell, W. Va., in place of Nellie Robinette, deceased.

Laurel H. Clovis, Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of L. C. Foster, retired.

WISCONSIN

Paul L. Burgess, Bristol, Wis., in place of J. O. Goff, retired.

George H. Poukey, Cumberland, Wis., in place of M. G. Dunham, retired.

Kenneth J. O'Hern, Forestville, Wis., in place of E. P. Naze, transferred.

WYOMING

Alice L. Hahn, Edgerton, Wyo., in place of H. E. Moore, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 8: 12: *"He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, may the clarion and compelling call of these words of the Master silence our innumerable fears and give courage to our ceaseless longings for a new social order wherein dwelleth righteousness.

May we never allow ourselves to become calloused and complacent in these days when urgent demands are challenging us to minister to the miseries and needs of helpless humanity.

Gird us with perseverance and patience as we continue to pray and labor for a nobler generation when men shall no longer harm one another in their hatred or persecute one another in their ignorance and blindness.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12677. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.15 an hour, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PROUTY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6597) entitled "An act to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Moss, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can and will tell us about the program for next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The program for next week is as follows:

There will be 11 suspensions on Monday.

Senate Joint Resolution 207, the equal time provision in connection with the Communications Act.

H.R. 12753, a bill amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

H.R. 12125, extending the Library Services Act.

S. 2633, Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960.

S. 2575, Health Benefits Act, retired Government employees.

H.R. 5383, a bill relating to the status of personnel of the Merchant Marine Academy.

H.R. 12419, a bill relating to the use of pesticides under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

S. 107, a bill relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, floating drydock.

H.R. 12341, an agricultural bill relating to restriction on imported commodities, dates, and so forth.

H.R. 9866, extending agricultural services to Guam.

H.R. 7656, establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

I shall ask unanimous consent later to call the Consent and Private Calendars on Tuesday. Then for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday the following are scheduled:

H.R. 7201, operation of hydroelectric power resources. Just before adjournment I promised the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that I would call the bill up on Tuesday last. It was a bill that was out more than 7 legislative days from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], a member of the Committee on Rules, met me outside the House Office Building one day just before we adjourned. As a member of the Committee on Rules, he could call it up. He very kindly talked to me about it, and I agreed to bring it up last Tuesday. Then, before we adjourned, we had the suspensions transferred from last Monday until next Monday, as the Members will remember. I told my friend, the distinguished minority leader, that I had only that bill, that there were only three rules out on bills that we had not acted upon and that I had given this promise to the gentleman from Mississippi. I suggested to the minority leader to talk to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and if it was agreeable to him, instead of bringing the bill up last Tuesday, to bring it up the following week, so there would be no legislative business for the Members this week. The House was awaiting action on the part of the Senate. I met the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] at the Los Angeles convention and spoke to him. I told him what the situation was. He said it was perfectly all right with him. I told him that it was the only business that would bring the Members back and that it would be too bad to bring them back under those circumstances and that if it was agreeable, I would put it down for the following Tuesday. He said that was perfectly agreeable. So it is down from that following Tuesday, and I am keeping my promise made to the gentleman from Mississippi. That is the story about that bill and this week.

Following that, there is a contempt citation out of the Committee on the Judiciary, relating to certain officials of the Port of New York Authority.

Then there are several contempt citations out of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Following that there is Senate Joint Resolution 170, a joint resolution concerning the North Atlantic Treaty Nations, out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There are several important matters on which action may be taken. If a rule should come out taking from the Speaker's desk the school construction bill to send to conference, that will go to conference. I imagine the conferees could work very effectively on that bill, if we could get the necessary 7 votes in the Rules Committee. If we get one Republican vote, we can do it.

There is the usual reservation, that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The gentleman tempts me to say something, but I shall refrain from saying it, as we have had a very long minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wanted to say merely that one additional Democratic vote would bring that bill out, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are 750 percent of the Democrats on the Rules Committee who are right and 1,000 percent of the Republicans wrong to date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has expired.

