that this suggestion can help them achieve a higher standard of service by placing all of them on the same basis.

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Communications Subcommittee, I believe our subcommittee should determine promptly whether additional legislation is necessary in order to give effect to this suggestion.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1960

Rev. James Clayton Pippin, minister, First Christian Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou who art the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, and upon whose shoulders all the governments of this world rest, empower these, Thy children, with the strength to be worthy servants under Thy rule. May our trust in Thee be stamped upon the coin of our character, that with pure motive we, as a Nation, would be faithful to Thee, not primarily because some other nation is faithless, and not only because we desire our Nation to be perpetuated, but grant, O God, that we may serve Thee because we love Thee and because we know that a Nation so serving makes Thy great heart glad.

As we begin the month in which we celebrate the birthdays of two of our greatest Americans, may their spirit of faith and brotherhood be born anew in us. Although a monument may never be built in our name, guide us so to labor toward preserving the ideals of this good land that theirs may never be torn down.

O Thou who art the seat of all wisdom, give us the wisdom to be loyal to Thee above any party, above any selfish desire for gain, that this grand Ship of State may sail on and on, until the day when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the Kingdom of Thy Son, our Lord, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 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; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933, RELATING TO CERTAIN INCREASED REPRESENTATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washing, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING CLAIMS OF GOVERNMENTS OF ISRAEL AND FRANCE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report and recommendation concerning claims of the Governments of Israel and France against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT GRANTORS FURNISH, FREE OF EXPENSES, EVIDENCES OF TITLE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, TO PERMIT CONVEYANCES AND GRANTS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interest in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of a public street, highway or alley, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF USE OF CONTRACTOR-FURNISHED DRAWINGS FOR PROCUREMENT PURPOSES, NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the use of contractor-furnished drawings for procurement purposes, Department of the Navy, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS MADE BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts made under the provisions of the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459), for the fiscal year 1959 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO MINING LEASES ON CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATION OF A CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND TO THE PUEBLOS OF ZIA AND JEMEZ, N. MEX.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to donate to the pueblos of Zia and Jemez a tract of land in the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant, New Mexico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 16–17, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE SUCCESSORS TO THE PRESIDENCY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO CERTAIN NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON CERTAIN POSITIONS COMPENSATED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 623, 84TH CONGRESS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grade 16 compensated under Public Law 623, 84th Congress, at that Administration, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CERTAIN POSITIONS IN FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, in that Bureau, as of December 31, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the council of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to the establishment of an East-West Cultural Center in Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the 60th Annual Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission to conduct a study for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Philippine and American soldiers, sailors, and marines who lost their lives while serving in the Philippines during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF IDAHO STATE INTERTRIBAL COUNCIL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have received resolutions adopted by the Idaho State Intertribal Council, meeting in semiannual conference on October 1, 1959, at Fort Hall, Idaho, numbered 15, 16, and 18, dealing with specific legislation concerning Indian affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

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

To the Committee on Government Operations:

"RESOLUTION 15

"Whereas the Idaho State Intertribal Council, organized and duly authorized through the official tribal delegates, meeting in semiannual conference, on October 1–2, 1959, at Fort Hall, Idaho, did duly discuss and consider S. 2244, of the 86th Congress; and

"Whereas many Indian tribes feel that there is a great need of usable equipment obtained from Federal Government surplus property and for which many Indian tribes cannot afford because of limited funds; and

"Whereas it is deemed beneficial that legislation proposed under S. 2244, of the 86th Congress, to many Indian tribes and that such equipment can be used to the best interest of many Indian tribes in promoting projects within its Indian reservation, developing its resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Idaho State Intertribal Council hereby endorses and supports proposed legislation under S. 2244, of the 86th Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the said council urges Congress, its subcommittees and committees to support S. 2244."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 16

"Whereas the Idaho State Intertribal Council, organized and duly authorized through the official tribal delegates, meeting in semiannual conference, on October 1–2, 1959, at Fort Hall, Idaho, did duly discuss at some length Senate Concurrent Resolutions No. 12 and No. 36, introduced in the 86th Congress; and

"Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 appears to the council to be a statement of policy in dealing with the Indians from which the Indians of Idaho could begin to build upon a more solid foundation in attempting to raise the social and economic levels of their members without fear of being forced into termination before their goals had been reached; and

"Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 is a restatement of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, of the 85th Congress, of which many Indian tribes and organizations have endorsed; and

"Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 has been supported by the Idaho State Legislature (35th sess.) through endorsement by House Joint Memorial No. 7: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Indians of Idaho, speaking through their intertribal council, hereby urge the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolutions No. 12 and No. 36 of the 86th Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the intertribal council opposes enactment of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 28, which is contrary to the aforementioned resolutions and its language is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 108."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION 18

"Whereas the Idaho State Intertribal Council has been duly organized and authorized by its official tribal delegates, meeting in semiannual conference, did duly consider proposed legislation under S. 812, of the 86th Congress; and

"Whereas the said proposed legislation, under S. 812, would enable a Youth Conservation Corps, similar to the former Civilian Conservation Corps program; and

"Whereas such bill would enable conservation and development of tribal resources, human or natural, on many Indian reservations, if enacted; and

"Whereas such bill would also aid curbing of juvenile delinquency and enable specialized training and skill of conservation practices as well as resources development, within Indian reservations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Idaho State Intertribal Council hereby endorses for enactment of S. 812, making possible a Youth Conservation Corps; and be it further

"Resolved, That the said Idaho State Intertribal Council urges the 86th Congress, its committees, and subcommittees, to support S. 812 for enactment.

REPORT ON FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of December 1959. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1959 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December, numbered—	In November, numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November, was—	In October, was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,364,253	2,372,247	−7,994	$1,006,487	$1,049,514	−$43,027
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,312,007	1,315,802	−3,795	546,462	564,736	−18,274
Department of Defense	1,052,246	1,056,445	−4,199	460,025	484,778	−24,753
Inside the United States	2,204,540	2,211,994	−7,454			
Outside the United States	159,713	160,253	−540			
Industrial employment	557,747	560,206	−2,459			
Foreign nationals	181,767	181,976	−209	23,103	22,752	+351

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1959, and comparison with November 1959, and pay for November 1959, and comparison with October 1959*

Department or Agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	86,518	87,594		1,076	$36,838	$38,897		$2,059
Commerce [1] [2]	62,744	62,969		225	20,025	15,947	$4,078	
Health, Education, and Welfare	59,898	59,909		11	26,503	27,099		596
Interior	50,004	[3] 50,473		469	23,921	25,507		1,586
Justice	29,996	30,087		91	16,438	17,178		740
Labor	6,192	6,216		24	3,249	3,236	13	
Post Office	[4] 559,193	560,269		1,076	218,137	227,226		9,089
State [5]	36,256	36,270		14	16,177	16,455		278
Treasury	74,206	74,413		207	36,446	38,278		1,832
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	408	407	1		240	244		4
Bureau of the Budget	432	434		2	324	334		10
Council of Economic Advisers	33	32	1		25	27		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	72			30	33		3
National Security Council	64	61	3		42	44		2
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,761	1,760	1		1,079	1,111		32
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	4	4			2	3		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4			4	4		
Independent agencies:								
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	488	496		8	83	84		1
Atomic Energy Commission	6,695	6,703		8	4,072	4,312		240
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	598			332	348		16
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2			1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	731	728	3		446	464		18
Civil Service Commission	3,595	3,621		26	1,825	1,920		95
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	5	1		5	4	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4			2	3		1
Commission on Civil Rights	76	75	1		35	40		5
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	3	3			2	6		4
Development Loan Fund	93	90	3		64	63	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	226	222	4		139	146		7
Farm Credit Administration	[6] 624	824		200	460	491		31
Federal Aviation Agency	34,113	33,983	130		18,901	19,136		235
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			3	4		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,277	1,275	2		740	768		28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,238	1,231	7		685	709		24
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	961	957	4		528	546		18
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	344	343	1		258	267		9
Federal Power Commission	840	837	3		486	510		24
Federal Trade Commission	736	738		2	471	486		15
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	46	1		32	35		3
General Accounting Office	5,029	5,047		18	2,631	2,757		126
General Services Administration [7]	27,331	27,321	10		11,295	11,627		332
Government Contract Committee	32	30	2		16	17		1
Government Printing Office	6,499	6,532		33	3,161	3,199		38
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,998	11,003		5	5,690	5,964		274
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	3			2	3		1
Indian Claims Commission	16	16			14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,307	2,304	3		1,277	1,332		55
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	6	6			4	4		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,567	9,525	42		5,487	5,702		215
National Capital Housing Authority	327	325	2		131	134		3
National Capital Planning Commission	43	43			26	25	1	
National Gallery of Art	314	314			117	119		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,624	1,579	45		892	918		26
National Mediation Board	116	117		1	81	84		3
National Science Foundation	549	562		13	293	315		22
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	35	35			21	20	1	
Panama Canal	13,856	13,876		20	4,245	5,948		1,703
Railroad Retirement Board	2,291	2,328		37	1,059	1,113		54
Renegotiation Board	290	293		3	202	211		9
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	170		15	95	96		1
Securities and Exchange Commission	946	936	10		543	568		25
Selective Service System	6,255	6,275		20	1,672	1,764		92
Small Business Administration	2,122	2,098	24		1,141	1,184		43
Smithsonian Institution	1,100	1,091	9		449	461		12
Soldiers' Home	1,018	1,012	6		304	302	2	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	37	36	1		23	22	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	27	1		$21	$22		$1
Tariff Commission	237	236	1		148	153		5
Tax Court of the United States	148	150		2	100	104		4
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,916	14,117		201	7,139	7,616		477
Texas Water Study Commission	34	31	3		20	20		
U.S. Information Agency	10,811	10,811			3,643	3,614	$29	
Veterans' Administration	[8] 172,954	173,167		213	65,384	67,212		1,828
Virgin Islands Corporation	522	622		100	84	124		40
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,312,007	1,315,802	325	4,120	546,462	564,736	4,127	22,401
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			3,795				18,274	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,813	1,802	11		1,179	1,256		77
Department of the Army	385,915	387,632		1,717	163,376	175,430		12,054
Department of the Navy	348,220	350,692		2,472	159,922	[3] 167,237		7,315
Department of the Air Force	316,298	316,319		21	135,548	140,855		5,307
Total, Department of Defense	1,052,246	1,056,445	11	4,210	460,025	484,778		24,753
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,199				24,753	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [9]	2,364,253	2,372,247	336	8,330	1,006,487	1,049,514	4,127	47,154
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,994				43,027	

[1] December figure includes 202 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] December figure includes 29,374 enumerators for the census of agriculture as compared with 29,389 in November, and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Excludes 307,324 temporary Christmas employees.

[5] December figure includes 13,321 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 13,274 in November, and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,197 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,193.

[6] Excludes 183 employees transferred to Federal Land Banks pursuant to Public Law 86-168.

[7] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

[8] Subject to revision.

[9] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1959, and comparison with November 1959*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	85,503	86,581		1,078
Commerce [1]	62,202	62,424		222
Health, Education, and Welfare	59,449	59,464		15
Interior	49,556	[2] 50,024		468
Justice	29,710	29,801		91
Labor	6,125	6,126		1
Post Office	[3] 558,003	559,057		1,054
State [4]	8,765	8,829		64
Treasury	73,667	73,877		210
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	408	407	1	
Bureau of the Budget	432	434		2
Council of Economic Advisers	33	32	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	72		
National Security Council	64	61	3	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,761	1,760	1	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	4	4		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4		
Independent agencies:				
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,655	6,662		7
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	598		
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2		
Civil Aeronautics Board	731	728	3	
Civil Service Commission	3,592	3,618		26
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	5	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	76	75	1	
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	3	3		
Development Loan Fund	93	90	3	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	226	222	4	
Farm Credit Administration	[3] 617	814		197
Federal Aviation Agency	33,260	33,145	115	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,275	1,273	2	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,236	1,229	7	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	961	957	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	344	343	1	
Federal Power Commission	840	837	3	
Federal Trade Commission	736	738		2
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	46	1	
General Accounting Office	4,955	4,972		17
General Services Administration [5]	27,327	27,317	10	
Government Contract Committee	32	30	2	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Government Printing Office	6,499	6,532		33
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,856	10,862		6
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	3		
Indian Claims Commission	16	16		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,307	2,304	3	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	6	6		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,565	9,523	42	
National Capital Housing Authority	327	325	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	43	43		
National Gallery of Art	314	314		
National Labor Relations Board	1,600	1,555	45	
National Mediation Board	116	117		1
National Science Foundation	549	562		13
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	35	35		
Panama Canal	394	394		
Railroad Retirement Board	2,291	2,328		37
Renegotiation Board	290	293		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	170		15
Securities and Exchange Commission	946	936	10	
Selective Service System	6,099	6,119		20
Small Business Administration	3,103	2,079	24	
Smithsonian Institution	1,089	1,081	8	
Soldiers' Home	1,018	1,012	6	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	37	36	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	27	1	
Tariff Commission	237	236	1	
Tax Court of the United States	148	150		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,914	14,115		201
Texas Water Study Commission	34	31	3	
U.S. Information Agency	2,693	2,723		30
Veterans' Administration	[7] 171,870	172,071		201
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,254,979	1,258,686	309	4,016
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			3,707	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,771	1,757	14	
Department of the Army	335,491	336,934		1,443
Department of the Navy	326,165	328,557		2,392
Department of the Air Force	286,134	286,060	74	
Total, Department of Defense	949,561	953,308	88	3,835
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,747	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,204,540	2,211,994	397	7,851
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,454	

[1] December figure includes 202 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Excludes 307,127 temporary Christmas employees.
[4] December figure includes 1,881 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,879 in November.
[5] Excludes 180 employees transferred to Federal land banks pursuant to Public Law 86-168.
[6] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[7] Subject to revision.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1959, and comparison with November 1959*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,015	1,013	2	
Commerce	542	545		3
Health, Education, and Welfare	449	445	4	
Interior	448	449		1
Justice	286	286		
Labor	67	90		23
Post Office	[1] 1,190	1,212		22
State [2]	27,491	27,441	50	
Treasury	539	536	3	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	474	482		8
Atomic Energy Commission	40	41		1
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Farm Credit Administration [3]	7	10		3
Federal Aviation Agency	853	838	15	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	74	75		1
General Services Administration	4	4		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	142	141	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2	2		
National Labor Relations Board	24	24		
Panama Canal	13,462	13,482		20
Independent agencies—Cont.				
Selective Service System	156	156		
Small Business Administration	19	19		
Smithsonian Institution	11	10	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,118	8,088	30	
Veterans' Administration	[4] 1,084	1,096		12
Virgin Islands Corporation	522	622		100
Total, excluding Department of Defense	57,028	57,116	106	194
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			88	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	42	45		3
Department of the Army	50,424	50,698		274
Department of the Navy	22,055	22,135		80
Department of the Air Force	30,164	30,259		95
Total, Department of Defense	102,685	103,137		452
Net decrease, Department of Defense			452	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	159,713	160,253	106	646
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			540	

[1] Excludes 197 temporary Christmas employees.
[2] December figure includes 11,440 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 11,395 in November. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,197 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,193.
[3] Excludes 3 employees transferred to Federal Land Banks pursuant to Public Law 86-168.
[4] Subject to revision.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1959, and comparison with November 1959*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,296	3,296		
Commerce	1,694	2,020		326
Interior	6,883	6,481	402	
Treasury	5,040	5,142		102
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	152	152		
Federal Aviation Agency	734	780		46
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,200	1,215		6
Government Printing Office	6,499	6,532		33
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,567	9,525	42	
Panama Canal	6,919	6,931		12
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,153	11,360		207
Virgin Islands Corporation	522	622		100
Total, excluding Department of Defense	53,681	54,069	444	832
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			388	

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 133,800	[2] 134,463		663
Outside the United States	[1] 8,300	[2] 8,386		
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	200,917	202,067		1,150
Outside the United States	516	522		6
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	158,886	158,985		99
Outside the United States	1,647	1,714		67
Total, Department of Defense	504,066	506,137		2,071
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,071	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	557,747	560,206	444	2,903
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,459	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1959 and comparison with November 1959*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Belgium	11	11					11	11
England	3,513	3,449					3,513	3,449
France	21,694	21,789	17,142	17,120	4		4,548	4,669
Germany	81,542	81,749	69,175	69,380	[2] 57	57	12,310	12,312
Japan	64,430	64,158	21,713	21,175	[2] 16,527	16,750	26,190	26,233
Korea	6,152	6,311	6,152	[1] 6,311				
Morocco	3,816	3,901	2	2	[2] 844	833	2,970	3,066
Netherlands	43	43					43	43
Norway	23	23					23	23
Saudi Arabia	1	1					1	1
Trinidad	542	541			542	541		
Total	181,767	181,976	114,184	113,988	17,974	18,181	49,609	49,807

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] Subject to revision.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,364,253. This was a net decrease of 7,994 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1960, which began July 1, 1959, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,370,694	3,703	
August	2,364,320		6,374
September	2,345,359		18,961
October	2,348,807	3,448	
November	2,372,247	23,440	
December	2,364,253		7,994
Net decrease for 1st 6 months of fiscal year 1960			2,738

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,312,007, a decrease of 3,795 as compared with the November total of 1,315,802. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,052,246, a decrease of 4,199 as compared with 1,056,445 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 1,076, Post Office Department with 1,076 and Interior Department with 469. The decreases in Agriculture and Interior Departments were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense, decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Navy with 2,472, the Department of the Army with 1,717, and the Department of the Air Force with 21.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 7,454, and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 540. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December total 557,747, a decrease of 2,459.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,364,253 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 181,767 foreign nationals working for U.S. military agencies during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 181,976. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Belgium	11			
England	3,513			3,513
France	21,694	17,142	4	4,548
Germany	81,542	69,175	57	12,310
Japan	64,430	21,713	16,527	26,190
Korea	6,152	6,152		
Morocco	3,816	2	844	2,970
Netherlands	43			43
Norway	23			23
Saudi Arabia	1			1
Trinidad	542		542	
Total	181,767	114,184	17,974	49,609

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Zeldi Bornstayn;

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

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Eugene Storme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2943. A bill to suspend certain postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 2944. A bill to authorize a study and investigation by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2945. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish demonstration food-stamp programs in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of James Demetrios Dourakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 2947. A bill to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of

Latter-day Saints; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2948. A bill for the relief of Ti Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2949. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to W. W. Simpson, Jr., of Carlsbad, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 2950. A bill to increase the borrowing authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for college housing loans; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2951. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 2952. A bill to prevent the application of any milk marketing order to milk produced in certain counties of Delaware and Maryland unless approved by a majority of the farmers producing milk in such counties; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2953. A bill to amend certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected; and

S. 2954. A bill to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARTKE (by request):

S. 2955. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2956. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ting-Wa Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2957. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 in order to vest administrative authority in the Secretary of Defense; to make mandatory a single overall war plan for the Armed Forces, with the military departments and the military budget tailored to that plan; to require the establishment of unified commands within the Armed Forces; to provide greater flexibility in the assignment and transfer of military personnel within and among the Armed Forces; to provide for a single Chief of Staff for the Department of Defense, who shall report to the Secretary of Defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2958. A bill to amend section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by relieving the Federal Communications Commission of the duty of making the annual report of personnel as now required by subsection (3) of section 4(k); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

RESOLUTION

Mr. ERVIN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 264) relating to the death of Hon. DAVID M. HALL, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, which was considered and agreed to.

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

STUDY OF FEASIBILITY OF ADDING LIKENESSES OF PRESIDENTS FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AND DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AT MOUNT RUSHMORE MEMORIAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of adding figures of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower to the present memorial. It is my hope that this proposal will pave the way for including likenesses of these two recent outstanding Presidents alongside those of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

It would be fitting to have the figures of Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower, each of whom commanded the hearts and minds of so many Americans and who contributed so much to our Nation, added to the panorama of other great past leaders. Both these men stirred our Nation to great heights. Each man played his part in making America more fully aware of its world responsibilities and its obligation to lead men of good will in the task of building world peace and security.