CALL OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Tuesday next to call the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2405. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a semiannual report with respect to the authority to establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects, pursuant to Public Law 85–685; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2406. A letter from the Administrator General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,950,000 pounds of silk waste now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2407. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,450,000 pounds of silk noils now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2408. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1959, pursuant to section 333 of the U.S. Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2409. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 52d quarterly report on export control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2410. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report of gifts and bequests received and accepted by the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, pursuant to Public Law 85–477; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13049. A bill to amend section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of an additional allowance to certain physicians assigned to duty at Veterans' Administration facilities where it is difficult to recruit or retain physicians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13050. A bill to establish a registry of persons refused a motor vehicle operator's license or who have had such licenses revoked; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 13051. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 13052. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 13053. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 13054. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to provide that Federal savings and loan associations may establish and operate new branches in States only if State savings and loan associations, or State banks and trust companies, are permitted by State law or practice to establish and operate new branches in such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13055. A bill to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. Con. Res. 715. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13056. A bill for the relief of Maria Lagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 13057. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lydia Brill Misroch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13058. A bill for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 13059. A bill for the relief of Constantin Magafas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Kefauver to the National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had the honor this week to address the National Association of County Officials at their silver anniversary conference at Miami, Fla.

It has been my experience that the men and women who make up this organization are a vital ingredient of our American democracy. Our Nation is composed of cities and counties and States—each with its important role in government.

It is at the county level where the problems of today are growing into a most serious challenge as our population explosion spreads the cities widely into the suburban areas of the country.

This challenge is being met courageously and with good planning by these county officials who carry the heavy burden of coming to grips with rapid development of their political subdivisions.

Most of the programs that the national association sponsors and works for are programs which the Democratic Party has worked for and sponsored over the years.

I ask unanimous consent that my speech before this outstanding association be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW THE DEMOCRATS STAND ON THE AMERICAN COUNTY PLATFORM

(Address by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER at Miami, Fla., to National Association of County Officials)

It is a great honor and privilege—for a number of reasons—for me to be here with you today.

It is always rewarding to speak to members of your organization, because you are the people upon whom such a large percentage of our citizens must depend for good government, for efficient government, and for progressive government.

It is a particular pleasure to be able to be with you at this silver anniversary conference. Your organization is not only growing venerable, it is also growing by leaps and bounds in size and, more to the point, in importance.

I am honored to represent—at least informally—the Democratic Party and the Democratic point of view. I am certain that you could have gotten a more polished speaker but you could not have found one who believes more deeply in the Democratic program and its importance to the future of our great country.

Recently, I took a little trip that carried me through all of the 95 counties of Tennessee. For me, it was a worthwhile trip in many ways.

During that trip, I talked with hundreds of county officials. I have seen many of them here today. I learned much from these men and women and, again, I wish to express my gratitude to them.

Despite their many, many problems, most of these public servants are devoted to their tasks and are full of enthusiasm about their counties. They are full of good ideas and good plans, and the vast majority of them face the future with optimism.

Yet, almost every one of them stressed the importance of solving one basic problem: What do we do with an expanding population, a greatly increased need for services, and a shrinking tax base—and a near breaking point in local taxation?

I believe that the Democratic Party over the years has evolved a partnership between the Federal Government and State and local governments which, if followed and fostered in the future, will solve this underlying problem.

This partnership has three foundation stones.

First, the Democratic Party believes that it is best to attempt solving local problems locally, just as it is best to let private enterprise do most jobs.

A few years ago at an annual conference in Chicago, your association approved a resolution calling upon every county in the *United States* "to prepare itself for the assumption of the greater governmental responsibilities which lie just ahead so that local governments across the Nation may justify the faith and confidence which have been reposed in them by the people." In my view, county governments must continue to assume more and more responsibilities in the years immediately ahead.

Second, local governments have encountered many problems without assistance, and these problems are common to local governments throughout this county. In this area, there is need for Federal and State cooperation with, and assistance to, municipal governments.