I am delighted that this measure has bipartisan support in this body, in the person of my good friend from Minnesota. On the House similar bills are being introduced by Representative PAUL A. FINO and Representative ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, both of New York. A moving force behind the drafting of this bill has been the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York.

No matter what Democrats may think of our present President, no matter what Republicans may think of President Franklin Roosevelt, all men of good will can agree that they are important historical figures who played vital roles in the story of our Nation. They deserve to be considered for their works and their place in history, apart from any partisan considerations. It is in this spirit that I offer this measure.

Mr. President, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial is a unique, magnificent and heartwarming aspect of our national life, enshrining as it does Presidents who have meant much to the progress and heritage of America. I hope this bill will make possible the addition of these two towering figures to this sculpturing marvel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this measure printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2944) to authorize a study and investigation by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), created by the Act entitled "An Act creating the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission and defining its purposes and powers", approved February 25, 1929, as amended, is authorized and directed to conduct a complete investigation and study of the feasibility of including figures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower in the Mount Rushmore National Memorial adjacent to the present figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, shall provide such assistance as the Commission shall deem necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report to the President and to Congress the results of the study and investigation authorized by this Act not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

INCREASED AUTHORITY FOR COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase by $500 million the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make college housing loans. Two hundred fifty million dollars would become available upon enactment and $250 million upon July 1, 1960.

Legislation providing for the establishment of the college housing program was first introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in 1950. In 1955, I proposed several amendments to the program, which were adopted with his assistance, and since then the program has functioned with great success.

This program permits direct Federal loans, at low interest rates, to assist colleges and universities in building housing accommodations for students and faculty, and in building other service facilities, such as dining halls, cafeterias, student unions, and in- and outpatient health facilities.

The present revolving fund of $1.175 billion is exhausted. The Housing and Home Finance Agency advises me that some 126 colleges have applications for loans now pending. These applications aggregate about $150 million. I am told that regional offices of the Agency are continuing to accept applications for loans, and that there are many applications in the "pipeline" which are not represented in the $150 million backlog on hand.

Enrollment in our colleges and universities for the fall term of 1959 exceeded 3 million, and it is estimated that this enrollment will double by 1970, if continued without any stimulation. Of all

the many problems facing colleges and universities, perhaps one of the greatest is their inability to provide shelter and service facilities to meet the needs of students and faculties. If the forecasted increase in students occurs, as now seems inevitable, and if we do not continue to assist colleges in meeting shelter requirements, many students will be denied a college education for no reason except lack of housing.

Although I believe that even greater quantities of funds could be wisely channeled into loans of this type, I am hopeful that the increased authorization of $500 million will be adequate to permit approval of acceptable applications at their present rate of receipt through fiscal year 1961.

Unfortunately, the President's program for fiscal year 1961 does not propose additional authorization for the college housing program. To the contrary, he recommends termination of the program and proposes the enactment of S. 1017, a bill he sent to the Congress last year, which is referred to as the "College Facilities Act of 1959."

S. 1017 would permit the Commissioner of Education to guarantee taxable bonds issued by private colleges and universities to obtain money with which to construct housing, academic buildings, or related facilities. In addition, S. 1017 would authorize grants to pay one-fourth of the debt service on bonds issued by both private and publicly supported institutions.

It is amazing to me that the President still persists in his efforts to end the existing loan program, when the majority of educators who have addressed themselves to this proposal have stated that they favor the present program. They do not favor the adoption of the program as contemplated by S. 1017. This position is shared by the State Universities Association, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education, the National Education Association, and the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities.

It has been evident for a long time that the present administration does not want to assist colleges and universities in meeting their acute housing problems. For example, for 4 years the President proposed to restore to the college housing loan program two provisions which were removed in 1955. These two provisions had made it impossible for colleges and universities to use the program. One proposal would have increased the interest rate, thereby increasing the debt service and forcing the schools to raise fees of students, or to deplete other revenue sources already overextended. The other proposal would have set up a standard of reasonable private terms whereby Federal loans would be denied if private funds could be obtained at an interest rate from one-fourth to one-half percent higher.

After failing to make the program unworkable by crippling amendments, the President has now offered an entirely new program which, in the opinion of many educators, is just another way to delay or reduce Federal assistance.

I do not propose today to discuss how our most formidable international competitor, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, may have moved ahead of us in some fields. However, it becomes more evident daily that the U.S.S.R. is investing heavily in human resources and talents. This investment is undoubtedly a key factor in the growth of the Soviet economy.

Investment in education is likewise a key factor in the growth of our economy. The subject of economic growth is analyzed and discussed at length in the January 23 issue of Business Week magazine. The Business Week article states in part that "the growth and power of nations depend primarily upon the qualities of their people. That puts the focus of a long-term growth program not just on our tax laws, or on plant and equipment spending, but on our schools and colleges and universities and laboratories, and all the other seedbeds of American talent."

I agree heartily with this conclusion, and we cannot risk abandoning a successful loan program in the uncertain hope that some other program may work as well. The need for loans is critical; the vehicle for loans is functioning; and this bill would provide necessary funds. I hope that the bill can be enacted quickly.

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

The bill (S. 2950) to increase the borrowing authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for college housing loans, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BASIC AUTHORITY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State," and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State in a letter to the Vice President of January 20, 1960, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President with regard to it.

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

The bill (S. 2951) to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State," introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State" is amended by changing the period at the end of the section to a comma and adding the following: "and the Secretary may provide for the payment of such other expenses as he deems appropriate to assure a suitable program for any participant coming to the United States under the exchange of persons program administered by the Department of State."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1960.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a proposed bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An act to provide certain certain basic authorities for the Department of State."

One of the most serious problems facing the Department at this time in the operation of its international educational exchange program arises from the inability to provide in a systematic way for certain expenses that are vital to the success of programs arranged for distinguished foreign visitors invited to this country. The objective in inviting these persons is to increase understanding between the people of other countries and the people of the United States. Often this objective can best be accomplished through meetings between these visitors and Americans of similar interests, background, and status. Because these visitors are able to remain in this country for only limited periods of time, and their American counterparts similarly have pressing demands upon their time, programs must be arranged which make maximum use of the time available. Many of the most productive meetings that can be arranged are in the form of luncheons, receptions, or similar functions.

Most of the meetings between these visitors and Americans are arranged by the cooperating agencies, both private and government, that assist in carrying out the international educational exchange program. The Department considers the cost of luncheons and other similar arrangements for meetings that are in every respect a vital part of the program to be reasonable and proper program expense. The Department believes, however, that it needs specific legislative authority for the payment of such expenses.

The attached draft bill is intended to provide such authority. The authority would be used sparingly and only as program requirements demand. It is estimated that approximately $20,000 from regular program funds would be used for this purpose over the period of the next fiscal year.

The Department urgently requests the enactment of the proposed legislation at an early date.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Most sincerely,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

PROPOSED DRAFT BILL

A bill to amend the Act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An

Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State" is amended by changing the period at the end of the section to a comma and adding the following: "and the Secretary may provide for the payment of such other expenses as he deems appropriate to assure a suitable program for any participant coming to the United States under the exchange of persons program administered by the Department of State."

PREVENTION OF APPLICATION OF MILK MARKETING ORDERS IN CERTAIN COUNTIES OF DELAWARE AND MARYLAND

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the clear policy of the Agricultural Marketing Act is to assist producers by stabilizing prices at fair and reasonable levels for the commodity covered by the act.

The act does not contemplate giving certain large handlers in an area benefits at the expense of local handlers.

The upper Chesapeake milk marketing order violates both of the above concepts, as follows:

First. Producers on the lower Eastern Shore counties were enjoying stable prices and good markets previous to the issuing of the marketing order.

Second. More producers in the area sell to local distributors than sell to Baltimore handlers. Those local distributors have a high utilization since most of the milk goes as bottled milk. They do not have facilities to handle large amounts of class 2 and class 3 milk as do large handlers in the metropolitan area. Therefore, the order would result in their having to pay into the pool to take care of surplus, money that now goes to the producer. Therefore, the order discriminates against handlers in the Eastern Shore counties.

When the referendum was held there were 1,855 votes cast. Of this number about 90 percent of the votes were cast in a block by the Maryland Milk Producers Association. Only 30 individual farmer votes were cast by producers in the area and of those, 10 voted in favor of the order and 20 were opposed.

It is clear the order was put into effect solely as a result of the block vote of the Maryland Milk Producers Association who voted all their members in the affirmative without first polling them to find out if a marketing order was desirable.

It appears that the net effect of the order on the Delmarva Peninsula will be to raise the price of milk 1 cent per quart to the consumer and to lower the net price to the farmer on the Eastern Shore—both at the same time.

This does not mean extra profits for the distributors but the difference is paid by the dealer into the Baltimore milk pool for distribution to those farmers in other areas who are producing surplus milk.

It is true that farmers in the surplus area will receive an increase but this is possible only by reducing the present price being paid to our own farmers.

Here we have a marketing order covering the Eastern Shore counties of Maryland and also affecting Delaware producers being voted into existence through a referendum at which time only 30 individual producers for the area voted and of the 30 producers, only 10 favorable votes were cast. In the whole area only 192 individual votes were cast and of those only 31 were favorable.

Thus it must be assumed that the votes putting the order into effect were cast by cooperative associations having large memberships in areas not contiguous with the Eastern Shore.

The congressional delegation, representing the Eastern Shore, are today introducing a bill which would eliminate the Eastern Shore area from the upper Chesapeake milk marketing order until such time as a majority of producers in the area have by a majority of individual votes indicated they wish to come under the order.

At a later date, I shall introduce proposed legislation to prevent block voting which makes it possible for a cooperative or association to vote all its individual members as a unit without any regard as to their individual views.

It is my opinion that decisions of approval or disapproval of any milk orders should be decided by a majority vote of the farmers themselves. That is a vote of 6 to 1 against the order.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], I introduce the bill, and ask that it may be appropriately referred, and also that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2952) to prevent the application of any milk marketing order to milk produced in certain counties of Delaware and Maryland unless approved by a majority of the farmers producing milk in such counties, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. FREAR), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8c(11) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 608c(11)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) No order issued under this section shall be applicable to milk produced in Kent and Sussex Counties, Del., and in Kent, Queen Annes, Caroline, Talbot, Dorchester, Wicomico, Somerset and Worcester Counties, Md., for resale in such counties unless and until a majority of the farmers who produce milk in said counties and who are eligible to vote on such order, shall, by individual ballot approve such order.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1960

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is at least as essential to have a modern defense structure, with clear lines of authority and responsibility, as it is to have adequate numbers of modern weapons.

Two ingredients are necessary for modernizing our defense organization: sound legislation, and the willingness to make that legislation effective.

The first is a responsibility of the Congress.

In order to fill that need now I am introducing a bill to amend the National Security Act in certain major respects.

The purposes of my bill are to—

First. Make mandatory a single overall war plan for the armed services.

Second. Require that the defense budget be tailored to that plan.

Third. Require the establishment of integrated or unified commands.

Fourth. Increase the flexibility of the assignment and transfer of military personnel within and among the Armed Forces.

Fifth. Require the appointment of a single Chief of Staff for the Department of Defense.

Sixth. Abolish the positions of Secretaries of the military departments and establish an Under Secretary for each of the services in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Seventh. Increase the authority of the Secretary of Defense.

This bill will strengthen civilian control and at the same time increase the capability of the military to carry out defense policy decisions.

It should be clear that this bill does not abolish the separate services, including the Marines. Rather, it is intended to make possible more effective performance of all military personnel.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2957) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 in order to vest administrative authority in the Secretary of Defense; to make mandatory a single overall war plan for the Armed Forces, with the military departments and the military budget tailored to that plan; to require the establishment of unified commands within the Armed Forces; to provide greater flexibility in the assignment and transfer of military personnel within and among the Armed Forces; to provide for a single Chief of Staff for the Department of Defense who shall report to the Secretary of Defense; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1960".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The text of section 2 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 401), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the purpose of the Congress to provide—

"(1) a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States through

the establishment of means for the integration of policies and procedures of the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security;

"(2) a Department of Defense, including the three military Departments of the Army, the Navy (including the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force under the supervision and control of the Secretary of Defense, and to provide for their administration by Under Secretaries of Defense acting under the direction, authority and control of the Secretary of Defense;

"(3) for the elimination of unnecessary duplication and for more effective, efficient and economical administration within the Department of Defense through increased centralization of control exercised by the Secretary over activities of the Department in the fields of research, engineering, and procurement;

"(4) for the establishment of unified defense, strategic, combatant, logistic, and other unified commands composed of elements of two or more of the armed forces; and

"(5) for the unified direction and control of all of the armed forces through the adoption of a single over-all war plan and the appointment of a single chief of staff for the Department of Defense who shall be the controlling member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 3. Section 203 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U.S.C. 171c), is amended by (1) redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) thereof as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (2) inserting therein, immediately after subsection (a), the following new subsection:

"(b) There shall be in the Department of Defense an Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, an Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, and an Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force. Each such Under Secretary of Defense shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum. The Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, and the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, shall perform such duties and exercise such powers with respect to the administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, respectively, as may be prescribed by law or directed by the Secretary of Defense. All determinations made, regulations promulgated, and instructions given by any Under Secretary of Defense under any provision of law shall be subject to approval, modification, or disapproval by the Secretary of Defense to the same extent as if he had been authorized by such provision of law to make such determination, promulgate such regulations, or give such instructions. Each Under Secretary of Defense shall take precedence within the Department of Defense after the Deputy Secretary of Defense."

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND JOINT STAFF

SEC. 4. (a) The text of section 141, title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 141. Composition; functions

"(a) There are in the Department of Defense the Joint Chiefs of Staff consisting of—

"(1) the Chief of Staff of Defense, who shall have power of decision with respect to all matters arising for determination by the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

"(2) the Chief of Staff of the Army;

"(3) the Chief of Naval Operations; and

"(4) the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

"(b) The Chief of Staff of Defense, assisted by the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is the principal military adviser to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall indicate to the Chief of Staff of Defense any matter scheduled for consideration by the Joint Chiefs which directly concerns the Marine Corps. Unless, upon request of the Chief of Staff of Defense for a determination, the Secretary of Defense determines that such a matter does not concern the Marine Corps, the Commandant shall meet with the Joint Chiefs of Staff when that matter is under consideration. While the matter is under consideration and with respect to it, the Commandant has coequal status with each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except the Chief of Staff of Defense.

"(d) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Chief of Staff of Defense shall, after consultation with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) prepare a single over-all war plan for the armed forces;

"(2) assign responsibilities to the armed forces in accordance with such plan;

"(3) review the major material and personnel requirements of the armed forces in accordance with such plan;

"(4) formulate policies for the joint training of the armed forces;

"(5) formulate policies for coordinating the military education of members of the armed forces;

"(6) provide for representation of the United States on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and

"(7) perform such other duties as the President or the Secretary of Defense may prescribe."

(b) Section 142, title 10, United States Code, is amended by (1) redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) thereof as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and (2) adding thereto, immediately after subsection (a) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(b) The Chief of Staff of Defense shall perform the duties imposed upon him by section 141."

(c) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 143, title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Joint Staff shall perform such duties as the Chief of Staff of Defense prescribes. The Chief of Staff of Defense manages the Joint Staff and its Director."

UNIFIED COMMANDS

SEC. 5. Section 202(j) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U.S.C. 171a(j)), is amended to read as follows:

"(j) With the advice and assistance of the Chief of Staff of Defense, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall establish from time to time (without regard to any requirement contained in the second or third sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of this section) such unified defense, strategic, combatant, logistic, and other unified commands as the President shall determine to be required for the effective performance of the single war plan of the armed forces. Each such unified command shall include units, elements, or personnel of two or more of the armed forces of the United States, and shall have such composition as may be determined from time to time under procedures established by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. Such unified commands are responsible to the President and the Secretary of Defense for such military missions as may be assigned to them by the Secretary of Defense with the prior advice of the Chief of Staff of Defense and with the approval of the President. Units, elements, and personnel of the armed forces assigned to any such unified command shall be under the full operational command of the duly designated commander of that unified command. All units, elements, and personnel of the armed forces not assigned to any such unified command remain for all purposes within and subject to control by their respective departments. The responsibility for the support of forces assigned to such unified commands shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Units, elements, and personnel assigned to such unified commands may be transferred therefrom only by authority of and under procedures established by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President."

TRANSFER AND REASSIGNMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 6. (a) The section 716 of title 10, United States Code, which appears first in chapter 41 of such code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 716. Secretary of Defense: authority to transfer and reassign military personnel

"(a) In order to assure maximum effective utilization of military personnel of the armed forces, the Secretary of Defense may, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the President, notwithstanding any provision of law other than a provision prescribing the authorized strength of any armed force—

"(1) transfer any officer or enlisted member of any branch, corps, department, or service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps to any other branch, corps, department, or service of that armed force;

"(2) assign any officer or enlisted member of any of those armed forces in an active duty status to perform active duty with any other of those armed forces or with any unified command; and

"(3) transfer any officer or enlisted member of any such armed force to, and appoint such officer or enlisted member in, any other of those armed forces.

"(b) No officer or enlisted member so transferred or assigned may under this section be appointed in any higher grade or assigned any higher rank than that held by him on the day before such transfer or assignment."

(b) The item contained in the analysis of chapter 41, title 10, United States Code, which relates to the section 716 thereof appearing first therein is amended to read as follows:

"716. Secretary of Defense: authority to transfer and reassign military personnel."

UNIFICATION OF LAWS RELATING TO MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 7. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that laws, regulations, and procedures governing the appointment, enlistment, retention, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers and enlisted personnel of like or comparable classes of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps should be uniform.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive study of all such laws now in effect, and within one year after the effective date of this Act shall transmit to the Congress a report containing (1) his recommendations for changes in existing law required to carry into effect the objective stated in subsection (a), (2) an analysis of the purpose and effect of the changes so recommended, and (3) proposed legislation to carry into effect the changes so recommended.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

SEC. 8. (a) Paragraphs (7) and (8) of subsection (c) of section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U.S.C.

171a(c)) are repealed, and the following paragraph is inserted at the end of that subsection in lieu of those paragraphs:

"(7) Each military department (the Department of the Navy to include naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps) shall be separately organized and shall be administered by an Under Secretary of Defense under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. The Under Secretary of Defense for a military department shall be responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the operation of such department and its efficiency. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, no Assistant Secretary of Defense shall have authority to issue orders to a military department unless (1) the Secretary of Defense has specifically delegated in writing to such an Assistant Secretary the authority to issue such orders with respect to a specific subject area, and (2) such orders are issued through the Under Secretary of Defense for such military department or his designee."

(b) The first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 203 of that Act (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, and the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force."

(c) The second sentence of subsection (d) of section 203 of the National Security Act of 1947 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force".

(d) Section 204 of that Act (5 U.S.C. 171d) is amended by striking out the words "other than", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "including".

GENERAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 9. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the following general amendments are made to title 10 of the United States Code:

(1) That title is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of the Army", "Secretary of the Navy", and "Secretary of the Air Force" wherever they appear therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretary of Defense for the Army", "Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy", and "Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force", respectively.

(2) That title is amended by striking out the word "Secretary" wherever it appears therein with relation to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretary".

(3) That title is amended by striking out the word "Secretaries" wherever it appears therein with relation to more than one of the Secretaries who on the day preceding the effective date of this Act were heads of the military departments of the Department of Defense, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretaries".

(4) That title is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of" wherever they appear therein with relation to a military department of the Department of Defense, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretary of Defense for".

(5) That title is amended by striking out the words "Secretaries of" wherever they appear therein with relation to more than one of the military departments of the Department of Defense, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Under Secretaries of Defense for".

(6) That title is amended by striking out the words "Under Secretary of the Army", "Under Secretary of the Navy", and "Under Secretary of the Air Force" wherever they appear therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Deputy Under Secretary of the Army", "Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy", and "Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force", respectively.

(7) That title is amended by striking out the words "Under Secretary" wherever they appear therein with relation to the Under Secretary of the Army, the Under Secretary of the Navy, or the Under Secretary of the Air Force (as those offices existed on the day preceding the effective date of this Act), and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Deputy Under Secretary".

(8) That title is amended by striking out the word "Chairman" wherever it appears therein with relation to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the words "Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff" wherever they appear therein, and inserting in each such instance in lieu of the matter so struck out the words "Chief of Staff of Defense".

(b) No general amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any provision of title 10 of the United States Code which is specifically amended by any provision of section 10 of this Act.

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 10. The following specific amendments are made to title 10 of the United States Code:

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 175(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the Under Secretary of Defense for or the Deputy Under Secretary of each of the military departments, or an Assistant Secretary of each such department designated under section 264(b) of this title;".

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 2302 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'Head of an agency' means the Under Secretary of Defense for a military department; the Deputy Under Secretary or any Assistant Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force; the Secretary of the Treasury; or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.".

(3) Section 2386 is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Funds appropriated for", the words "the Department of Defense or for".

(4) Section 3012(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Department of the Army shall be administered by the Under Secretary of Defense for the Army under the supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense."

(5) Section 3032(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Army staff shall furnish professional assistance to the Under Secretary of Defense for the Army and to the Deputy Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of the Army."

(6) Section 5012(c) is amended by striking out the words "between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "by the Secretary of Defense."

(7) Section 5031(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Department of the Navy shall be administered by the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy under the supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense."

(8) Section 5033(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is a Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy, appointed from civil life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

(9) Section 8012(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Department of the Air Force shall be administered by the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force under the supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense."

(10) The first sentence of section 8013(a) is amended to read as follows: "There are in the Department of the Air Force a Deputy Under Secretary and three Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force."

(11) Section 8013(b) is amended by striking out the word "four".

(12) Section 8032(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Air Staff shall furnish professional assistance to the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force and to the Deputy Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and Chief of Staff of the Air Force."

(13) Sections 3034(d)(4), 5081(c), 5201(d), and 8034(d)(4) are each amended by striking out the words "unified or specified combat commanders", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "duly designated commanders of unified commands established".

(14) The section 716 of title 10, United States Code, which appears second in chapter 41 of such code is redesignated as section 717 thereof, and the analysis of that chapter is amended by striking out the section number "716" where it appears therein for a second time and by inserting in lieu thereof the section number "717".

APPLICATION TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW

SEC. 11. (a) Each reference to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force contained in any Act not amended by this Act shall be deemed to refer to the Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, or the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, respectively.

(b) Each reference to the Under Secretary of the Army, the Under Secretary of the Navy, or the Under Secretary of the Air Force contained in any Act not amended by this Act shall be deemed to refer to the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy, or the Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force, respectively.

(c) Each reference to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff contained in any Act or any provision of any Act not amended by this Act shall be deemed to refer to the Chief of Staff of Defense.

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 12. (a) Until the appointment and qualification of the first individual appointed to the Office of Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, or Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, the powers, duties, and functions of each such office may be exercised and discharged, without further appointment, by the individual who on the day preceding the effective date of this Act was serving as Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, and while so serving each such individual shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Under Secretaries of Defense.

(b) Until the appointment and qualification of the first individual appointed to the office of Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy, or Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force, the powers, duties, and functions of each such office may be exercised and discharged, without further appointment, by the individual who on the day preceding the effective date of this Act was serving as Under Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Navy, or Under Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, and while so serving each

such individual shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for the Deputy Under Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

(c) Until the appointment of the first individual appointed to the Office of Chief of Staff of Defense, the powers, duties, and functions of such office may be exercised and discharged, without further appointment, by the individual who on the day preceding the effetcive date of this Act was serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and while so serving such individual shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff of Defense.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) All contracts, commitments, orders, regulations, determinations and instructions of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force which are in effect on the day preceding the effective date of this Act with respect to, or in execution of, any power, duty, or function affected by any amendment made by this Act shall continue in effect, to the same extent as if such amendment had not been made, until rescinded, modified, superseded, or otherwise rendered inapplicable, on or after the effective date of this Act, by or under the authority of (1) the Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, respectively, or (2) the Secretary of Defense.

(b) No action or other legal proceeding lawfully commenced by, on behalf of, or against the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force relating to any official power, duty, or function of any such secretary shall abate by reason of any amendment made by this Act. Any such action or proceeding may be maintained after such amendment by, on behalf of, or against the Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, the Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, or the Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, respectively.

(c) Except as expressly provided by amendments made by this Act, nothing contained in this Act shall alter or impair the status, organization, powers, duties, or functions of (1) the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or (2) any officer of any such department.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the ———— month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT ON PERSONNEL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by relieving the Federal Communications Commission of the duty of making the annual report of personnel as now required by subsection (3) of section 4(k).

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Commission, requesting the proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2958) to amend section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by relieving the Federal Communications Commission of the duty of making the annual report of personnel as now required by subsection (3) of section 4(k), introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission wishes to recommend at this time for consideration of the Congress the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934 (as amended), to relieve the FCC of the obligation of making the annual report of new personnel as now required by section 4(k)(3) of our act (47 U.S.C. 154 (k)(3)). Attached is a copy of the bill as we drafted it as well as the justification.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Commission that it has no objection to the submission of this letter.

It is hoped, therefore, that this proposal will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress. The Commission will be glad to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Congress or by any committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO RELIEVE THE COMMISSION OF THE OBLIGATION OF MAKING THE ANNUAL PERSONNEL REPORT AS NOW REQUIRED BY SECTION 4(K)(3), (47 U.S.C. 154 (K))

Section 4(k)(3) of the Communications Act requires the Commission to include in its annual report to Congress information respecting all persons taken into employment during the year covered by the report, including names, pertinent biographical data, experience, Commission position held and compensation paid, and a statement of the names of all persons leaving the Commission's employ during the same period.

The FCC has complied with the provisions of subsection 4(k)(3) since it was enacted in 1952, but in our opinion, this subsection serves only a limited purpose, and the effort and expense required for its operation is disproportionate to any benefits achieved.

To the extent this requirement can be eliminated our budgetary expenses could be diminished slightly. The following is an estimate of the time and effort absorbed in preparing this part of the annual report:

(1) Amount of time spent in editing and typing—approximately 3 weeks per year;

(2) Number of pages—varying from year to year, averaging 29 pages;

(3) Time of new employee spent in completing this biographical data form—approximately 15 minutes;

(4) Number of new people employed each year—approximately 250.

All persons taken into the employment of the Commission are required to complete the "Application for Federal Employment" (form 57) and a "Biographical Data Work Sheet." The later is used for compiling the supplement to the annual report to Congress as required by subsection 4(k)(3) of the act. All information required on the worksheet duplicates the information required on the application for Federal employment. So in the event the requirement of 4(k)(3) is abolished there would be no need for the worksheet. The Commission would still have the same information available in its files.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. DODD], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], I submit amendments intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 8) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The amendments are as follows:

On page 8, line 24, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and to authorize a two-year program of loans for the construction of private nonprofit elementary and secondary school facilities."

On page 17, line 3, after "Act" insert a comma and "or a private school which receives a loan under the provisions of section 11,".

On page 17, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"LOANS TO PRIVATE NONPROFIT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

"SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sum, not to exceed $75,000,000 in any fiscal year, as is equal to 15 per centum of such sums as may be appropriated in such year pursuant to the authorization in section 4, for making loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the States for constructing school facilities. Such loans are hereby authorized to be made by the Commissioner, and the total amount of such loans which shall be allocated to qualifying schools in each State for each such year shall be in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated in such year pursuant to the authorization in this section as the private nonprofit elementary and secondary school population in such State bears to the total such population for all the States.

Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

"(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(3) may be in an amount not exceeding the total construction cost of the facilities for which made, as determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner, which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the contract for the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

"(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than forty years after the date on which such loan was made.

If any part of the total funds allocated to schools within a State under the provisions of this section remain unused at the end of the first fiscal year in which funds are made available under this section, it shall be reallocated at the discretion of the Commissioner for loans under the provisions of this section to schools in other States. Such reallocated sums shall be over and above the sum authorized to be appropriated in the succeeding fiscal year under the provisions of this section."

On page 17, line 17, strike out "SEC. 11." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 12."

On page 18, line 24, before the semicolon insert a comma and "or for the purposes of section 11 which is provided by a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school."

On page 19, after line 11, insert the following:

(g) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school means a school owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"A bill to authorize a two-year program of Federal assistance for elementary and secondary school construction."

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have the amendments lie on the table until the close of the day's business on Tuesday, so that those who wish to do so may join in their sponsorship.

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

Mr. MORSE. This amendment adds to the program of grants for public school construction, a program of loans for private school construction. It authorizes the appropriation of an additional 15 percent of the amount authorized for public schools, or $75 million a year.

In essence, this amendment is an extension of the same principle Congress applied to the National Defense Education Act; namely, that where grants are made to public schools for improvement of their facilities, loans should be made to the private schools for the same purposes.

Congress must face up to the fact that there is now an urgent national interest in our education system. But the education system of the United States must be considered as a whole and strengthened as a whole. At least 15 percent of the Nation's children attending elementary and secondary school are being educated in private schools.

Therefore, while our amendment does not extend an outright grant of funds to these schools, I believe Congress must extend credit for their construction needs.

The test of financial soundness, by which the Office of Education would screen applications under this amendment, makes clear that to receive a loan, the private institutions must demonstrate sound credit ratings. In other words, there is nothing in this amendment to encourage the formation of private schools just to take advantage of the Federal program.

The Commissioner of Education must be assured the money will be repaid—with interest.

Nonetheless, the high interest rates which now govern the lending of private funds are severely curtailing the construction of needed private elementary and secondary schools. Our amendment applies to these loans the interest rate formula now in effect for the college housing program.

The apportionment of funds among the States contained in our amendment would conform with the proportion which the number of school-age children attending private schools in each State bears to the proportion of such attendance nationally.

The Federal Government has followed the policy of lending to private, nonprofit institutions in the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, the college housing program, and the National Defense Education Act. I believe our amendment is a logical and desirable addition to S. 8.

I submit the amendments well aware of the fact that there will be those in our country who will oppose them under the mistaken notion that somehow or other they violate the basic doctrine of the separation of church and state.

No Member of this body is a stronger defender of the perpetuation and preservation of the doctrine of separation of church and state than is the senior Senator from Oregon. These amendments have nothing whatsoever to do with that issue. The amendments go to the question of whether or not we are to make available adequate school facilities for the boys and girls of the country.

The private schools of the country are performing a very important public function in the education field. If anyone has any doubt about it, imagine for a moment that we could press a button now and turn off all the private schools of America so that the currents of education they now make available to the American taxpayers suddenly ceased; imagine that all the boys and girls going to private schools today should appear tomorrow morning at the doors of the public schools. Then perhaps the taxpayers would have a better idea of the great public contribution the private schools are making to the education of our boys and girls.

For 16 years in the Senate I have taken the same position regarding any Federal-aid money appropriated for the benefit of boys and girls. When the money goes to the education of our boys and girls, there is no conflict with the traditional doctrine of separation of church and state. We need to recognize that wherever little boys and girls are going to school it is in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of preserving the human resources of America that they get a decent education.

I close by saying, as I have been heard to say before, that there is a great educational challenge facing the American people, the challenge of seeing to it that we keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. We cannot keep ahead of her in manpower, but we owe it to future generations of American boys and girls to see to it that we assure them a better chance of having a heritage of freedom left to them.

The best weapon we have, so far as preserving the security of freedom for future generations of American boys and girls is concerned, is to see to it that in our generation we take the steps necessary to provide Federal assistance—in this case a Federal loan—in order to give boys and girls a good educational opportunity by providing them with school facilities which make it possible for them to develop the maximum potential of their brainpower.

MEMORIAL TO ALBERT EINSTEIN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 28, 1960, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155) authorizing the establishment in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Albert Einstein, introduced by Mr. JAVITS on January 28, 1960.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing reports pursuant to Senate Resolutions 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 91, 86th Congress, be extended to March 15, 1960.

These reports concern certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

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

By Mr. HILL:

Address entitled "A Charter of Independence for Senior Citizens," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH to the West Virginia Institute on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Aging, January 25, 1960.

HISTORY OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it must have been 25 years ago that Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, was first elected to the House of Representatives. Shortly after he arrived there, he was assigned to the House Committee on Military Affairs, which later became a component of the House Committee on Armed Services. He has served continuously on that committee. In addition, some years ago he was designated the minority whip.

Recently, Representative ARENDS has devoted a great deal of time to the development of what he calls a history of ballistic missiles; and in connection

with that work he has made use of research. Last week, I had occasion to examine the document he has prepared. Knowing, of course, that he could draw upon so many who are experts in that field, I felt that the statement was a truly significant one; and I believe it should have widespread currency.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the statement by the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois.

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

BALLISTIC MISSILES [1]—A HISTORY

(By Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS)

INTRODUCTION

Major military weapons never spring forth full-blown overnight. The first operational B–17 took a decade to develop. The B–29 and B–52 are likewise the outgrowth of years of effort.

Similarly with modern rocketry. Though in America it began 17 years ago, it turned seriously to long-range ballistic missiles only 7 years ago.

Not until fiscal year 1953 was expenditures in any one year on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars.

Since 1953 these programs have advanced with impressive speed. Today they involve the expenditure of 10 times as much each day as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952.

In the early postwar years military studies slowly advanced American ballistic missile knowledge. Propulsion, guidance, heating and weight problems appeared very difficult. Their solution obviously was costly. Yet, the level of effort remained low and sporadic. Moreover, critical data controlling warhead weights were unknown. Until 1953 the operational feasibility of long-range ballistic missiles seemed far distant to those in authority. As a result, these programs were deemed unworthy of major effort. To be sure, one such program, the forerunner to Atlas, was started as long as 14 years ago, in 1946, but it died 3 years later in the 1949 defense cutbacks. The program was revived in 1951 but even then only as a component development effort.

From World War II to 1953, due partly to skepticism as to the practicality of long-range ballistic missiles and due also to emphasis on strategic bombers, our missile effort, such as it was, went mainly into such air defense missiles as Nike-Ajax, Terrier I, and Falcon. Some short-range ballistic missiles and some relatively slow nonballistic aerodynamic type long-range missiles did receive some support. Corporal and Redstone are examples of the former and Snark and Navaho of the latter. Long-range ballistic missile efforts, however, were held down to low-support studies.

Viewed in retrospect, therefore, it is hardly remarkable that as of 1960, 15 years after World War II, American long-range rocketry is in some respects matched or surpassed by the Soviets. That result was foreordained by years of low-priority attention and lack of funds while the Soviets evidently were advancing their rocketry full blast.

What is remarkable is how rapidly the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile (IRBM) programs of the United States have advanced in less than 6 years. The speed of this advance in so short a period augurs well for the Nation's security. It is convincing testimony to the competence of our scientists and engineers.

[1] Intercontinental and intermediate range.

THE YEARS 1942–46

The year 1942 marks the beginning of our World War II rocket program. The work was principally on solid propellants, which burn like cigarettes within the rockets. It was carried forward with military support, by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. From it evolved our World War II "artillery rockets," air-to-surface rockets, rocket boosters for airplanes, other special rocket motors, and our first serious effort to propel rockets with liquid fuels. During the summer of 1945 this work produced the Army WAC Corporal, a rocket fueled by nitric acid and aniline.

When World War II ended, the Allied Nations placed scientific teams in Germany to analyze that nation's technical accomplishments in rockets and missiles. A number of the best German scientists and engineers were induced to go to Russia and to the United States. The United States, however, pressed this effort less aggressively than the Soviets.

In the latter part of 1946 the Russians identified other scientists and technicians associated with German missile programs. Hundreds of them were removed to Russia. German research facilities and production plants were stripped of machinery, instruments, blueprints and missiles or missile components. These too were shipped to Russia. Thus the Russians were able to exploit German missile technology. The indoctrination of Soviet scientists and technicians was thereby facilitated, and they acquired faster the know-how to bring uncompleted German ideas to practical realization.

The advantage the Soviets achieved due to their early decision to develop and extend this German missile technology is evident.

THE YEARS 1946–50

This period is one of halting, low-level efforts on long-range ballistic missiles.

In 1946 several potentially useful programs had been started. As captured V–2 rockets were used up, the development of American designed and produced rockets began.

For instance, the Army arranged in 1946 to rebuild the V–2's. In the so-called Bumper program, the V–2 was converted into a first-stage booster rocket. It carried a second rocket, the WAC Corporal, which in turn carried scientific instruments to high altitudes. Maximum speed attained during these later tests was about 5,200 miles per hour—maximum altitude, about 250 miles. The standard V–2 performance was 3,600 miles an hour and 100 miles maximum altitude.

The year 1946 marked also the Air Force's first attempt on the ICBM. The program, known as the MX–774 at Convair, was intended to advance long-range rocket techniques. It turned out, however, to be rather short lived. The Defense slashes of 1947 terminated this program. For the next several years Convair used corporated funds to carry on MX–774 weapons studies at low financial levels.

In 1946 the Air Force also established the Snark and Navaho programs. These were long-range, airplane-type guided missiles, not the ballistic type. However, from the liquid propellant rocket booster to be used with Navaho grew the high-thrust liquid propellant engines for today's Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter.

Also in the late 1940's the Navy developed the first version of its Viking, a high-altitude scientific research rocket.

THE YEARS 1950–53

The development of the Army's Redstone, a 200-mile tactical ballistic missile, was begun in 1950. Not until 1953 was the first Redstone missile fired, a flight test that was only partially successful. Much of the information obtained from this and subsequent Redstone firings was applied to the Jupier when that program was initiated in late 1955.

In the design of long-range ballistic missiles, weight is critical. Generally speaking, it takes about 200 pounds of launching weight to place 1 pound of warhead on a target several thousands miles away. Because the first atomic warheads weighed 9,000 pounds, clearly a major reduction was required in nuclear warhead weight for missile use.

During the 1946–53 period the Atomic Energy Commission embarked on a program of atomic weapon improvement which resulted in lighter and higher yield nuclear warheads.

It was on January 31, 1950, that development of thermonuclear weapons was permitted to go beyond low-priority studies in the United States. On that date the President directed the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with this development.

However, during this entire period the significance of warhead improvement was not applied to the problem of long-range ballistic missiles. For this and other reasons, long-range ballistic missile development languished. The warhead problem, therefore, became one of the central factors in the delay of American progress on such missiles. During this slack period in the United States, the Soviets appear to have gone full speed ahead with their own long-range ballistic missile programs.

In October 1950, Mr. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corp., was appointed Defense Department Director of Guided Missiles, with authority to institute a Manhattan-type project for missiles. However, after analysis of the missile programs, Mr. Keller decided against a Manhattan-type project on the grounds that it would take a year to institute such a program. In 1953, Mr. Keller was asked to remain with the new administration. He resigned late that year at his own behest.

Missile feasibility studies started in 1949 by the Rand Corp., were completed in the fall of 1950. These studies confirmed the military worth of long-range ballistic missiles. Subsequently, in January 1951, the decision was made by the Air Force to resume studies of the MX–774 weapon, redesignated "Atlas." This program however was given only a long-term, low-priority objective—that of determining whether a large 5,000-mile ballistic rocket was then technically feasible. Six months later, in June 1951, the Atlas project was formally reactivated.

On June 16, 1953, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson ordered a review of the guided missile program to identify and eliminate duplication. He stated that "a continuous effort should be made to standardize on one missile for production and use by all military departments, wherever, within the employment limitation of each type of missile, standardization appears to be practicable." As a part of this review a group of civilian scientists headed by Dr. John von Neumann was requested to review the strategic missile programs. It was later known as the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee.

Between fiscal years 1951 and 1953 the ICBM program grew from a half million to 3 million dollars per year.

THE YEAR 1954

The Strategic Missiles Evaluation (Von Neumann) Committee reported in February the highly significant possibility of achieving a major technological breakthrough on warhead size and expressed its conviction that other technical problems associated with the development of ICBM's could be resolved in a period of a few years. The Committee also recommended the formation of a special management organization to assure early ICBM availability.

As for technical factors, the Von Neumann Committee recommended that the ICBM project be completely reoriented to take advantage of the advancing warhead technology, thus permitting relaxation of guidance tolerances and propulsion requirements. The committee also noted the potential desirability of an IRBM.

Nine days later the Assistant Secretary of Air Force (Research and Development) approved the broad reorientation of the program recommended by the Committee.