Third, administratively, the best way to handle these problems is through the advice and help of the State, county, or municipality.

Many of these problems are the direct result of an almost exploding population in our country. But many of them stem almost wholly or in large measure from two migrations, which are ever increasing in intensity.

One is a migration from the cities to the suburbs, and this migration will not cease until we take the drastic steps necessary to clean up and rebuild our cities.

The other is a migration of people from the farms to the urban centers. I deplore not having a farm program which will permit families to stay on the farms. But I recognize that increased mechanization will continue the flow of people to the cities.

The crush of population has and will continue to multiply the great urban-suburban problems of which we are all only too familiar.

These problems are common to thousands of communities. And, in the view of the Democratic Party, the local communities have no way of solving many of them without help. The widespread nature of the problem and lack of a local solution adds up to a national responsibility.

Every State is at the limit—or close to it—of its taxing ability. So are counties. So are cities.

The Federal Government on the other hand, even under the restrictive Internal Revenue Act of 1954, is able to assist in many of these matters.

Without Federal assistance, many pressing problems will not be solved.

This truism—this fact of life—is reflected time and again in the American county platform.

I have been familiar for many years with the general objectives of the National Association of County Officials and where you stood on literally thousands of pieces of Federal legislation. In preparation for meeting with you today, I have studied your most recent platform and policy statements in detail.

The question that I am supposed to answer is: Where does the Democratic Party stand on them?

The short answer is that the Democratic Party goes at least—and I repeat, at least—95 percent of the way with you.

A good indicator of this great similarity of objectives and means is to compare the American county platform with the domestic planks in the Democratic platform which was actually drawn up recently by the delegates to the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles.

Take almost any subject that you choose—airports, housing, tax on local bonds, highways, aid to dependent children, urban renewal, regional housing, control of water pollution, et cetera—and you will find that on almost any one subject there is a striking resemblance between the two platforms. Naturally, there are some differences, especially in detail—and I shall discuss the major of these differences later—but, on the whole, they are strikingly similar platforms.

It might be pointed out that there is also a remarkable coincidence between the platform of the Republican Party and that of your organization.

Does this really mean that there is no difference between the parties on the major subjects of interest to you as county officials?

I think not.

If you examine the Democratic and Republican platforms in detail, I think you will discover that they reflect a considerable difference. The Republican platform is liberally sprinkled with high-sounding phrases but is short on specific commitments.

Further, there are better indicators of the differences between the parties than election-year platforms. The real differences show up in a number of other ways.

It has been Democratic Presidents and Democratic Congresses which have originated almost all of the partnership programs which are keystones in your American county platform. If you go down the long list of Federal-State-local cooperative programs, you will find that almost every one of them is a Democratic program in origin.

Also, on the question of timing, the Democrats have favored establishment of Federal aid plans before being forced into them by the sheer weight of adverse circumstances. If things get bad enough, the Republicans will support a "crash program," which frequently is too little and too late. Their recent program for area redevelopment is a good example. They are not willing to admit that States and local governments need assistance until things have hit rockbottom. They will admit to a national responsibility only as a last resort.

Another difference comes in the question of enthusiasm. Whereas the Democrats have enthusiastically initiated many programs of power development, highway modernization, control of water pollution, and a hundred others, the Republicans go along with these programs with a marked lack of enthusiasm—you might even say they drag their feet from time to time.

Last, but not least, is the question of which of the parties has the better record of delivery on promises. When looking to the future for expectations, we must look to the past for performance.

And when we look back it is clear which of the parties has delivered on the programs of importance to you. It is clear which of the parties has supported these programs in Congress when the chips are down. And it is clear which party's Presidents have signed such programs into law and which party's Presidents have scuttled such programs through use of the veto.

President Eisenhower has vetoed important legislation with respect to housing, urban renewal and slum clearance, area redevelopment, public works, aid to airport construction, and stream pollution control.