Accordingly, the Air Force set up a group to study the Von Neumann report and define the organizational realinement required to accelerate the ICBM. From June through August major management and procedural changes were placed into operation. A streamlined organization under the Air Force Research and Development Command was set up. It was known as the Western Development Division (WDD) and became an autonomous group responsible for directing and coordinating the effort toward primary objectives. Under the command of Brig. Gen. B. A. Schriever, Atlas became WDD's basic mission.

During the Castle tests in the Pacific through the period of March to May 1954, the feasibility of developing a smaller lightweight, high-yield thermonuclear weapon was proven, thus confirming the soundness of the Von Neumann Committee's recommendations.

THE YEAR 1955

By spring the Atlas program was expanding rapidly. The $3 million program in fiscal year 1953 had grown to $14 million in fiscal year 1954, to $161 million in fiscal year 1955.

In February the Killian Committee (Technological Capabilities Panel) recommended that concurrently with the ICBM effort, an IRBM program be initiated to develop a missile of 1,500-mile range.

In June the Scientific Advisory Committee (formerly the Strategic Missile Evaluation Committee) recommended that two ICBM's be developed concurrently in order to assure earliest attainment of an operational capability. In September the President approved assignment of the highest priority to the ICBM research and development program. The same month the Titan ICBM project was established in supplementation of the Atlas program to provide the desired multiple approach.

In November the Secretary of Defense approved the formation of the Defense Ballistic Missile Committee and ordered organizational changes in the military departments to handle the ICBM and IRBM programs. At the same time he approved a program of two 1,500-mile intermediate range missiles subsequently named "Jupiter" and "Thor." The Jupiter was to be launchable either from land or sea. It was intended that Thor would be based upon experience already gained in the Atlas program, while Jupiter would be based on experience gained by the Redstone Arsenal team from the V–2 and Redstone missiles.

The Secretaries of Army, Navy and Air Force at once implemented the new organizational program.

The Air Force placed its ICBM and Thor programs under the already established Air Force Ballistic Missile Division initially called the WDD.

A joint management committee was established by the Army and Navy for the Jupiter program. The Navy created the Office of Special Projects and assigned to it responsibility for the technical development of the sea-based IRBM. As a corrolary to the Jupiter program, which employed a liquid propellant, the Navy also began studies of a solid propellant version to reduce shipboard logistical problems.

Five hundred fifteen million dollars of defense funds was reserved to carry out these programs. In December the Secretary of Defense presented to the President and his advisers the new organizational alinement and the long-range missile programs. The President then assigned the highest priority to these programs.

THE YEAR 1956

On January 20, in order to assure a common interchange of technical information, as well as provide competent guidance for all the programs, the Scientific Advisory Committee was transferred from the Air Force to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. On the same date this Committee presented certain recommendations to assure that the long-range ballistic missile programs would proceed at maximum speed. The office of a special assistant for guided missiles to Secretary of Defense was established, first with Dr. Murphree and later Mr. Holaday occupying this key position.

In February, the Army activated the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. B. Medaris.

In September, the Jupiter-C, a multistage test vehicle, was fired. It went 3,300 statute miles, rose to 680 statute miles, and reached a maximum velocity of 13,000 miles per hour. During the same period the Air Force X–17 reentry test vehicle flight tests clearly demonstrated that the reentry problem was solvable.

In October, the Scientific Advisory Committee recommended initiation of a new, smaller, solid-propellant IRBM with improved capability of being launched from a submarine.

In November, the Secretary of Defense reviewed service responsibilities for operational use of the IRBM. He assigned responsibility for operational deployment of land-based IRBM's to the Air Force and ship-based IRBM's to the Navy. Also in November the development of the Polaris (solid propellant) IRBM program (including six submarines) was approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Navy was authorized to terminate its participation in the Jupiter program.

The next month, following Navy withdrawal from the Jupiter program, separate Army and Navy Ballistic Missile Committees were established under the chairmanship of the respective Service Secretaries.

THE YEAR 1957

In August the estimated operational capability date for Atlas was changed from March 1959 to June 1959. In December an accelerated program of 9 squadrons of 10 missiles each was approved. The Titan, alternate to Atlas, program was reduced from 4 to 2 test missiles per month and the completion date for the first operational squadron was set back. During this period it was decided to discontinue the Navaho airplane-type missile project which had become obsolescent because of progress in the development of long-range ballistic missiles.

The President, in October, reaffirmed the highest national priority for both Jupiter and Thor systems to obtain an IRBM capability at the earliest practicable date and provide for continuance of both missiles until one proved successful. The Army was authorized in November to produce the Jupiter at a rate of five missiles per month. Four Jupiter 15-missile squadrons were to be established with the operational date of the first squadron to be December 1958.

Also to be operational in December 1958 was the first squadron of Thor, with 3 more 15-missile squadrons scheduled for a later date.

The decision was made to launch Polaris missiles from submarines only.

Nearly $1.4 billion was spent on ICBM and IRBM programs in fiscal year 1957.

THE YEAR 1958

Flight tests proved the performance of the Atlas guidance system and the integrity of the airframe. Among the successful test flights in the development series, one Atlas was placed in earth satellite orbit in December. Other flights demonstrated the operation radio-inertial guidance system.

A schedule was approved for four squadrons of Titan in hardened bases. Components of the missile system were delivered and a few of them tested.

Research and development of Minuteman were begun. Minuteman is to be a solid propellant, three-stage ICBM and will carry a nuclear warhead up to 5,500 nautical miles. It will be guided by a self-contained, all-inertial system.

Flight tests of Thor, Jupiter, and Atlas revealed a problem in the failure of certain components of the turbopump assembly used to pump propellants into the main engine. The difficulties were isolated and corrective modifications developed. Later flight tests verified success of the modifications.

The first Royal Air Force students entered training in the United States under U.S. Air Force instruction in May in accordance with government-to-government agreements for the RAF to man and command all Thor units in the United Kingdom. During the year, the Thor guidance system was improved, permitting an average impact accuracy better than that originally specified and by the last of the year Thor was meeting its production schedule with operational missiles being shipped to England for deployment.

The initial increment of the first Jupiter squadron was ready for deployment in December. Consideration was given to deploying them to Italy.

The President in November approved a nine-submarine Polaris program. The initial operational capability date of the first Polaris submarine was advanced to late 1960. Later it was again advanced to early 1960 with four more following at 3-month intervals.

Congress appropriated $90 million for the Minuteman program in excess of the amount in the fiscal year 1959 President's budget. This amount was applied against the fiscal year 1960 program (i.e., aprpoved for utilization beginning July 1, 1959).

Congress also appropriated $609 million over the President's budget for Polaris; the President released $309 million of this on December 23 for development and for conversion of a surface ship to a tender for submarines and for a sixth nuclear-powered ballistic missile launching submarine.

The total spent in fiscal year 1958 was more than $2 billion.

THE YEAR 1959

Flights of the operational prototype Atlas which began in April had little initial success and the planned date for achieving a limited operational capability was changed from June to September. Considerable effort was devoted to determining the causes of the malfunctions that resulted in the explosion of four out of five Atlas missiles launched before June 30 and how to correct them. Since June 30 causes of the malfunctions have been corrected and the first launch by the all-military team on September 9 at Vandenberg AFB was successful. A plan to improve the system's survivability and provide a faster reaction time was approved. Beginning with the third squadron, the complexes, each with three missiles and three launch positions, will be about 18 nautical miles apart and, to shorten missile launching time, all squadrons from the third on will have individual missile launchers. Beginning with the fifth squadron, each missile will be dispersed to a separate firing point.

Progress to date on the Titan resulted in approval of an increase in the number of squadrons from 4 to 11. Each squadron will have 10 missiles. The first six squadrons will be organized into three complexes, each with three launchers and the missiles will have radio-inertial guidance. The complexes will be about 18 nautical miles apart. In the 7th through the 11th squadrons, the nine launchers will be at least 18 miles apart and guidance will be all-inertial.

Prototype Minuteman missiles were fired from silo launchers, verifying the feasibility of launching Minuteman missiles from underground launchers of the silo type.

The total planned Thor force was reduced from nine squadrons to four, all deployed in England. In January it became evident that the construction, installation, checkout and modification effort in England would require more time and personnel than was originally planned. This caused about a 4-month delay in turning over the first squadron to the RAF. In June, RAF–U.S. Air Force representatives drafted preliminary procedures for declaring the U.S. squadrons satisfactorily operational in conformance with a governmental agreement.

The operational version of the ablating nose cone for Jupiter was flown on all missiles fired this year and has proved to be completely satisfactory. Two operational type nose cones were recovered with all their payloads in perfect condition. One of these carried biomedical experiments in support of National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs. A site for two Jupiter squadrons was selected in southern Italy. Each squadron of 15 missiles will be deployed in five sites, with three missiles at each, all launchers to be more than 11 nautical miles apart.

All major objectives of the Polaris program to date have been achieved. The launching system for the first Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington*, passed its tests. The launcher for the next submarine class entered development; it will accommodate the 1,200-mile missile as well as the 1,500-mile missile planned for 1962. The first Polaris submarine was launched in June and is being completed. The sixth submarine will have several improvements, one being a greater operating depth. On July 1 contracts were let for the seventh, eighth, and ninth submarines. The first submarine will probably become fully operational in late 1960 and the remainder will follow at 3-or-4-month intervals.

In 1959, Congress appropriated $85 million for Atlas and $87 million for Minuteman in excess of the amounts included in the fiscal year 1960 President's budget. These amounts were approved for utilization in the fiscal year 1960 programs (i.e., beginning July 1, 1959).

On June 24 the President released $300 million Polaris money (the remainder of the $609 million mentioned earlier) for obligation in fiscal year 1960 for the seventh, eighth, and ninth Polaris submarines.

These programs have been operating at a level of slightly under $3 billion annually over the past 18 months.

SUMMARY

Today and for the near future, our deterrent and retaliatory capabilities depend largely on the ability of current Air Force and Navy jet bombers to survive enemy attack on the ground and in the air and to deliver nuclear weapons. However, with passage of time, potential enemies' ability to destroy jet bombers on the ground and in the air may be improving faster than the jet jombers' ability to survive, thus weakening their deterrent qualities. Therefore, in 1955 we gave highest priorities to our IRBM and ICBM programs.

The Atlas, our first ICBM, started in 1946, canceled in 1949, begun again at low priority in 1951, accelerated in 1954, finally became operational in 1959. This missile is the beginning of the ballistic missile phase of deterrence. We can strike a large portion of the earth with 5,500 mile range Atlas missiles launched from this country. On the other hand, potential enemies have Atlas-type missiles also and our Atlas missiles are vulnerable to surprise attack by them. Therefore, we are hardening and dispersing our newer Atlas launching sites and developing other ICBM's, Titan and Minuteman, which will be in even harder sites. Titan was begun in 1955 as a backup in case Atlas failed. Minuteman, a smaller, solid-propellant, 3-stage rocket was begun in 1958. These newer missiles, widely dispersed, will be capable of launching on shorter notice, so that some of them could be launched before enemy missiles destroy the sites, assuming we got sufficient warning.

The least vulnerable deterrent seems to be our Polaris-launching submarines, because they are hard to find. Polaris, begun in late 1956, will be operational late in 1960 with the availability of the first submarine.

Thor and Jupiter were approved in late 1955 and Thors were deployed in about 3 years from the development initiation date. These land-based IRBM's supplement the deterrence of ICBM's and Polaris.

From an expenditure of one-half million dollars in fiscal year 1951, programs for IRBM's and ICBM's will reach almost $3 billion in the current fiscal year. Missile programs in the research stage quickly overtake and obsolete those in production. Therefore programs are designed so as to meet current needs without stockpiling missiles that will soon be outdated. Furthermore our skilled research and development manpower is being taxed to the fullest on existing and scheduled missile programs. Both because of the evolutionary stages of missile development and the utilization of technical manpower, it is unfeasible and uneconomical to pour more money and men into "crash programs" that might disrupt the sound and orderly missiles program now intended to give the United States full deterrent power.

Department of Defense obligational program for missile systems,[1] fiscal years 1946–60

[Millions of dollars]

	IR/ICBM programs	Other surface-to-surface missile programs	All other missile programs	Grand total, all missile programs
Fiscal year 1946 and prior	(2)	19	51	70
Fiscal year 1947	(2)	20	38	58
Fiscal year 1948	(2)	36	45	81
Fiscal year 1949	(2)	45	53	98
Fiscal year 1950	(2)	65	69	134
Fiscal year 1951	0.5	185	598	784
Fiscal year 1952	.8	239	818	1,058
Fiscal year 1953	3.0	403	760	1,166
Fiscal year 1954	14.0	336	717	1,067
Fiscal year 1955	161.0	398	911	1,470
Fiscal year 1956	515.0	387	1,368	2,270
Fiscal year 1957	1,365.0	603	2,502	4,470
Fiscal year 1958	2,077.0	639	2,391	5,107
Fiscal year 1959	2,959.0	685	3,269	6,913
Fiscal year 1960	2,952.0	509	3,173	6,634

[1] Program data reflected in this table cover the developmental and capital costs involved in missile programs, i.e., the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

[2] Excludes $2.3 million programed in fiscal year 1946–49 for the Air Force MX–774 ballistic missile research program which was a precursor to the Atlas ICBM.

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to minor revision due to program adjustments.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, several evenings ago, a sizable number of Members of Congress, other Government leaders, and private citizens gathered together to honor a most distinguished and illustrious citizen of the State of Rhode Island. The honored guest was, of course, our great colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. In the course of the program, several eloquent—though all too brief—addresses were delivered by a number of the Senator's colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Among them were the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]; the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY; and Representative AIME J. FORAND.

All of us who heard these fine remarks were greatly impressed, and in order that the Members of the Senate who were not present may have the opportunity to read them, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR GREEN, THE RHODE ISLAND CITIZEN

(Remarks of U.S. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE at testimonial dinner given by Women's National Democratic Club for U.S. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, January 26, 1960)

It is an honor for all of us to join in tribute to a great American and a good friend—the senior U.S. Senator from Rhode Island—my colleague, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

It is my privilege to touch upon his life before he entered the Senate in 1937. It is the chapter of his indelible Democratic impress upon the Rhode Island scene.

How does one cover some 70 years in the 7 minutes at his disposal? Does he leap back 92 years to the birthday of "Mr. Democrat" on October 2, 1867? I think not. That would only serve to emphasize the length of life. The true dimensions of a man's career are the depth of his character and the loftiness of his principles.

On the other hand, I might place stress on young GREEN'S student days at Brown University—at Bonn—and at Harvard Law. And then again the test of a man is not how he is educated, but how he uses that education. Our guest of honor's learning was to be forever at the people's service.

His life-long prowess in athletics I shall not detail—his excellence in tennis wrestling, swimming—and all the other manly arts in which he engaged. These merely provided a sound body for a sound mind.

Mention could be made of his personal and family wealth—the banks he founded—the businesses he fostered—the material resources and the social position that was his. In Rhode Island, at the turn of the century, it was almost a heresy for a man of his heritage to espouse the Democratic cause. But this, our THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN did.

I will not say that the Democratic cause of that day was not popular. It was just a case of not being permitted. The political fortunes of Rhode Island at that hour were in control of a very special few—and they were not Democrats.

They were not even the elected officials—but they did dictate to elected officials—they determined legislation—they designated judges and they distributed favors. To them a Governor was only the puppet of the

bosses who created him. In the cold calculations of these men and in their bold contrivance of power they believed that they would be secure for a century. Democrats just did not win. The one mistake they made—they miscalculated THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

After 30 years, certainly this is being said without recrimination. I speak of it only so that you who may be unfamiliar with the Rhode Island political history may know something of the adverse atmosphere that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN challenged and the adversity against which he rose to greatness.

I have said that the true dimensions of a man's career are in the depth of his character and the loftiness of his principles. In character and in principle THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN had only one goal—perfection in public service.

He placed character above opportunism and he championed the Democratic cause in a Republican State—and brought to it prestige and purpose and a persistency that would not accept defeat.

At 45 years of age he led the fight for Governor—and lost. He tried again at 61—and lost again. He fought again at 63—and was again defeated. But in all this he was paving the way for victory at the age of 65—and at a time when most men are thinking of retirement, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN had only stepped across the threshold into a life of public service.

I come now with special pleasure to what I term a great hour of decision in the life of our friend. I speak of it intimately because I was there.

The time is 25 years ago—the place is the statehouse at Providence, R.I. I have just been sworn in to my first day of public service in the general assembly of my native State.

Governor GREEN has been elected to office for the second time. And now—on this day and for the first time—the Democrats are in control of both houses of the general assembly. The air is electric with sweeping changes in the making. Our friend, Governor GREEN, is at the helm. The Democratic Party has the votes. It can either set up the dynasty or direct the destiny. But there would never be any doubt about what Governor GREEN would do.

He put character above political power—and gave the State government back to the people. He gave back their government, their courts, and their Governor's office. He made the Office of Governor responsible and respected.

To the people's conscience he gave the understanding care of our neglected State institutions. He accepted the moral and physical guardianship of the unfortunate, the dependent, the aged, and the ill.

From that day forward, Rhode Island has been able to hold its head high as a little State with a big heart. That is a day that Rhode Island will never forget. It is an hour that I shall always remember.

That was my first real contact with the inspiring leadership of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. On that day, all Democrats were lifted by the inspiration of his courage and his character.

In all the intervening years, that lesson of his decision, his decency, and his dignity has never left us. In all the years that I have worked under him, and beside him, he has been my idol of intellectual honesty, my ideal of dedicated service to the people.

No period in the life of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN can be separated from the history of Brown University. It has always been close to his home—and always close to his heart. It has been mutual love between alma mater and loyal son—an alumnus now for 73 years.

Brown University has an honor roll of great sons. To mention a few—John Hay in statesmanship, Charles Evans Hughes in judiciary, and John D. Rockefeller in human philanthropy.

To these let me add THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, the citizen of the century—his own century of years, our own century of his great and good service.

And in this century's document of democracy, to the decisiveness of Harry Truman, to the wisdom of Woodrow Wilson, and to the record of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, let me add our own illustrious Rhode Island citizen, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, the contemporary of them all and the colleague of them all in building an America first in pride and first in power.

TOAST TO SENATOR GREEN BY THE HONORABLE J. W. FULBRIGHT

I ask you to join me in a toast to a great American.

What a life his has been.

And what tremendous satisfaction he must enjoy in looking back over his years as Governor, as Senator, and as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

No breath of criticism has ever touched him for he is the soul of honor and integrity.

I know I speak for everyone here in wishing him well in the years ahead. And I know that I speak for everyone here in expressing the hope that he will permit us to celebrate his 100th birthday. We may not all be here but I am sure he will be; and what's more, he will probably walk down from Rhode Island for the occasion.

I raise my glass to the chairman emeritus, to the senior Senator from Rhode Island—that great and gracious gentleman, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1960

Senator GREEN's eminent success in the field of foreign relations is undoubtedly based on a combination of factors, principal of which is a deep and genuine love of his fellow man coupled with what might be called an innate natural curiosity. This combination of factors has permitted him to get to know people—people of all nations and at all levels. In the Senator's mind the cementing of human relations has ever been the best possible hope for world peace and he has devoted much of his energy toward that end.

I believe that the world owes a considerable debt to Senator GREEN. Everything he has done has been done to bring the peoples of the world more closely together, which of itself adds to the strength of America. In our tribute to the Senator this evening, we pay our respects to a great American who has laid the basic framework for a large number of policies which have helped bring America to a position of preeminence in the world.

A former Speaker of the House, Champ Clark, once aptly commented that some public men are bigger than their reputations, some smaller than their reputations, and some equal to their reputations. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure you will all agree that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is one of those rare public men who are bigger than their reputations. He has enriched the times in which he has lived and all of us with whom he associated. He leaves a political heritage second to none in the annals of American Government.

To him I wish the blessings of continued health and many years in which to enjoy the rewards that God has in store for him.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN AIME J. FORAND AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN BY THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1960

I am most thankful to the committee in charge for giving me this opportunity to participate in this tribute to Senator GREEN, whom I have known for many years and have had the pleasure to serve with for more than a quarter of a century.

Like you, I respect him and admire him. I consider it a great privilege to call him my friend.

When I was invited to speak on the subject "Senator GREEN, the World Traveler," I asked myself the question: Why does he travel so much? And believe it or not, I found the answer in the title of a television show—"Youth Wants To Know."

True, Senator GREEN gets a great deal of pleasure out of his travels, but Senator GREEN wants to know, and from all reports, he gets information and facts in all his travels. This has served him in good stead and has meant much to our country, as was so eloquently stated a few days ago by Senator FULBRIGHT when he said, "Senator GREEN has brought to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee the wisdom which comes only from long experience, the knowledge which comes only from personal acquaintance with most of the world's statesmen and the courage of his convictions."

Senator GREEN has traveled more, I believe, than any other Member of Congress. But don't let anyone get the idea that his travels date back only to the time he entered Congress. The fact is he started to travel before I was born.

It was way back in 1893, shortly after he left the Universities of Bonn and Berlin that he started his travels.

Since then he has made several trips around the world. To name countries he has not visited would be much easier than to list those he did visit.

He has been to Europe many, many times. He has been to Jamaica, England, Ireland, the Orient, the Scandinavian countries, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Greece, France, Nova Scotia, Cuba, Mexico, Canada, South and Central America, Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, Australia, Switzerland, Venezuela, Brazil, Africa, and you name it, he's been there.

Senator GREEN prefers to travel by air. He loves to fly but when he can't fly that does not stop him. He'll use any means of travel—train, horseback or camelback, steamboat or rowboat, canoe or what have you.

And he is no slouch in his travels on foot, particularly on the dance floor.

I recall during his last election campaign, when his opponent's chief argument was that Senator GREEN was too old—he was then 87—Senator GREEN attended a Polish dinner. Sitting across the table was a pretty teenage Polish girl. Suddenly there was Senator GREEN and this pretty girl dancing a polka. After the dance the Senator asked, "Am I too old?"

During his travels he knows how to mix business and pleasure. Proof of this is found in the official reports he files and in the stories his fellow travelers tell.

I shall not dwell on the official reports. They speak for themselves. But I like to repeat what has been told to me by some who traveled with him. Nearly all have said they enjoy traveling with Senator GREEN, but nearly everyone has the same complaint. He drives too hard. He exhausts them.

I believe it was Senator WILEY who reported that he got up early one morning to go out to visit something he had missed the day before and as he was leaving the hotel at 7 o'clock in the morning he met Senator GREEN who was returning from a similar venture. He, too, had missed something but had gotten up earlier and had already accomplished his misison at the time Senator WILEY was starting on his.

Senator SPARKMAN likes to tell of something that happened in 1951 when he and

Senator GREEN were in Greece with seven other Senators, all much younger than Senator GREEN.

After lunch, at a yacht club in Athens, a diplomat advised the group that it being such a hot day, they should rest for a while and then late in the afternoon they could go to the Acropolis. Most of the group took the advice, but not Senator GREEN. He had places to go and he went.

On his return to the city from the club, the road led them along a beautiful stretch of water, so Senator GREEN stopped and took a swim. Then he visited some of the excavations of ancient ruins.

The young Foreign Service officer who accompanied him told the other Senators that Senator GREEN had almost worked him to death.

Late in the afternoon his colleagues went on the trip to the Acropolis. As they were going up to it they heard someone climbing behind them and as they looked back there was Senator GREEN climbing rapidly to catch up to them, and several steps behind him, was the young Foreign Service officer, with his tongue virtually hanging out.

I'd love to tell you more about this wonderful man but time will not permit so let me say, simply, Senator GREEN we love you, we respect you, and we admire you. God bless you.

THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in 1956 the Congress passed and the President approved a Federal Highway Act which was of the largest dimensions in the field of highway construction ever attempted by this or any other nation.

To our traditional ABC program was added a 40,000-mile interstate highway network which was to be authorized by 1969 and completed by 1972. The interstate network was estimated to cost the Federal Government $25 billion, plus $12 billion for the ABC roads making a total of $37 billion. Prime considerations in the justification of this new program were traffic safety and defense.

This act replaced the traditional method of financing by direct appropriation to a highway trust fund, into which were deposited certain existing excise taxes and some new increased excise taxes levied on highway users.

Not all of the highway user taxes were dedicated to the fund. It is interesting to note that over $1½ billion a year is still collected directly from highway users and put in the general fund.

In the light of this fact it is pertinent to examine what has happened since 1956. The trust fund is short of money. Last year, in order to meet this problem, the administration eyed an increase in highway user taxes—to be exact, a 1½-cent increase in the Federal tax on gas for 5 years. This would have brought the Federal tax to 4½ cents on every gallon of gas or diesel fuel.

The popular attitude seems to be to blame the current road program crisis upon the Congress for accelerating the highway program under the 1958 act to meet the recession. Congress did authorize an additional $515 million for the ABC system, plus $500 million for the ABC system, and no provision was then made for additional funds. In 1958 the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, told the Senate Public Works Committee, as can be found on page 68 of the hearings:

I see no need for additional revenue legislation.

In fact, he was at that point asking on behalf of the President for exclusion from the trust fund of $32 million of the tax which is derived from aircraft use.

He was also asking that forest highways and public land highways authorization be charged to the trust fund, heaping another $32-odd million in annual costs upon the fund. Additionally another $4 million in alleged Treasury and Labor Department costs were to be paid out of the trust fund. In sum, the trust fund was to be depleted by $68 million annually, or over $1 billion over the life of the highway program.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that when the 1956 act was set up $2,336 million were in effect taken from the trust fund. Three hundred and seventy-eight million dollars in highway user taxes was put in the general fund—and for what reason? The Senate report on the 1956 bill says that this was to help balance the year 1957 budget.

I call to the attention of my colleagues that this was one of the few Eisenhower budgets that was balanced; a $1.5 billion surplus developed that year.

The 1956 act also included as a charge against the trust fund the following estimated expenditures from prior authorizations of the year 1954 and prior acts.

	ABC	Interstate
1957	$690,000,000	$110,000,000
1958	450,000,000	150,000,000
1959	250,000,000	43,000,000
1960	140,000,000	
1961	75,000,000	
1962	50,000,000	
Total	1,655,000,000	303,000,000
Grand total	1,958,000,000	

Thus the trust fund was shorted in funds and saddled with costs to the tune of $2,336 million. These are moneys which, in my judgment, should be repaid to the trust fund on an orderly basis by the general fund.

It is also a fact that over $1.5 billion annually of the highway user taxes still go into the general fund, which more than offsets the $68 million in alleged taxes or charges cited in 1958 by the administration for impact upon the trust fund.

Under the circumstances, I do not believe Congress should enact further taxes to augment the trust fund.

Priority consideration should be given instead to taking appropriate portions of existing highway user taxes and dedicating them to the trust fund in amounts needed to permit the highway program to go forward at least at the authorization levels outlined by the 1956 act. I have in mind an ABC authorization of $950 million for 1962 and $975 million for 1963 with an interstate authorization of $2.2 billion for these 2 years. This will maintain the program on schedule in terms of the 1956 act. Additional revenues approaching $400 million for these years will be needed to meet this goal.

I believe it is incumbent on the Eisenhower administration, which is now in its last year, to cooperate with the Congress in restoring to the trust fund the funds which have been diverted to benefit the general fund and this administration. Restoring these funds to highways would be in accord with the pay-as-you-go principle so often enunciated by the President. The highway program could indeed finance its own way if allowed to operate on the income intended to accumulate in the trust fund.

We in the Congress can be proud of the effort we have made to help the President achieve balanced budgets. Due to the efforts of our Committees on Appropriations and all of the Members of both the House and Senate, Congress has cut almost $12½ billion from the administration's budgets since fiscal year 1954. We shall make a proportionate contribution toward fiscal responsibility again this year. The savings we have achieved in the general budget form another sound reason for making available to the trust fund the revenue properly due it.

THE STUDENT LOYALTY OATH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, included in the National Defense Education Act, which the Congress passed during the last session, is a loyalty oath. The act requires that the students who receive the benefits of that act take an oath of loyalty to the United States, and declare that they do not believe in and are not members of and do not support any organization believing in or teaching the overthrow of the United States by force, violence, or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, a small group of college presidents do not like that requirement, and have put pressure upon the Senate and House of Representatives to have it removed from the act.

Therefore, I was very much interested to read in a newspaper article of last week that some of the alumni of Harvard University have suggested that the students themselves vote as to whether they want that requirement retained in the act.

The article reads in part as follows:

It seems incredible that the president of Harvard could be so inconsistent, discriminatory, dogmatic, and smug in denying to worthy students the opportunity to borrow Federal funds simply because a negative affidavit of allegiance to the United States is required.

The article, which appears over the signatures of certain of the alumni who are opposed to that action of the president of the university, is of such importance at the moment, because I feel certain that within the coming days this body will be asked to take action again on the National Defense Education Act, that I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks. I may add, in sounding a slight note of humor, that in examining some of the material I have on Arizona history the other day, I discovered that Gen. John C. Fremont was required to take an identical

oath of allegiance before he was sworn in as Governor of Arizona. So I felt that what was good for General Fremont might be good for some of our students.

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

ASK HARVARD LET STUDENTS DECIDE—EIGHT ALUMNI DECLARE THEMSELVES ON OATH OF LOYALTY

BOSTON.—Eight members of the alumni of Harvard University have issued a public appeal to their alma mater asking the students on Government grants be permitted to decide whether or not they are willing to take the required oath of loyalty to the United States.

The action of the president of Harvard, Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, in denying to students the opportunity to get public aid because Dr. Pusey disapproves of the oath is strongly condemned. The text of the statement follows:

"It seems incredible that the president of Harvard could be so inconsistent, discriminatory, dogmatic and smug in denying to worthy students the opportunity to borrow Federal funds simply because a 'negative' affidavit of allegiance to the United States is required.

"The National Defense Education Act requires two things: (1) an affirmative oath of allegiance to the United States and (2) an affidavit that the applicant does not believe in, is not a member of and does not support any organization believing in or teaching the overthrow of the United States by force, violence or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

"Obviously, the one is the corollary of the other. The negative affidavit is simply the logical complement to the positive oath of allegiance.

"Dr. Pusey and certain other educators who agree with him apparently do not object to the oath of allegiance requirement, although many of them in the 1930's strenuously objected to the law now on the books requiring a teacher to take such an oath of allegiance. [Mass. Gen. Laws (Ter. Ed.) c. 71, s. 30A.]

"They do not now dare to oppose the oath of allegiance in the Federal education law, because to do so would be to deny to college students the privilege of taking the oath of allegiance which is granted to lawyers, teachers, judges, Senators, Congressmen, servicemen, the President of the United States, and, yes, the Boy Scouts.

"As a matter of fact, the negative affidavit is much less broad in scope than the affirmative oath. For example, an alien might truthfully declare that he does not believe in the violent or illegal overthrow of the U.S. Government and still be justified in declining to take the oath of allegiance because he feels no affirmative loyalty to the United States, and indeed owes none.

"If the educators object to the negative affidavit on the ground of vagueness, and not for the patriotic and security reasons behind it, perhaps the law should be changed. Until that is done, however, why deprive worthy students of the right to the Federal funds simply because certain educators disagree with Congress? Actually, the negative affidavit seems most explicit.

HARVARD'S POLICY

"It is difficult to determine from Dr. Pusey's statement whether Harvard's policy was enunciated as a matter of principle, or simply because Harvard feels that the additional affidavit requirement in the law is superfluous or ineffectual. If the latter, why all the fuss and furor over something that would seem to be immaterial; why deprive deserving students of funds simply because Harvard considers the affidavit requirement useless? If, however, Harvard's new policy is based upon principle, why did Harvard compromise its principle last year by permitting its students to receive Federal moneys when the same oath of allegiance and affidavit were then required? Dr. Pusey's belief last year that the law would be changed is a poor rationalization for a compromise of principle.

"Dr. Pusey is disturbed that the National Defense Education Act discriminates against a few students who have conscientious objections to declaring allegiance to the United States. But what about Harvard's new policy? It clearly discriminates against the host of students who need money for education and who would be proud, as loyal Americans, to sign an oath of allegiance or a negative affidavit, no matter how broadly worded, at any time and whether or not Federal funds are involved.

"President Pusey and some other college presidents decry the affidavit requirement in the Federal law as an 'affront to academic freedom of belief and conscience.' Again, what about Harvard's new policy? It denies to each needy student at Harvard and elsewhere that very freedom to make up his own mind as to whether he will or will not declare allegiance to the United States in the form asked. Harvard itself is dictating conscience to its own students, thereby depriving them of the right to exercise and express their own beliefs and conscience.

"Dr. Pusey adverts to the right of every citizen to urge change in the law. Why, then, doesn't Harvard confine its efforts in that direction instead of acting like the boy who picks up his marbles and goes home because the other boys won't play the game his way?

"The thing that worries us most about the whole affair is the negative attitude adopted by so many of our institutions of higher learning. Instead of advancing the patriotism that is fostered in grammar school and high school, the presidents and many professors of certain of our colleges and universities actually ridicule any manifestation of loyalty to our country.

"For instance, Mark DeWolfe Howe, constitutional law professor at Harvard Law School, in a recent speech, with the sarcasm typical of ivory tower savants, accused Congress of inserting the affidavit requirement in the Federal education law 'in a burst of happy patriotism.'

"Since when has it become plebian or unsophisticated or 'old hat' to express one's patriotism?

"In this year 1959, when, on the one hand we have gang wars among our own juveniles and a real threat of war from abroad, it is sickening to hear certain of our college educators encourage youth to thumb their noses at any law they do not like; to act like spoiled children; and to laugh at the very burst of patriotism that brought this country through 183 years of freedom."

The letter is signed by Vernon D. Hitchins, Edmund M. Murray, Henry Swaebe, D.M.D., Harris A. Reynolds, Arthur J. McLaughlin, Jason A. Aisner, Robert C. Cochrane, Jr., Edward Hyde Earle.

A CRITICAL LOOK AT TRENDS IN TODAY'S GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY CHIEF JUSTICE M. T. PHELPS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona, the Hon. M. T. Phelps, has served on the Supreme Court of Arizona since 1949, and is now in his second term as chief justice. He received his law degree from Vanderbilt University, at Nashville, Tenn. He practiced law in Phoenix from 1913 to 1923, and then was on the bench of the superior court until his elevation to our State's highest tribunal.

Mr. President, although Judge Phelps is not a member of the political party to which I belong, he is, in my opinion, one of the outstanding citizens of this country. He has great affection for the Constitution and for the historic American concept of freedom of the individual.

In the December 28, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, there appeared an article, written by Judge Phelps, entitled "From a State Chief Justice—A Critical Look at Trends in Today's Government." I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

FROM A STATE CHIEF JUSTICE—A CRITICAL LOOK AT TRENDS IN TODAY'S GOVERNMENT

(By M.T. Phelps, chief justice, Supreme Court of Arizona)

The Federal Constitution provided the foundation for the best form of government ever conceived by the mind of man.

Its outstanding characteristic was that it created a government of limited powers; that it should have only such powers as were expressly, or by necessary implication, delegated to it by the provisions of the Constitution; that all powers not so delegated to it nor prohibited to the States by it were reserved to the States respectively or to the people. It was designed to be a government of laws, and that those whom we were obliged to trust in its administration were to be bound by its provisions to function within their constitutional limitations.

These limitations were observed for 125 years, and, as a result thereof, we became the most powerful nation on earth, and, by reason of our natural resources and the genius of our people, we became the most prosperous, and we are unquestionably the most advanced nation today in the field of the applied sciences. We were beginning to enter the field of mass production, not only of the necessities of life but of the luxuries as well.

It was at about that period that the generation to which I belong was entering upon the stage of action endowed with the richest heritage of any generation in history, and, oh, how woefully we have failed in the execution of the trust reposed in us.

At that time our individual liberties under the protective shield of the Constitution were yet intact. We then had the right to own property, real and personal, and to use it as we desired so long as we did not interfere with the rights of others. And we had the right to contract to sell it to whomsoever we pleased without let or hindrance from any source. Or we had the right to refuse to sell to persons to whom we did not wish to sell.

Today we are forbidden to use our real property as is our constitutional right, and we are denied the right to refuse to sell to persons to whom we do not desire to sell. We then had the right to keep it as against the wishes, plans or schemes of any group or groups of persons as long as we lived. Today, under the Urban Renewal Act initiated by the United States Congress, if implemented by State or local law, we can be forced to sell our homes against our wishes, to satisfy the aesthetic tastes of some city-planning commission.

There is now a nationwide movement being vigorously advocated by 27 liberal organizations to enact in every State in the union a law that carries the innocent title of a "fair housing" law which makes it a crime punishable by both a fine and im-

prisonment for a property owner, when approached by a real estate agent or other person to purchase his property, for the owner to inquire as to the color or race of the prospective purchaser.

This law has been enacted already in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Colorado and Oregon. It was introduced in 13 States last year and would have passed the Rhode Island Legislature but for the vigorous opposition of a great constitutional lawyer in Providence. Watch for it here at the next session of the legislature.

If you advertise an apartment in your home or apartment house, such an inquiry as above mentioned will subject you to both fine and imprisonment if the bill passes.

At that time we had the right to will our property to whomsoever we pleased without the slightest fear that, a hundred years after our death and the valid judgment of a court distributing it to the beneficiaries of our bounty, some court would decree such will to be void because its provisions did not conform with their more modern view of justice. Sadly, that is no longer true—the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 set aside a will executed in 1835 and named beneficiaries thereof persons expressly excluded by the terms of the will.

ENTRY "WITHOUT A SEARCH WARRANT"

At that time our home was our castle, and no one under the provisions of the Constitution could enter it against our wishes without a search warrant, but the Supreme Court of the United States recently held that a city health inspector could enter the home of a citizen of Baltimore without a search warrant to ascertain its sanitary condition.

At that time we were free as individuals if engaged in farming to grow whatever crops upon our own soil our judgment dictated to be for our best interest. No Government agent snooped around armed with the purported authority of Congress to tell us how many acres we could plant to corn, cotton, wheat, rice or tobacco and to then and there impose a fine upon us if he discovered we had exceeded the acreage prescribed in the act which we could grow upon a farm in our class. We then had the right to due process of law in a court of justice and to produce evidence in our defense before the fine was fixed.

No authority was then vested in the Secretary of Labor to tell a cottongrower who procured his laborers through a U.S. employment agency the minimum wage he was required to pay his cottonpickers measured by the highest wage paid by any farmer in the area for the same kind of work, regardless of the difference in the circumstances of the parties or the quality of the cotton to be picked.

Nor was the Secretary of Labor vested with power to close labor camps because of unsanitary conditions, as was done recently in Santa Clara County, Calif., according to the Arizona Republic of September 17 of this year. Public health and public morals were a matter of local concern, and such action was taken only after a hearing before a proper tribunal and judgment pronounced after hearing.

The action of the Secretary of Labor, whether justified or not, in either case is the action of a government of men and not a government of laws. It was the act of a dictator. If the Secretary of Labor can do what he is reputed to have done; if Congress can enact a law of that kind, then Congress can authorize the Secretary or other public official to close your home and forbid your occupation of it upon any specious ground it may assign as the reason therefor.

At that time a local contractor in Phoenix or elsewhere engaged in the installation of plumbing or in building houses was not subject to regulation by the Federal Government upon the ground that he was engaged in interstate commerce or a business affecting interstate commerce because some of the materials used by him came from without the borders of the State.

At that time State courts determined whether they did or did not have jurisdiction to determine the legal rights of parties to a contract executed in the State for the performance of work within the State. In fact, the right of the State courts to determine their own jurisdiction had never been questioned under such circumstances.

But today, if it involves a contract between such contractor and a labor union and an unfair labor practice is charged, whether true or not, and often whether there is even a semblance of interstate commerce involved, the matter must be referred to the National Labor Relations Board, and, even though it refuses to entertain jurisdiction under the ruling of the Supreme Court, before a State court in the exercise of the sovereign rights of the people may assume jurisdiction it must petition such Federal Administrative Board for permission to do so.

Can you think of anything more out of harmony with the 10th amendment to the Federal Constitution which reserved to the States or to the people all powers not delegated to the Federal Government?