As you know, the use of the President's veto power has somewhat dampened Federal assistance programs. It has not ended them, but the veto and the threat of veto have resulted in the drastic scaling down of a number of specific programs. The constant reminder that the public works bill was vetoed twice last year serves to delay many very badly needed projects.

I said earlier that I would discuss the points of difference as well as the points of agreement between your platform and that of the Democratic Party. I could find only two differences of any consequence.

First, your platform is specific in its opposition to the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. As I understand the Democratic proposal, the new department would work not exclusively on urban problems but would concern itself with suburban and metropolitan problems at the same time. After all, the problems are so intertwined as to be inseparable. As this proposal is spelled out in the coming months of the campaign, I hope that you and your association will follow its development with an open mind. I think that such a cabinet office might be almost as useful to many, many county officials as it will be to city officials.

The second major difference of opinion comes with respect to Federal aid to education, which is supported by both major political parties. I shall not try to proselytize on this subject, but rather explain why I favor Federal aid to education and why my party is for it.

The most common justification for Federal aid to education is the need for building an educational system in this country that will allow us to compete with the Communist countries in the years ahead. This is a valid justification. If our educational system falls behind theirs in this age of frightening technological advance, the next generation of Americans will fall hopelessly behind in national defense, and then it will be too late to do anything whatsoever about it.

For myself, I would advocate radical improvements in our educational system if there were no external threat at all. We are the richest nation in the world, and we can afford not only an adequate school system but a really first-rate educational system for all our children. Sadly enough, this is lacking in many places.

There is no argument that it would be preferable to have our school system brought up to par by local or State efforts. And in recent years local communities and States have made herculean efforts to keep up with the demand for more and better schoolrooms and for more and better paid teachers. Yet there is a serious shortage of both today.

The chief stumbling block, as you all know, is tax resources. At the moment local tax resources are stretched to the breaking point.

The Federal Government does have the tax resources to be of assistance and this Federal aid can be rendered in such a way as to leave local control unimpaired. It can also be rendered in such a way as to allow States and local communities flexibility as to how the funds are to be used, either for school construction or to supplement teachers' salaries.

I have talked too long, but I find that the question of Federal-State-local cooperation is not only one of the most interesting but one of the most complex questions that we face. We must and, I believe, we will continue to solve it on a case-by-case basis.

There is no magic formula, no single equation. But where there is good will, mutual trust, and a spirit of cooperation, we can go forward with a number of vital and progressive programs.

Your association has a program and a platform which are so close to those of the Democratic Party that I can see no obstacle to our going forward together.

Without Federal and State cooperation with, and assistance to, local communities, many of our problems will not be solved. They will simply canker and increase and ruin the life of our communities.

With continuing cooperation, they will be solved and America's great potential will be realized.

Thank you.

Vice President Nixon Wrong on Medical Care Plan for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statement made some weeks ago by Vice President NIXON on the matter of medical care for the aged. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE BILL

The administration medical care bill deserves the support of all American who recognize the need for better medical care for the aged and who want to meet that need without adopting a program which would open the door for socialized medicine, as would the Forand bill.

It is superior to the Forand bill in these respects:

1. The administration bill provides coverage for 12½ million people over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate health insurance coverage.

The Forand bill provides no coverage whatever for 4 million aged people who are not covered by social security. Over 2 million of these 4 million have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. This important group of 2 million is covered by the administration bill.

2. Under the administration bill those who are eligible for the program have complete freedom of choice as to whether they desire to participate in it or to provide for their own protection on an individual basis.

The Forand bill compels all those on social security to participate in the program regardless of whether they need it or want it.

3. The administration bill provides for the use of virtually all medical facilities and services, including medical, nursing and other health services, in the patients' own homes, thereby serving the need of the patient most effectively and economically.

The Forand bill would put a still heavier load on already overburdened hospitals and skilled nursing homes, since its benefits are available only in institutions. In effect, in order to get the benefits of the program, those participating would be forced to go to hospitals and nursing homes, even when they did not desire to do so.