At that time window washers and janitors were not engaged in interstate commerce or a business affecting interstate commerce and, therefore, were not subject to regulation by the Federal Government merely because they worked in a building where there happened to be a tenant who was engaged in interstate commerce. This is no longer true. They must now obey the ipse dixit of Federal regulatory bodies.

At that time we were allowed to choose our associates in accordance with long-established customs of all enlightened peoples. This was considered by them to be conducive to the welfare of society. Today the U.S. Supreme Court decrees with whom we shall associate—not only in our schools but also in our neighborhoods—by declaring null and void all restrictions in deeds of conveyance relating to race or color. This is true notwithstanding the fact that it is the use to which we may put that which we own that constitutes property, rather than the ownership thereof. Ownership of either realty or personalty without the right to use it is not property nor a property right. One never knows if he belongs to the 400 until that Court prescribes his niche in society.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

At that time the Federal Government was not engaged in business in competition with private enterprise. Today, it is reputed to be financing approximately 700 big corporations split up into about 3,000 companies, all of which are tax free and actively competing with private enterprise. This includes TVA, its fertilizer plants, etc. The reputed value of these enterprises is over $50 billion, which, if privately owned and subject to taxation, would lighten our taxload by millions of dollars.

At that time there were no urban-renewal projects, to which I have heretofore referred, costing the taxpayers millions of dollars annually and which, up to date, have cost the taxpayers $344,300,000. This is socialism in action in our country, just as the ownership of over $50 billion of industrial plants by the Government is socialism at work.

At that time, as above stated, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government were functioning within constitutional limitations, and the respective States of the Union were in exclusive control of matters then considered as purely local in character, including their free system of education, agricultural pursuits, etc. Each State prosecuted without question from any source all crimes committed within its borders in violation of its statutes. Today we must surrender this sovereign right to the Federal Government if it has a law on the same subject, on the ground that it has preempted the field.

We may not now preserve the morals of our people. Within the past 3 months the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeals of New York which held that a certain book, "Lady Chatterley's Lover," was detrimental to the morals of the citizens of New York and should be suppressed. The book winked at adultery in certain cases, according to the decision. The Supreme Court had a different concept of what constituted immorality and reversed the New York Supreme Court decision, forcing the citizens of New York to accept the book whether they liked it or not.

The first outright defection from the principles embodied in the Constitution and first 10 amendments as adopted was the adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution in 1913 providing for a tax on incomes from all sources. That amendment placed no limitations whatever upon the amount of taxes the Government could levy and collect in proportion to one's personal income. All taxes previously provided for were limited by the Constitution.

We were induced by proponents of a new and strange philosophy to sow the wind, and we are now reaping the whirlwind which is rapidly leading us into national bankruptcy. It is the source of all funds for foreign aid, farm subsidies, Federal aid to public schools, and the 500 to 700 million dollars assigned to the President for emergency use to correct the economic imbalance between the United States and the backward nations of the world.

When the income tax amendment is repealed, these frills, this waste, will go, too, and a lot of bureaucrats will cease to dictate the policies of our Government. There will be sufficient funds to adequately finance the Federal Government if waste and intermeddling in nongovernmental functions is eliminated.

FOREIGN AID—WILLFULLY WASTED

Engaging in business in competition with private enterprise, foreign aid, farm subsidies, Federal aid to public schools is wholly unconstitutional. The funds used in foreign aid are willfully wasted and, if properly investigated, would amount to a national scandal. Yet Mr. Fulbright, head of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate, makes the statement in the September 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report that the way to win the cold war is to spend more money. He urges the President to increase spending for public schools, for weapons of defense, for airbases around the world, for foreign aid and civil defense. He dismissed as nonsense the idea that the Nation cannot afford more spending.

This is a sample of the quality of statesmanship at the head of our Nation today. With a national debt of approximately $290 billion, as against approximately $16 billion in 1928; with our national budget for 1959 at $77 billion, leaving an estimated deficit of $12 billion for this year, as against approximately a billion-dollar budget in 1912 and 1913, for the chairman of the Foreign Aid Committee of the U.S. Senate to make a statement like that for publication is an effrontery. It is more than that—it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Our dollar is worth 47 cents plus today; our gold reserve at Fort Knox is rapidly shrinking, with less than $20 billion left. There is outstanding against this reserve foreign obligations, according to recent reports of $12 billion which is payable in gold on demand. If demand is made, our gold reserve will drop to less than $8 billion and the American dollar will have no value among the nations of the earth, and its purchasing

power will be nil at home. Legally, we are not on the gold standard, but watch the value of the dollar skid when the gold at Fort Knox is shipped to Europe.

We are carrying out to the letter the Marx plan as set forth in his "Manifesto."

DANGER IN THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

It is later than we think. Mr. Khrushchev's visit just recently is significant—he sought disarmament. This was predicted years ago, and it was said the American people would be easily persuaded to disarm. With Khrushchev's record, would you trust him? I certainly would not, President Eisenhower's views to the contrary notwithstanding.

But the frightening aspect of this move by Khrushchev is that we have surrendered to the United Nations the power to enter into a treaty with other nations to disarm and, only last week, the United Nations made it known through the press that it was glad the Big Four were considering the discussion of disarmament, but their conclusion, they said, whatever it might be, would be treated as advisory only and the commission set up in the United Nations would make the final decision in the matter. With a pro-Communist organization to decide these matters, what can we expect from the United Nations?

You recently read of their present negotiations to socialize South American nations, which, if it takes place, will so strangle the economy of this Nation that we cannot long endure even if we were not cursed with other ills that are gradually but surely leading us into a dictatorship and eventually into world government. On October 26 Mr. Lodge joined with a Russian representative to present to the United Nations a resolution favoring disarmament.

I am making a study of the Charter of the United Nations in an attempt to analyze and interpret its meaning and, although it contains no limitations upon the power of the United Nations and apparently intended to conceal more than it reveals, I consider it to be the result of a communistic conspiracy more dangerous to our national security than Soviet Russia is today, although I am not discounting the dangers Russia presents to our freedom.

I sincerely believe that it was extremely unwise to invite Khrushchev to the United States. He will translate into falsehood everything we said or did in every instance and his people will have a worse impression of us than they now have.

His insincerity in proclaiming he favors peace is clearly apparent from the action of the Russian lords jamming the Voice of America to the people of Russia on all reports from America concerning his visit here except the occurrence upon his arrival. He has recently announced he will aid China in recovering Formosa. His henchmen have treated members of our Embassy with total disrespect and he is now fostering Chinese invasion of Tibet and Laos.

The worst effect of his visit is the loss of confidence of those already enslaved by Russia and who would be our strongest support in the event of a shooting war with Russia.

FEDERAL ELECTION REFEREES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, now that it has been established beyond question that the Attorney General of the United States modeled his Federal election referee bill after one of the infamous Reconstruction Acts, I think the American people are entitled to ask Mr. Rogers, "Why?"

It is interesting to note that this same Attorney General Rogers has preached, both before and since assuming the office he now holds, about congested dockets in the Federal courts and the need for more Federal judges to cope with the situation. It is difficult to understand why, if the dockets of our Federal courts are as congested as Mr. Rogers contends he would want to increase the burden by forcing Federal courts to assume receivership of State and local election machinery.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that the congestion is not so great as Mr. Rogers would have us believe, but, rather, that he wants to see judges recommended by him put on the Federal benches of the land to administer such a law?

And, Mr. President, since most of the so-called congestion in Federal courts apparently exists in the large cities of the North, is it not possible that Mr. Rogers wants election referees appointed by Federal judges recommended by him to assure that the closely divided vote in pivotal metropolitan areas goes to the Republicans rather than to the Democrats?

Could it be, Mr. President, that the Attorney General of the United States is looking at this scheme through the eyes of a potential candidate for Vice President?

Could it be, Mr. President, that the Attorney General of the United States is laying the groundwork for a revival of "Davenportism" on a national scale, with himself both appointing the judges who name the election referees and then prosecuting before those same judges the cases their referees make?

Mr. President, on the basis of the facts at hand, it is impossible to accept at face value Mr. Rogers' pious contention that his only interest is in protecting the right to vote in the South.

Mr. President, I think the Attorney General owes the citizens of this country some frank answers about just exactly what he does have in mind.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the approval of the acting majority leader I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the President said in his budget message, delivered to this body on January 18:

> Effective management of a (national) debt of this size requires a reasonable distribution among securities maturing at different times. * * * 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.

We all know, Mr. President, that this is not a new request; President Eisenhower has continuously urged congressional action for almost a year.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday, January 31, 1960, I found an interesting editorial entitled "Realism on Interest Rates." This piece discusses the Joint Economic Committees' recently issued study on employment, economic growth, and price levels. It expresses both criticism and support on various elements of the present administration's economic policies.

But the principal point of the editorial, Mr. President, is interest rates on long-term Treasury bonds, and here the administration's policy is strongly supported by a newspaper usually concerned with aspects of growth. The editorial, indeed, claims that those who stand opposed to the request of the President on the removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term bonds have retreated from reality. Also, the editorial states:

> It seems plain enough that the existence of the ceiling, far from holding down interest, is presently contributing to the substantial rise of the Federal interest burden and to the high level of interest rates generally.

As the ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] also pointed out to this body on January 14 that we have statistics which show generally that we are now paying a higher interest rate for short-term money than we are on 20-year bonds.

Mr. President, I urge my Senate colleagues to support the President's request on lifting the arbitrary and outmoded 4¼ percent ceiling, and as soon as possible, before the situation grows even worse.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

REALISM ON INTEREST RATES

The Joint Economic Committee's recommendation against lifting the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds seriously marred what, in many respects, was a highly useful summary of its year-long study of employment, growth, and price levels. To be sure there are, as the Republican minority complains, a number of political overtones—such as the frequent and somewhat arbitrary choice of the years 1953–59 to illustrate economic trends that might better be viewed over a longer period. But such diversions can be understood, if not countenanced. They do not invalidate the main theme of the report, which is that the country can do much better in economic growth than it has lately done.

On the interest rate ceiling, however, the Democratic majority simply retreats from reality. As conditions for lifting the ceiling, the majority Members propose a number of reforms in debt marketing, including greater use of auction sales, the disposal of long-term issues in periods of recession and low-interest rates (with the Federal Reserve Board to undertake independent countercyclical action in the bond market in the interest of promoting recovery) and other steps calculated to lengthen the average maturity of the debt and reduce total interest costs. Some of these measures may have much merit. But as Republican Sen-

ator JAVITS observes in his supplemental views, "they are not likely to change materially the debt management problems facing the country right now." The minority urges that Congress promptly remove the 4¼ percent ceiling, as the President repeatedly has requested. And two Democratic Members, Representatives BOLLING and COFFIN, grant that "there is no logical reason for an arbitrary 4¼ percent ceiling."

As the Republican dissent notes, "refusal to abolish the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling provides no ceiling on interest at all. It simply places a ceiling on maturities (5 years), thus forcing the Treasury to compete with the multitude of short-term borrowers, sending these rates higher and higher." There is sound reason to agree with the minority's observation that a long-term bond might well have sold for less than the 5-percent-plus rate commanded by the last short-term Treasury offering. As a result of its confinement, by law, to the short-term market, the Treasury has been obliged to increase its maturities in the under-5-year category substantially. The average maturity of the debt fell last year from a high of 4 years 9 months to 4 years 4 months.

No doubt there are many Members of Congress who refuse to support removal of the long-term interest ceiling largely because this appears, on its surface, to be a move toward higher interest costs—or perhaps merely because the subject is a difficult one to explain. But it seems plain enough that the existence of the ceiling, far from holding down interest, is presently contributing to the substantial rise of the Federal interest burden and to the high level of interest rates generally. Unless Congress means to leave the Treasury in a well-nigh impossible situation in meeting the forthcoming burden of refinancing, it ought to rise above the political fray—"rather than leave undone," as Mr. JAVITS said, "something which is in the national interest."

AGRICULTURE'S MEN OF THE YEAR AWARDS IN GEORGIA, FLORIDA, AND ALABAMA

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Progressive Farmer magazine, in its January 1960 issue, devoted an article to the publication's choices for Agriculture's Men of the Year Awards in the States of Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

In my own State the coveted honor went to the Honorable Phil Campbell. Mr. Campbell is the commissioner of agriculture of my State. He is one of the able young public servants who is devoting himself to the field of agriculture, and I publicly commend him for his many accomplishments, which have brought this recognition from such an authoritative source.

Mr. President, I also noted that the Florida award was presented to Mr. Frank L. Holland, of Winter Haven, Fla., who is the brother of my good friend and our admired colleague in the Senate, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. It is evident that ability in the agricultural field is among the many talents inherent in the Holland family. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has served with great distinction for many years on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, in my opinion, is perhaps the best informed man in the United States on all phases of the culture of citrus fruits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Progressive Farmer, together with related stories from the Winter Haven Herald and the Lakeland Ledger, two of Florida's outstanding newspapers, be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

MR. CAMPBELL—A LIFELONG FARMER WORKING FOR FARM PEOPLE

Phil Campbell, Georgia's commissioner of agriculture, has proved friend to both farmer and all other citizens of the State in these among numerous other ways:

He helped put in a quality program on State farm markets. Georgia farmers are encouraged to produce and sell high-quality fruit and vegetables. He helped plan and complete the building of a $10 million Atlanta State farmers market. He started major improvements on other Georgia farm markets.

He launched a program to get rid of brucellosis in Georgia cattle by 1960. This has saved thousands of dollars for Georgia farmers. Now 157 of the State's 159 counties have been cleaned up.

He started a program to promote meat-type hogs in Georgia and to improve selling of these, so farmers would get better prices.

He has worked to improve quality of Georgia-produced eggs. In spite of price difficulties, Georgia's egg industry is growing.

In cooperation with other southern commissioners of agriculture, he has helped get Federal funds to get rid of screwworms and fire ants in Georgia. He is also behind the program to get rid of white-fringed beetles.

He helped start inspection of poultry processing plants to protect buyers and promote almost nationwide selling of Georgia broilers.

In 1957 he led a movement by Georgia farmers which gives tobacco growers a "say-so" in opening of tobacco markets in their State.

With the cooperation of the extension service and the crop reporting service, he has published a farm history of each county of Georgia.

Mr. Campbell, a native of Clarke County, Ga., has been a dairy and cotton farmer since he was 18. He milked cows and grew cotton on his Oconee County farm while studying agriculture at the University of Georgia. He was elected commissioner of agriculture in 1954 and reelected in 1958. He has continued to live on and operate his farm near Watkinsville.

MR. HOLLAND—RESEARCH HAS LED TO VARIED SERVICE

Frank Lassetter Holland has not only worked for, but has spoken and fought for Florida farmers for more than three decades. As manager of the Florida Agricultural Research Institute since its founding early in 1933, he and his organization have cooperated in every proper way with public agencies and institutions and other farm groups for the good of Florida agriculture and its people.

The institute began with 11 members. It now has 46 commercial and cooperative fertilizer and pesticide manufacturers working closely together. The institute encourages research to find the best fertilization program for specific crops and soils—the program that will produce highest returns from the dollars invested in fertilizer. It works to find the most effective controls for plant insects and diseases; and to obtain legislation fair to both consumer and manufacturer, insisting on proper labeling, sampling, and inspection to protect the consumer.

"The Florida Agricultural Research Institute is always ready to lend a hand with research, but never attempts to influence research results," says Dr. J. R. Beckenbach, director of the Florida Agricultural Experiment Station. "As soon as our research shows the most desirable plant nutrition program, FARI and its member companies adopt it."

As one of the organizers and first chairman of the Florida Agricultural Council, Mr. Holland has helped obtain more nearly adequate State appropriations for agricultural research and extension work. He is secretary of the Florida conference group, composed of representatives of grower organizations, industry, and college. This group has presented the views of Florida agriculture before the Food and Drug Administration and Congress.

He has served as president of the Florida State Horticultural Society, one of the oldest organizations of its kind in the country, with widespread influence in all horticultural fields. In 1954, Frank L. Holland received the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association's award of distinction.

[From the Winter Haven Herald, Winter Haven, Polk County, Fla., Jan. 15, 1960]

A DESERVED HONOR FOR FRANK L. HOLLAND

Frank L. Holland, one of Winter Haven's most respected professional men and civic leaders, has been honored by being named recipient of the 1959 Man of the Year in Service to Agriculture in Florida award by the Progressive Farmer, foremost agricultural journal of the South. It was the second time in 14 years that a Winter Haven man was so honored, Dr. Arthur F. Camp, former head of the State citrus experiment station at Lake Alfred, having received the award in 1945.

We know of no Floridian more deserving of the award than Mr. Holland, who has been head of the Florida Agricultural Research Institute here since its organization in 1933. Under his experienced guidance the Institute has grown to represent 46 fertilizer and insecticide firms in Florida and its contribution to the agricultural and horticultural growth of the State has been most impressive and far reaching. Holland has proved himself truly the man for the place in his business connections as he has in the many and varied civic activities that have made him a most valuable citizen of Winter Haven. Outstanding has been his service as chairman of the citrus committee of the chamber of commerce for many years. Executive Vice President E. L. Davis of the chamber speaks with deep appreciation of Holland's assistance in an advisory capacity in helping Winter Haven obtain the $1 million USDA citrus research laboratory, the new State plant board buliding, and the new facilities of the State Canners Association. He has also served the community in various other capacities and all spell out a high type of leadership which he has also given to State horticultural and agricultural interests. The Herald and all Winter Haven extends congratulations on this much-deserved recognition.

[From the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger, January 1960]

FRANK HOLLAND HONORED FOR AGRICULTURAL WORK

WINTER HAVEN.—Frank L. Holland, manager of the Florida Agricultural Research Institute, has been named 1959 Man of the Year for Florida Agriculture by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

The announcement of the award was made by Alexander Nunn, executive editor of the magazine which is received regularly by 1,400,000 southern farm families. A story about the selection of Holland as Man of the Year appears in the January issue of the magazine, Nunn said.

Holland, a brother of U.S. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Bartow, has been associated with the Florida Agricultural Research Institute since it was founded in 1933. Since its inception, the institute has grown from a membership of 11 to a group of 46 commercial and cooperative fertilizer and pesticide manufacturers working to improve Florida agriculture.

CROP FERTILIZATION RESEARCH CONDUCTED

The institute encourages research to find the most effective fertilization programs for specific crops and soils, and for the most effective controls for plant disease and insects. It also works for better farm legislation and legislation to protect the consumer through proper labeling, sampling and inspection.

Holland's career in agricultural improvement work in Florida has brought him previous honors. In 1954 he received the award of distinction of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.

He helped organize and was first chairman of the Florida Agricultural Council; he is secretary of the Florida Conference Group, composed of representatives of grower organizations, industrial establishments and colleges; and he is a past president of the Florida State Horticultural Society, one of the oldest organizations of its kind in America.

A native of Bartow, Holland attended Bartow public schools before entering the University of Florida, where he earned a degree in agriculture.

WORLD WAR I VETERAN

He entered the Army during his last year at the university and during World War I commanded a company of infantry overseas.

The day after his discharge from the Army he obtained a job with a citrus grower in Polk County, and since that time has been associated with citrus industry in all of its phases.

In 1927 he joined the extension service of Florida as Polk County agricultural agent, a post he held until his resignation in 1933 to join the Florida Agricultural Research Institute.

He has been a resident of Winter Haven since 1933 and is a member of the Methodist Church, the American Legion, the Elks Lodge, and the Bartow Chamber of Commerce.

Holland and his wife, the former Miss Dorothy Burwright, of Bartow, live at 324 Avenue B, NE.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will my distinguished senior colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend my distinguished senior colleague for inserting the articles in the RECORD. And I also commend the Progressive Farmer magazine for the selection of these outstanding men.

Mr. President, I particularly desire to say a word about Georgia's distinguished Commissioner of Agriculture, the Honorable Phil Campbell. He became a member of the General Assembly of Georgia, representing Oconee County, when I was Governor of the State. He made his living, while he was a student at the University of Georgia, milking cows and growing cotton on a farm in Oconee County. He served in the general assembly, while he made a living doing the same kind of work. He was elected the commissioner of agriculture of our State. He is a graduate of the College of Agriculture of the University of Georgia. He has earned and richly deserves all of the honors which have been bestowed upon him. I am pleased to join with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] in paying tribute to Mr. Campbell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague for associating himself with the statement I have made and for his own remarks about Commissioner Campbell. I do not know of any higher tribute which he could have paid any individual than the statement he made, that Commissioner Campbell had been able to make a living on the farm for the past 7 years. That is a real accomplishment.

DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN TO DELIVER INVOCATION IN THE HOUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Dr. Israel Goldstein, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun in New York City, is to offer the invocation this morning in the House of Representatives.

Dr. Goldstein's invocation marks the 100th anniversary of the first prayer delivered by a rabbi before the House. This took place on February 1, 1860, and was delivered by Dr. Morris J. Raphall, then rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun. Dr. Raphall's prayer of 100 years ago reflected the tension and anxiety of a nation on the brink of a great and costly Civil War. Times have changed, but the patriotism and loyalty of American Jews remain strong.

Mr. President, Dr. Goldstein's prayer is not a beginning. It marks a 100th anniversary. It is a significant reminder of the large and extremely significant role which Jews have played in the history of our Nation.

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FARM PROPOSALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has sent me an analysis of President Eisenhower's farm proposals which shows that the administration recommendations would during the next 4 years: increase farm output; sharply reduce farm prices; and significantly drop total farm cash receipts.

The Department of Agriculture had sent me a 29-page analysis in reply to my request last year of Secretary Benson to spell out for the Congress the effect of the Eisenhower proposals on farmers in coming years.

The farmers of America are hereby put on notice that their presently depressed income will, according to the administration itself, fall even further if the President's recommendations are put into effect. Already suffering from a 7-year depression, the farmer is herewith told by the administration's own experts that the Eisenhower program spells a further and deeper depression.

To make it worse, farmers can reasonably expect a development that the Department of Agriculture does not assume; that is that the prices farmers pay both for production and family living cost will continue to rise relentlessly in the next 4 years as they have in the past 4. If they do so the farmers' diminishing cash receipts will be eroded another huge 10 percent by 1963.

So the farmer is on notice from this administration that with all the rosy forecasts of a vast growth in American wealth and prosperity, the farmer is going to be left out; that he will remain the No. 1 victim of economic injustice. In this analysis the administration is admitting that it knows this and that it is planning it that way.

The Department of Agriculture report projects an increase of about 6 percent in farm output during the period 1960 through 1963.

The Department analysis would anticipate, under the Eisenhower proposals, a drop of from 10 percent to 12 percent in farm prices during the period.

The smaller drop would be expected under the first of two alternative administration proposals—a "transitional program" with a 35 percent increase in the soil conservation reserve, combined with "some progress towards less rigid support for wheat, tobacco, and peanuts," but with other programs remaining much the same as at present.

The other administration alternative, a "no control" program, assumes "the average level of supports for most of the major mandatory commodities adjusted moderately downward and controls removed on all commodities except tobacco." It would also cut the conservation reserve to 20 million acres.

The report predicts a drop in cash receipts for farmers of $400 million under the "transitional" program, from $31.8 billion in 1960 to $31.4 billion in 1963. It anticipates a decrease of $1.6 billion in cash receipts—from $32.4 to $30.8—if the "no control" program were adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from True D. Morse, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, together with a copy of the extremely significant report referred to. It is my understanding that this is the first time the Department of Agriculture has ever told the American people what the consequences of its own proposals will be if Congress puts them into effect.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This is in reply to your request for an analysis of the economic effects on agriculture that might result from the adoption of the President's proposals with respect to farm price supports.

As you know, the President's message of last January did not attempt to formulate a farm program in any final or rigid form, but rather urged that Congress take steps to establish more realistic and flexible levels of price support and to move in the direction of easing production controls. In the light of this, it seemed to our analysts that the best way of obtaining the type of estimates in which you are interested was to make them under a number of alternative assumptions

involving a fairly considerable range in the price support level and the degree of production control involved.

Though the actual work in response to your request was undertaken early last year, it was several months before a reasonable satisfactory set of preliminary figures could be obtained for such a comprehensive project. While these preliminary figures were being reviewed, we received other requests for projections of a similar analytic nature and, in making these, advantage was taken of new statistics relating to the current year and of the results of studies that had been made of longtime trends in crop yields. It was thought very desirable, therefore, to reexamine the preliminary analysis made in response to your request in the light of some of our subsequent work and to make the material submitted as up to date as possible.

Accordingly, we are transmitting to you the final results of the work undertaken at your request. The projections involved have been prepared by career technicians of the Department in as objective a way as the basic data and existing analytic methods permit.

Your attention is especially called to the preliminary discussion of the limitation of studies of this type. We all know that, in trying to visualize the effect of a comprehensive program over a period of years, there is a considerable latitude for individual judgment. However, we believe that careful study and judicious use of the estimates will throw light upon the implications of various proposals to alter present farm programs.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN ALTERNATE FARM PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this analysis is to indicate the approximate effects of specified farm programs on agriculture output, prices received by farmers, and farm income over the next 4 to 5 years. The alternative programs considered are based in general on the idea that mandatory supports be related to a percentage of recent average market prices, and that steady progress be made in the relaxation of production controls.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS INVOLVED

Analysis of the economic impact of farm program proposals of this nature is especially difficult because of the fact that they necessarily call for a considerable degree of flexibility and administrative discretion. This feature is not, of course, unique to recently proposed programs. In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, for example, the prescribed loan levels for wheat, cotton, corn, and rice ranged from 52 to 75 percent of parity. However, the fact remains that programs of this type imply no absolute level of price support or degree of production control, but rather a wide range of possibility for both. The only practicable way to analyze the impact of such a program is to estimate the results under a number of alternative assumptions, each of which necessarily involves a considerable degree of artificiality, but can serve to indicate the range of results to which various combinations of price supports, production controls, and export subsidies might lead.

RELATION TO OTHER ANALYSES

Although the present study represents a special analytic effort, it is built upon and related to a number of analyses previously published by the Department. Between 1955 and 1957, several studies of the effects of alternative farm programs have been prepared at the direction of the Congress. The most relevant of these were: "Alternative Methods for Supporting Prices to Farmers and Controlling Production of Milk and Butterfat" (1955); "A Study of Various Two-Price Systems of Price Support and Marketing Which Could Be Made Applicable to Rice" (1955); "Various Methods for Supporting the Price of Cotton" (1956); and "Possible Methods of Improving the Feed-Grain Program" (1957). On its own initiative, the Department also published a study "Estimates of Cost of Programs for Price Support by Direct Payments" in October 1957. The present analysis is in a real sense a continuation of these earlier studies, both in terms of estimating procedures used and program implications. In recent months, 1960–65 projections of agricultural prices and production under specified assumptions were prepared at the request of Senator ELLENDER. The same basic methods of analysis have been used in all these studies, although differences in major assumptions lead to different results.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Overall economic framework

For the economy as a whole, it is assumed that upward trends in population, productivity, and real income per capita will continue; and that retail prices and prices paid by farmers will not rise significantly above current levels. The projections corresponding to these assumptions are shown in the following table:

TABLE 1.—*Overall economic assumptions*

Item	Unit	1958	Projected			
			1960	1961	1962	1963
Population [1]	Million	174.1	179.8	182.6	185.4	188.1
Disposable income [2]	Billion dollars	310.5	338.0	351.0	364.0	378.0
Per capita disposable income [2]	Dollars	1,784	1,878	1,919	1,959	2,003
Retail prices	1947–49=100	123.5	124	124	124	124
Prices paid by farmers including interest, taxes, and wages.	1910–14=100	293	300	300	300	300

[1] Total population including Armed Forces overseas. Figure for 1960 is Census Bureau projection. Estimates for other years later than 1958 are interpolations based on Census Bureau projections for 1960 and 1965.
[2] Income estimates for 1960 and later years assume 1958 price level.

PROGRAM ASSUMPTIONS

The number of specific program assumptions that could be made under the present proposals are very large indeed. With respect to production controls, for example, one might assume no controls over the next 5 years, fairly strict controls, or some progression from fairly strict controls to no controls. With respect to price supports, many combinations are also possible, such as 90 percent of the previous 3-year average applied generally, 75 percent of that average applied generally, or something in between. With respect to exports, various levels of commercial sales, subsidized sales, or grants for economic development might be assumed. After examining a considerable number of possible alternatives, three were selected for intensive analysis, although the implications of several others will be discussed. The three program assumptions are as follows:

1. That present programs continue in effect for cotton, corn, rice, and dairy products, and that support levels for other major mandatory commodities (wheat, tobacco, and peanuts) are 90 percent of the average price received for the 3 preceding years, plus a degree of control sufficient to keep production of tobacco and peanuts in line with normal domestic consumption and recent levels of export. For wheat, controls are assumed to be sufficiently stringent to bring about a gradual reduction in stocks. It is also assumed that a conservation reserve program is in effect. Opinions as to what constitutes a desirable acreage reserve level vary considerably within a range of about 30 to 50 million acres, and no attempt was made to establish any particular optimum level. For analytical purposes, however, it was assumed that acreage within that program increases gradually to a level of about 40 million acres by the end of the period. In the following writeup, this group of assumptions is referred to as the "transitional" program, or program I.

2. That the major commodities for which price supports are mandatory are supported at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for the 3 preceding years and that, except for tobacco, no production controls are in effect. Under this set of assumptions, the conservation reserve program is held at the 1959 level of about 20 million acres. This set of assumptions is referred to as "no controls" or program II.

3. That the prices of the major mandatory commodities are supported at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for the 3 preceding years, but with a degree of control sufficient to keep production of this group of commodities, except corn and dairy products, in line with normal domestic and recent levels of exports. The assumption of a conservation reserve rising to 40 million acres is also retained. During the course of the analysis, it developed that the results under this set of assumptions were not significantly different from those under the "transitional" program. Hence, this analysis is focused on the "transitional" and "no controls" programs, with only limited reference to this third set of assumptions.

Under each of the three program assumptions it is further assumed that for the principal export crops the relatively high levels of exports reached during recent years will be maintained over the next 4 or 5 years, whether through commercial exports, Government programs, or some combination of both. This is in line with the efforts being made to find additional outlets for our farm products abroad in the interest of promoting peace and economic development.

The first, or "transitional," assumption is used because it recognizes the possibility that the present programs for cotton, corn, rice, and dairy products may well be continued without great change, but that some progress may be made toward less rigid support levels for wheat, tobacco, and peanuts. The second, or "no controls," set of assumptions is designed to show the results if the average level of support for most of the major mandatory commodities is adjusted moderately downward and controls are removed on all commodities except tobacco. In this latter case, controls were retained for tobacco because of the small acreage involved, the great uncertainty as to what would happen if controls were dropped and the fact that controls on tobacco have been relatively successful, with tobacco growers approving acreage limitations on most types by heavy majorities.

The estimates arrived at under these two assumptions are shown in considerable detail. The basic tables for the principal commodities affected by price support programs

typically show production, prices, cash receipts, exports, acreage, and changes in stocks.

Since a flexible range of price supports between 75 and 90 percent of the average market price during the immediately preceding years has been widely discussed, the question may well be raised as to why a set of estimates is not presented across the board at the 75-percent level. The reason for this is that there have been no indications that supports at this level would be employed generally or for any extended period. However, there may be instances where it would be desirable to reduce supports toward this lower level, and the implications of these will be discussed separately after presentation of the results arrived at under the two principal analytic assumptions.

Limitations of the study

Any analysis of this type is subject to a number of important limitations that must be borne in mind if the results are to be usefully interpreted. Accordingly, these will be discussed in some detail.

1. The estimates presented are built on a review of average statistical relationships between supply, prices, and consumption and longtime trends, toegther with the judgment of specialists in the respective commodity fields. The individual commodity estimates are not of uniform reliability. Statistical information and knowledge of economic relationships differ widely among commodities. The production response of crops that have been under control for long periods are particularly difficult to estimate under competitive conditions. Unfortunately, this applies to two of the most important and controversial crops; namely, cotton and wheat. Further, margins of error are especially wide for crops whose acreage and production are normally very small.

2. Estimates of commodity aggregates tend to be more reliable than those for individual commodities, and larger aggregates tend to be more reliable than smaller ones. Thus, it would normally be expected that estimates for a large crop such as corn would be subject to a smaller percentage of error than for a small crop such as rye; that estimates for grains as a total would be more accurate than the estimates for any single grain; and that estimates for the total of all crops would be more accurate than those for subaggregates, such as food grains and feed grains.

3. Analysis of a program applied to agriculture as a whole is inherently more difficult and more subject to error than analysis of a proposed program applicable to a single commodity or to a few related commodities. For example, in analyzing the impact of proposed changes in a particular program, such as dairy products or cotton, one can proceed on the assumption that other influences within the agricultural economy can be held constant. In analyzing an overall program, this simplifying assumption is precluded. One must, for example, consider all the interrelationships among such crops as cotton, wheat, feed grains, and soybeans, and in turn, the interrelationships among the feed grains and all the livestock items. It is obvious that this problem not only makes the analysis far more complicated, but multiplies the possibility of error for individual commodity estimates.

4. The application of uniform program assumptions to all commodities introduces a degree of artificiality that may be unrealistic for particular commodities. However, any attempt to avoid this by introducing numerous special assumptions for particular commodities would require prejudgment of policy decisions. The introduction of adjustments of this sort is obviously beyond the scope of this particular study.

5. The study is limited to the effects of the assumed conditions on production, prices, cash receipts, and changes in stocks. The equally important problem of Government cost, which involves estimates of storage cost, administrative expenses, and losses in export subsidies was not a part of the study.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Before presenting the numerical results, a few general observations are in order.

1. There is hardly any doubt but that high support levels have contributed to excessive production, increasing surplus stocks, and high Government costs.

2. The downward adjustment of agricultural production to lowered support prices, particularly for wheat, cotton, and the feed grains, necessarily takes place over time, and the rate of adjustment cannot be gaged with any high degree of accuracy. Having made relatively large investments in land and capital equipment, farmers are reluctant to reduce inputs until the prospect of low prices over a fairly long period become rather definitely established. Thus, the shorter the adjustment period that is looked at in conjunction with lower prices, the poorer appears the price and income position of the farmers. The longer the period, the more likely that farmers will reduce excessive commitments, turn to better alternatives, and bring about some improvement in their price and income position.

3. The prospects of improving agriculture's position through greater flexibility in price supports is not uniform for all segments. The most promising area for the introduction of additional price flexibility is in the livestock-dairy-feed sector, provided that some means can be found for preventing excess acreage in wheat and cotton from being diverted into production of surplus feed supplies.

4. The question of the nature and size of any conservation reserve program is of very great importance. The more effectively this can be carried out in the cotton and wheat growing areas, the better the chance of bringing about needed adjustments, of limiting the decline in income received by producers of these crops, and of introducing more flexible and competitive pricing in the livestock-dairy-feed segment.

5. Finally, it needs to be especially emphasized that there are numerous program alternatives to those actually selected for analysis. The principal objective here has been to contrast results under something close to the present program with those under a program that shifted gradually to reduced supports and quite rapidly to freedom from controls. The temporary imposition of stringent emergency controls on a major commodity such as wheat could greatly alter the projected carryover situation.

SOME OVERALL QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

This section summarizes the results of the two principal program assumptions in terms of prices received by farmers, the index of farm output, cash receipts from farm marketings, and total acreage. Projections are given for the 4 years, 1960–63. Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine is omitted, since the analysis was made during that year, and comparisons between actual forecasts for 1959 and what might have happened under certain hypothetical programs have little meaning. Attention is best focused on the last 1 or 2 years, as it is only toward the end of the period that the assumed programs would have had sufficient time to make their influences felt throughout the farm economy as a whole.

Most of the comparisons made are between the 1963 projections and the actual average for the years 1955–57. This base period appears to be a better point of reference than 1958 which was influenced by a number of factors that caused farm income to be relatively high. The livestock markets were unusually strong; a record crop output augmented income from crops placed under CCC loans; delayed harvests in 1957 pushed marketings from some crops into 1958; and there was some increase in soil bank payments to farmers. Following are some of the highlights as presented in table 2:

1. Under both programs the assumed reductions in support prices would necessarily mean a drop in the general level of prices received by farmers. The average level projected for 1963 under program I is about 9 percent below 1955–57, while under program II, the drop would be about 13 percent. However, the drop in prices received for crops is appreciably greater than for livestock. The average projected level for crops in 1963 under program I is about 15 percent below 1955–57 as compared with about 5 percent for livestock. Under program II, the corresponding declines are 18 and 10 percent. The decline in crop prices is primarily a reflection of the decline in support levels. Livestock prices will, as usual, follow feed-grain prices downward as larger livestock output is stimulated. However, the drop will not be as great as for crops, due to the higher price and income elasticity of livestock products and also to the influence of factors other than feed in production and prices of livestock.

2. Increases in total farm output are substantial under both programs. Under program I, the projected increase in the index of farm output in 1963 is about 14 percent higher than in 1955–57, while under program II, the increase is approximately 18 percent. The increase in the livestock segment by 1963 is about 17–18 percent above 1955–57 under both programs. This is due to the stimulation of livestock production through lower feed prices combined with a continued growth in demand. The rise in crop production, largely from the expansion of wheat and cotton, is restrained by acreage controls and the influence of the conservation reserve program. Projected output of crops in 1963 under program I is about 10 percent higher than 1955–57. With the relaxation of controls, crop output rises to a level about 15 percent above 1955–57. A large part of the increase in crop output under both programs is due to the assumption of a gradual longtime increase in yields.

3. In general, the assumed decline in prices received is somewhat more than offset by the increased output in the farm economy as a whole. Thus, compared to 1955–57, cash receipts in 1963 are about 5 percent higher under program I, while under program II, they are about 3 percent higher. There is a considerable difference between the position of livestock and crops. With the relatively larger increase in output and the relatively smaller decrease in prices, cash receipts from livestock under program I are projected to be about 14 percent higher than in 1955–57, while cash receipts from crops are projected to be about 6 percent lower. Under program II, however, a further decine in livestock prices results in cash receipts from livestock only about 8 percent above 1955–57. But with production restrictions removed from crops under program II, increased sales tend to offset some further decline in projected prices, so that total cash receipts from crops projected under this program are still only about 3 percent below the level of 1955–57.

4. Under the transitional program, planted acreage in 1963 is appreciably lower than in 1955–57 due to the gradual expansion of the conservation reserve program. The actual projected drop is about 22 million acres. Under the noncontrol assumption, all of this acreage would be planted, and the total shown is about 3 million acres that actually were planted during 1955–57.

5. The most significant differences between the results under the transitional program and those under the no-control program are not those affecting cash receipts, but those affecting the carryover situation. Under the transitional program, production controls, together with the conservation reserve, tend to put a brake on stock accumulation. Carryovers of wheat and cotton would be somewhat reduced, but stocks of feed would continue to rise. Under the no-control program, however, marked accumulations would take place in the carryover levels of cotton and wheat, though this would be accompanied by an appreciable decline in the level of feed grain stocks.

Note on conservation reserve program

The importance of assumptions with respect to the size of the conservation reserve program for this or any other analysis requires special emphasis. If the number of acres in such a program is increased sufficiently, it serves as a substitute for direct controls and tends to eliminate the surplus problem. If, on the other hand, this program is eliminated or held at a very low level, the surplus problem tends to reemerge. Anyone can vary the results of this analysis quite considerably by making large changes up or down in the conservation reserve assumption.

Payments under the conservation reserve program will also serve to increase cash receipts to farmers somewhat above the levels indicated by the projected cash receipts from farm marketings. It is not possible, however, to produce a very firm estimate of how much this supplementary income might be under the two major program assumptions analyzed here without greatly expanding the scope of the present study. This is especially true under program I where the conservation reserve is gradually increased to a level of 40 million acres. With direct production controls on a number of commodities, notably cotton and wheat, there would be a strong tendency for the uncultivated acres to go into feed grains, the production of which is not controlled. The larger the size of the soil bank program, the greater the number of acres that must be taken out of cropland having good alternative uses. Under program II where only 20 million acres are kept in the conservation reserve, the payments would remain relatively low, probably adding not more than a quarter of a billion dollars to farm income. With the program totaling 40 million acres, average payments would probably have to be increased and total payments would likely be more than double the one-quarter billion dollars estimated under program II.