4. The administration bill preserves the opportunity for private insurers to continue to expand their insurance coverage for the aged. The Forand bill would inevitably curtail the opportunity for continued growth in the coverage and adequacy of voluntary health insurance and would set up irresistible pressures for establishing a compulsory health insurance program for all people regardless of age—a development which inevitably would lead to the socializing of the medical profession. Importantly, the administration program avoids that threat because of its basic voluntary nature.

5. The administration program provides a comprehensive 10-point benefit program which would substantially meet the costs of long term or other expensive illness. The Forand bill provides only a 3-point benefit program limited to the first dollar costs involved in institutional care and surgery. In a nutshell, the administration bill offers the best protection against the costs of catastrophic illness.

The difference between the administration's program and the Forand bill goes to the fundamental nature of our free society. The Forand bill and similar plans would set up a great state program which inevitably would head in the direction of herding the ill and elderly into institutions whether they desired this or not. Such a state program would threaten the high standards of American medicine.

The administration program recognizes the medical problems of the elderly but preserves our basic American principle—a freedom of choice. This would permit elderly citizens who need medical care to accept institutional treatment if they desired and would also enable them to stay home—a choice which many of them undoubtedly would take—and still receive the medical care which they need in the advanced years of life.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I think the Vice President erred in his assessment of the advantages of the administration proposal as against those of the Forand bill, and I would like to comment briefly on the major points in his statement.

Even if the administration proposal were passed by the Congress, no one would receive benefits without the action of State legislatures. Ninety-nine State legislative bodies would have to act on enabling legislation and authorizations. The prospect of favorable State action should be judged in the light of the recent statement by 30 State Governors, representing more than two-thirds of the U.S. population, advocating that health insurance for the aged be provided through the OASDI system, rather than through Federal-State financing.

Further, before the claim for coverage of 12½ million people could be realized, each State would have to enter into negotiations with insurance carriers, and each person potentially eligible would have to prove his financial need and many would have to pay an enrollment fee.

And in the highly unlikely event that all of that were accomplished, an enrolled individual would have to pay medical bills of $250 from his own resources—$400 for a retired couple—before he could receive the first penny of benefits from the administration's so-called health program.

The Vice President states that each individual eligible would be free to choose whether he wishes to participate. The individual's choice is limited in reality only to whether he will accept the benefits if his State offers them. The taxes to finance the program would be equally compulsory under the administration program as under the Forand bill. And how much freedom would there be for the individual living in a State whose legislature was either unwilling or unable to raise the funds necessary to participate? As I understand freedom—it means freedom to participate—as well as freedom not to participate. The Vice President seems to understand "freedom" to mean only freedom from participation in the social security system.

Vice President NIXON claims that the administration program "preserves the opportunity for private insurers to continue to expand their insurance coverage for the aged," while the Forand bill would not. Private insurance flourished as never before after social security benefits were initially enacted, though similar fears were expressed at that time. Private pension plans have grown in the last 25 years to supplement the basic social security pension. An identical development can be expected in the health field, once basic health protection is provided through the social security system.

Mr. NIXON says that the Forand bill would lead to the socializing of the medical profession. Such a statement is pure sloganeering. The Forand bill leaves all existing relationships between doctor, patient, and government unchanged, providing simply a mechanism for paying certain bills.

The Vice President seeks to persuade us that the Forand bill would result in herding the ill and elderly into institutions whether they desired this or not. I find it hard to believe that Mr. NIXON is not fully aware that no one can get into a hospital without being admitted by a physician. Providing insurance against the costs of hospitalization will not result in a massive exodus from the

homes of America to the hospitals. Instead, it will remove the economic barrier to needed hospitalization so that medical necessity can govern whether a person will enter a hospital.

Now the task of providing the aged citizens of our country with some protection against the burden of high medical expenses is obviously an immense one. It cannot be solved with a single stroke of the pen, or with empty promises. There is no panacea. After much study in both Houses of the Congress, a way was proposed by which we could begin to meet this problem. It seemed reasonable to approach this problem as, 25 years ago, we approached the problem of providing some income security to the aged citizens of that generation. The earliest pensions under social security were, indeed, modest ones but they provided the sound basis on which a social security program which provides a real measure of dignity in old age has been built.

The Forand bill, by covering all those eligible for social security, covers the vast bulk of the aged. Social security beneficiaries as a proportion of the total population are continually increasing. Once this large group is provided for, it is a simple matter to extend coverage to those outside the system as, for example, one of the Senate versions of the Forand bill—S. 3503—of which I am a cosponsor, already does. No one has come up with any suggestion which would provide benefits to as many people as would the social security approach.

Expenses for hospitalization are by far the largest single item of health care costs for the aged. There is no better place to start attacking the problem than by providing for financing of institutional care.

The administration decided on a different approach. Instead of advancing a modest workable program, such as those contained in the Forand, Kennedy, McNamara, or Anderson bills, the administration took it upon itself to promise the American people "the works," in the hope that the fact that it could not deliver the goods would somehow be obscured.

In contrast, no one claimed that the Forand bill would solve the problem of protecting all of America's aged from all their medical bills, but it does provide a firm foundation on which we can build in the future.

We are proud that we have proceeded responsibly to meet this vast problem. We are proud that we are proceeding in a great tradition. Just 25 years ago, when the Congress passed the original social security Act, President Roosevelt used these words as he signed that bill into law:

> We can never insure 100 percent of the population against 100 percent of the hazards and vicissitudes of life, but we have tried to frame a law which will give some measure of protection to the average citizen and to his family against the loss of a job and against poverty-ridden old age. This law, too, represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete.

President Roosevelt understood that these problems could be met, one solid and constructive step at a time. He did not feel it necessary to promise the people everything, while delivering nothing.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1960

(Legislative day of Friday, August 19, 1960)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of a recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Most merciful God, who art the fountain of all grace, the source of all wisdom and goodness, we would lift our eyes to the infinite blue of Thy love which arches each new day.

Thou hast called us whose lives so swiftly ebb away, to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages. Accepting with humility the call of destiny to be the center and leader of a new world of freedom, quicken our love of America that we may see the shining glory of the Republic both as a heritage and a trust. Against all odds and evil opposition may we keep our passion for freedom, our delight in friendship, our quest for new knowledge, our hatred of falsehood, and our intolerance for that which degrades human personality.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

REDUCTION OF NATIONAL DEBT—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Iowa County, Wis., Farm Bureau, favoring a 2-percent annual reduction of the national debt. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

"Whereas the debt of the Federal Government has reached tremendous proportions, and

"Whereas little or no effort is being made to reduce this debt, and

"Whereas it is vital to the financial security of the country that the debt be paid: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Iowa County Farm Bureau board of directors go on record favoring a 2-percent annual reduction of the national debt, based on greater efficiency in Government operations rather than on an increase in the annual budget; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Congressman GARDNER WITHROW, and all county boards of supervisors of Wisconsin; also all Wisconsin Farm Bureau boards of directors."

Iowa County Farm Bureau Board of Directors: Donald Peterson, President, Roy Anding, M. L. Arneson, Blaine Price, John Zemlicka, Clifford Wedlake, Robert Masters, Robert Mueller, Ed Tonkin, Harley Rundhaug, Erick Fessell, Gaius Davis, Andrew Leuthold, Reuben Kritz.

I, John W. Zemlicka, secretary of the Iowa County Farm Bureau, do certify that the above resolution was passed unanimously by the Iowa County Farm Bureau board of directors at a regularly held meeting August 12, 1960.

JOHN W. ZEMLICKA.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3800. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard (Rept. No. 1858).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 3299. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State (Rept. No. 1860).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3269. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain property to the State of Hawaii (Rept. No. 1859).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Charles H. Cox, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 36 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.