In the two sections that follow the projections for both the livestock and crop sectors are presented in somewhat more detail.

THE FEED-LIVESTOCK SECTOR

The impact of the alternative programs on this sector merit separate treatment. All parts of the sector are highly interrelated, and the statistical and economic knowledge concerning the interrelationships is somewhat better than for other parts of the farm economy. The data on which the subsequent discussion of both the livestock and crop segments is based will be found in tables 3 through 7.

Results under program I

Feed Grains—Production and Prices

Under this assumption the price of corn might be expected to decline gradually to about 95 cents by 1963. The decline in corn prices is limited by the operation of the provision in current legislation requiring support at not less than 65 percent of parity. Total acreage planted to feed grains rose to 158 million acres in 1959 compared with 150.6 acres in 1958. From this level, acreage is expected to decline to about 149 million acres by 1963. This would be about 8 percent below the 1955–57 average.

With normal weather, as compared with very good weather in 1958 and 1959, total feed grain output might be expected to drop from 158 million tons in 1958 and 167 in 1959 to around 150 to 152 million tons in the period 1960–63. This takes into account the long-time upward trend in yield and a small reduction in acreage. Projected production on the 4-year period would be about 12 percent above the 1955–57 average.

Livestock—Production and Prices

As a result of this rise in production, average annual supplies of feed grains throughout the 5-year period would be in excess of 230 million tons. With lower feed prices and continued large supplies, the number of grain consuming animal units under program I might rise to about 184 million in 1963 compared with 176 million estimated for 1959, an increase of 5 percent. Compared with the 1955–57 average, this would be a rise of nearly 13 percent.

Production responses for hogs, beef cattle, and broilers would all be appreciable, with projected increases of about 17 percent, 20 percent, and 48 percent respectively above the 1955–57 level. With increased supplies of these commodities, prices received by farmers would tend to show appreciable declines. For hogs, prices might drop to an annual average of around $13 per hundredweight by the end of the period. These projections for hogs are stated in terms of normal or average relationships, ignoring cyclical fluctuations that might take place. For cattle, the projected price is $16.25 per hundredweight, about 2 percent above the 1955–57 average. The projected declines in the prices of broilers and eggs from 1955–57 would be around 21 and 12 percent respectively.

Milk production might be expected to rise from about 125 billion pounds in 1955–57 to about 136 billion pounds by 1963, an increase of 9 percent. However, the price of milk at wholesale would be about the same as in 1958.

Effects on Cash Receipts

Since the expansion in output provides a considerable offset to the decline in prices, the change in projected cash receipts is fairly moderate. By 1963, total cash receipts from livestock and livestock products are projected at about 18.8 billion dollars compared with 16.5 billion dollars received in 1955–57, but there would be a slight drop in cash income received directly from feed grains. However, the income for feed usually represents only about 10 percent of total cash receipts from the total livestock feed complex. Therefore, projected cash receipts from livestock, livestock products and feed grains combined by 1963 would be about 11 percent above the 1955–57 average.

Effects on Feed Supplies

The projected expansion in grain consuming animal units, plus other domestic uses, would come close to consuming projected feed grain production by 1963. This, however, would not be enough to bring about a reduction in current carryover stocks of feed grains, which are expected to exceed 79 million tons at the end of the 1959–60 marketing year. There might in fact be some further increase in stocks over the 5-year period unless some way were found to expand exports above the recent high level of around 13 million tons.

Results under program II

Feed Grains—Production and Prices

Under this assumed program, the price supports on corn would be somewhat lower than under program I. Corn prices might reach a level of about 85 cents a bushel by 1963 compared with 95 cents under the transitional program. This lower price, combined with expanded acreages of wheat and cotton under the assumption of no controls, would tend to contract feed grain acreage, which is projected at about 145 million acres compared with 149 million acres under program I. This contraction in acreage would be accompanied by a decline in total output of feed grains, which is projected at 148 million tons as compared with 152 million under program I, and the record output of nearly 167 million tons in 1959.

Livestock—Production and Prices

The projected drop in the feed grain prices would give a further stimulus to the output of cattle, hogs, poultry and eggs, accompanied by some further small declines in the prices of these products. In the case of dairy products, however, the drop in the support price due to the use of 90 percent of the 3-year average would give a projected average wholesale price of all milk of $3.74 per hundredweight compared with $4.15 under program I. This would also tend to decrease milk output slightly below that projected for program I, and bring a decline in cash receipts of around 14 percent.

Effects on Cash Receipts

All in all, the price-production pattern envisioned under program II would result in cash receipts from livestock and livestock products in 1963 of about $17.8 billion compared with about $18.8 billion under program I and $16.5 billion received in 1955–57. Because of reduced feed grain output and lower prices, there would be a further decline in cash income received directly from their sale. Cash receipts from livestock, livestock products, and feed grains combined are projected at about $19.5 billion under program II compared with $20.7 billion under program I, a drop of nearly 7 percent.

Effects on Feed Supplies

The projected production of feed grains under this program would be less than required by the expansion of grain-consuming livestock. Accordingly, this deficiency would be made up by increased utilization of the large supplies of feed grains, with the annual reduction in stocks accelerating markedly by the end of the period. Thus, projected stocks of feed grains would be down to around 63 million tons by the close of the 1963–64 marketing year compared with an expected 80 million ton carryover into 1960–61. This carryover, however, would still be above the 1955–57 average of 50 million tons.

It would appear, therefore, that by the end of the period we would be approaching a situation in which feed grain prices might be expected to show increasing strength. This in turn would tend to check the increase in grain consuming animal units and strengthen the income position of the whole livestock segment. It should be emphasized, however, that this favorable development is predicated on the program assumptions which permit a large expansion in acreage devoted to wheat and cotton.

THE CROP SECTOR

In estimating the impact of the assumed alternative programs on crops, attention has been focused on a limited number of commodities, principally feed grains, which have already been discussed, wheat, cotton, soybeans, rice, peanuts and tobacco. Specific estimates are not presented for minor crops such as flaxseed and tung nuts. Furthermore, no analysis has been made for fruits and vegetables, as this important segment does not come within the scope of the central price support and production control program. However, in building up overall estimates under the different programs, an allowance has been made for

fruits and vegetables, as well as for many other commodities on the basis of recent trends in production, prices, and cash receipts.

Results under program I

Cotton

The projections for cotton are carried out under the assumption that the present program continues over the 5-year period. Under this assumption, the governing factors in the supply situation are the minimum acreage allotment limitation of 16.3 million acres and the gradual decline in support prices. In this connection, it should be noted that actual projected acreage in any particular year may be below the 16.3 million level because of the combined effects of abandonment and the conservation reserve program.

Under the specified conditions, acreage would rise from the low level of 12.4 million in 1958 to a projected 15 million in 1963, but the latter would be more than a million acres less than the 1955–57 average. Production would be higher than the 1955–57 average of 13 million bales, totaling approximately 14 million bales in 1963. Projected prices received would decline gradually from the 33.1 cents per pound received in 1958 to an assumed level of 26.2 cents in 1963. However, even with the expansion in production, there would not be much change in cash receipts, which are projected at about 1.9 billion dollars in 1963, about the same as in 1958 and slightly below 1955–57. Under the above conditions, stocks in 1963 might be about the same as the 8.9 million held in 1958. This compares with an average carryover of 11.5 million bales during 1955–57.

Wheat

This program involves the assumption that restraints on production, including the conservation reserve, will keep the output of this commodity in line with normal domestic consumption and some increase over recent export requirements, and also bring some reduction in stocks. Two specific alternatives have typically been advanced for wheat; namely, relaxation of controls and an intensification of them. The wheat assumption adopted under program I is used to illustrate the effects of the latter alternative.

Under such a program, wheat acreage would have to be reduced from 56.4 million acres in 1958 to not more than 50 million in 1960–63, while production would also have to drop from 1,462 million bushels in 1958 to a projected level of about 1 billion during 1961–63. This would be about 5 percent above the 1955–57 average. Furthermore, under the formula of 90 percent of average prices in the 3 preceding years, the average price received would drop from $1.72 a bushel in 1958 to around $1.32 in 1963. Given this combination of smaller production and lower prices, cash receipts from wheat would decline to an estimated $1.25 billion in 1963, about 30 percent less than in 1955–57. This would account for most of the projected decline in total cash receipts from crops from 1955–57 to 1963 under program I.

Although a program of this type would by definition bring about a gradual decline in surplus wheat stocks, total carryover by 1963 would still be in the neighborhood of a billion bushels. In order to bring about a further decrease in the size of this surplus, annual exports would have to be increased above the assumed 450–525 million bushels, or production further restricted below the assumed level of 50 million planted acres.

Tobacco

For this commodity, the present control program was retained for reasons already indicated, but with a projected decline in the level of price supports. Here, the result is a stable acreage, gradual increase in the production of flue-cured and burley tobacco, an appreciable decline in prices received, but with the expansion in production approximately offsetting the price decline. Thus, by 1963 cash receipts from flue-cured tobacco remain at about the 1955–57 level and those from burley somewhat lower. Furthermore, there is an appreciable decline in carryover of both types between 1958 and 1963.

Other

A number of changes, either up or down, are projected for cash receipts from soybeans, rice, and peanuts, as indicated in table 6. These crops, however, have little effect on the total level of cash receipts.

Results under program II

Using 90 percent of average prices in 3 preceding years as the basis of supports, abandoning controls on all commodities except tobacco, and reducing the conservation reserve has relatively little effect on total cash receipts from crops. Thus, by 1963, cash receipts from crop marketings under program II are projected at $13 billion, compared with $12.6 billion under program I. The comparable figure for 1955–57 is $13.5 billion. However, there are marked differences in the economic implication of program II as compared with program I for individual crops.

Cotton

There is hardly any doubt but that with the high initial support rates, a marked expansion would take place in cotton production at the outset, and surpluses would accumulate at an accelerating rate. For example, the acreage projection under program II in 1963 is 21.2 million compared with 15.6 million under program I. This does not seem unreasonable in view of the fact that planted acreage of cotton has exceeded 25 million as recently as 1953. It is extremely difficult to make a reliable forecast of possible production on this acreage under a situation involving no controls, but it is reasonable to assume that the upward trend in yields would continue and that the result might be an annual production of over 18 million bales. Even with total disappearance estimated at the relatively high rate of 14 to 16 million bales annually, the result would be a rapid acceleration of stock accumulation. However, if the price level reached by 1963 were to continue or decline somewhat further, one might expect some acreage contraction to develop. With 4 to 5 million bales being added each year, total carryover by 1963 could reach the startling level of around 24 million bales.

On the income side, the sharp increase in production would be offset in considerable part by the drop in price which is projected to reach about 23.4 cents in 1963 under program II compared with 26.2 cents under program I. Cash receipts would rise slightly with a projected total of $2.2 billion in 1963 under program II compared with $1.8 billion under program I, and slightly above $2 billion in 1955–57. But the cost of income maintenance in this particular instance would be the rapid increase of Government holdings of cotton.

Wheat

Without production controls, and with support prices initially at relatively high levels, it would be expected that the planted acreage of wheat under program II would jump sharply above the average of recent years. Because of the lack of knowledge as to what would happen under conditions of sudden decontrol, it is extremely difficult to project year-by-year changes in wheat acreage with any high degree of confidence. The projections made under program II portray a middle course between the hypothesis that a gradual lowering of the wheat price would bring about a rapid and appreciable reduction in acreage, and that which postulates a much slower downward adjustment, or even an increase in the short run. What is shown here is a large initial jump from an average of 56 million acres in 1955–57 to 67 million in the first year of decontrol, after which the increase in acreage is slowed up, coming to a halt in 1963 at the assumed price level of $1.23 a bushel.

Even after allowing for some drop in yields on the larger acreage that would be planted in the absence of controls, annual production in 1963 under program II is projected at close to 1,200 million bushels compared with 1,030 million under program I, and an average output of 963 million bushels in 1955–57. The output of 1,462 million bushels attained in 1958 on about 56 million acres was due to an extraordinary yield. This is unlikely to be duplicated in the near future.

There would be a small improvement in cash receipts from wheat under program II compared with program I since the price is lowered only moderately by the large production relative to disappearance. The projections are about $1,370 million and $1,250 million respectively. The comparable figure for 1955–57 is $1,740 million.

For wheat, as for cotton, program II means a further accumulation of stocks. Under this program, total wheat carryover is projected to over 1.5 billion bushels compared with about 1.0 billion under program I and about 1.3 billion at the beginning of the 1959 crop year.

Tobacco and Other Crops

The position of tobacco under program II is by assumption the same as under program I, and cash receipts from soybeans also remain virtually unchanged. Output of rice and peanuts, as well as cash receipts, rise somewhat under the assumption of no controls, and this is accompanied by a very marked rise in the stocks of these two commodities. However, the total impact of the changes occurring outside of wheat, cotton, and the feed-livestock sector is relatively small.

Note on the conservation reserve assumption

Under program II, it is assumed that the conservation reserve is maintained at the 20-million acre level. Another possible alternative would be to maintain the general assumption of no production controls but to increase the acreage reserve to around 40 million acres as under program I. It is difficult to say exactly what this might mean for farm prices and income, but it is fair to assume that these would be higher than under program II, perhaps tending to approximate the level of program I.

FURTHER LOWERING OF SUPPORT LEVELS

Although supports at 90 percent of the previous 3-year average without controls, as analyzed under program II, would probably result in a gradual reduction in the carryover of feed grains, stocks of cotton and wheat would increase. This raises the question as to whether a further lowering of support levels would impose any real check on the expansion of these crops. This is an extremely difficult question to answer satisfactorily, as an additional drop in the prices for these commodities pushes us still further beyond the range of recent economic and statistical experience. For example, use of the 75 percent principle over a period of 5 years would permit dropping the wheat price to around 85 cents a bushel, corn to around 70 cents a bushel, and cotton to about 20 cents a pound.

However, if supports were gradually reduced toward these levels, there is hardly any doubt that they would begin to impose appreciable checks upon output and lead to gradual reduction in stocks. Lowered prices

would be partially offset by larger marketings, but total cash receipts would decline somewhat below those projected for program II.

It might also be pointed out that these broad conclusions assume, as in the case of program II, an acreage reserve of 20 million acres. If this were increased to between 30 and 40 million acres, it would presumably be possible to bring about a rough equilibrium within agriculture at a price level somewhat above that which would result from the continued application of the principle of price support at 75 percent of the market price for the 3 preceding years. An acreage reserve of 50 million acres would, of course, mean a further strengthening of prices.

TABLE 2.—*Cash receipts, index of farm output, index of prices received by farmers, and acreage, under alternative programs, 1960–63, with comparisons*

Item	Unit	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program [1]				No-control program [2]			
				1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Cash receipts:											
Livestock [3]	Billion dollars	16.5	19.3	18.9	19.0	18.9	18.8	18.6	18.6	18.1	17.8
Crops	do	13.5	14.3	12.9	12.8	12.6	12.6	13.8	13.5	13.2	13.0
Total [4]	do	30.0	33.6	31.8	31.8	31.5	31.4	32.4	32.1	31.3	30.8
Index of prices received by farmers: [5]											
Livestock	1910–14=100	235	273	252	244	235	225	247	237	224	212
Crops	do	230	223	210	205	199	196	206	200	193	188
All farm products	do	232	250	233	226	218	212	228	220	210	201
Index of farm output:											
Livestock	1947–49=100	121	125	129	134	138	142	130	134	139	143
Crops	do	106	118	113	114	115	117	118	120	121	122
All farm products	do	114	124	122	125	127	130	126	129	131	134
Acreage:											
Planted	Million	344	330	329	326	322	322	349	348	347	347
Total [6]	do	358	357	359	360	362	362	369	368	367	367

[1] Present program for cotton, feed grains, rice and dairy with 90 percent of average price in 3 preceding calendar years and controls for wheat, peanuts, and tobacco.
[2] 90 percent of average price in 3 preceding calendar years with controls only on tobacco.
[3] Includes an allowance of $250,000,000 for miscellaneous livestock products.
[4] Includes an allowance of 6 percent to cover miscellaneous items. Income from crops obtained by subtracting adjusted livestock figure from total.
[5] For years covered in the projection the index is not strictly comparable to that reported by the Crop Reporting Board. This difference is due to the use of crop years in the computations made for 1960–63, while the Board used calendar years. Based on crop year data, the index in 1958 was 249.
[6] Acreage and conservation reserve program both in effect 1956–58. Only conservation reserve during 1960–63.

TABLE 3.—*Acreage, planted and total: Estimates based on alternative farm programs, projections for 1960–63 with comparisons (million acres)*

Crop	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program				No-control program			
			1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Corn	77.8	74.7	83.5	82.0	81.5	81.5	83.0	81.5	81.0	81.0
Oats	44.9	38.4	35.0	35.0	34.0	34.0	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5
Barley	15.9	16.3	16.0	15.0	14.5	14.5	14.0	13.0	12.5	12.5
Sorghum grain	24.2	21.2	20.0	19.5	19.0	19.0	18.5	17.5	17.5	17.5
Total feed grains	162.8	150.6	154.5	151.5	149.0	149.0	150.0	146.5	145.5	145.5
Wheat	56.3	56.4	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	67.0	69.0	70.0	70.0
Rice	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
Cotton	16.5	12.4	16.2	15.7	15.1	15.1	22.3	22.0	21.5	21.2
Soybeans [1]	20.0	23.8	25.1	25.1	25.0	25.3	25.1	25.3	25.6	25.8
Peanuts [2]	1.5	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Tobacco [1]	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4
Hay	74.0	73.0	70.0	69.5	69.0	69.0	70.0	70.0	70.0	70.0
Total items shown	334.0	320.2	320.3	316.5	312.8	313.2	339.9	338.5	338.3	338.3
Total planted 59 crops	344.2	330.4	329.3	325.5	321.8	322.2	348.9	347.5	347.3	347.3
Soil bank	[3] 19.5	[4] 27.0	30.0	35.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
Total acreage	357.3	357.4	359.3	360.5	361.8	362.2	368.9	367.5	367.3	367.3

[1] Harvested.
[2] Picked and threshed.
[3] Average of combined acreage and conservation reserve programs during 1956–57.
[4] Includes acreage and conservation reserve programs. For 1960–63 the soil bank projections include only the conservation reserve.

TABLE 4.—*Production: Estimates based on alternative farm programs, projections for 1960–63 with comparisons*

Commodity	Unit	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program				No-control program			
				1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Livestock:											
Cattle and calves	Million pounds	27,521	27,698	29,000	30,400	31,700	33,000	29,100	30,400	31,800	33,200
Hogs	do	19,125	19,421	21,100	21,700	22,100	22,400	21,500	22,100	22,800	23,600
Milk	Billion pounds	124.8	125.2	126.0	129.0	132.5	136.0	125.5	127.5	130.0	133.0
Eggs	Million dozens	5,022	5,057	5,042	5,433	5,517	5,633	5,042	5,433	5,583	5,683
Broilers	Million pounds	4,101	5,431	5,610	5,824	5,940	6,056	5,610	5,824	6,022	6,204
Crops:											
Corn	Million bushels	3,369	3,800	4,020	3,975	3,985	4,015	3,995	3,950	3,960	3,990
Oats, barley, and sorghum grain	Million tons	40.4	51.3	39.8	39.0	38.4	39.1	37.2	36.0	36.0	36.1
Total feed grains	do	134.7	157.7	152.4	150.3	150.0	151.5	149.1	146.6	146.9	147.9
Wheat	Million bushels	963	1,462	977	995	1,012	1,030	1,164	1,187	1,192	1,192
Cotton	Million bales	13.0	11.5	14.5	14.2	13.9	14.1	18.6	18.6	18.6	18.5
Soybeans	Million bushels	436	574	565	575	580	595	565	580	590	605
Rice	Million hundredweight	49.4	47.0	52.0	52.8	53.6	54.4	75.6	76.8	78.0	79.2
Peanuts	Million pounds	1,531	1,836	1,650	1,700	1,750	1,800	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
Tobacco, all	do	2,012	1,736	1,713	1,980	2,050	2,120	1,713	1,980	2,050	2,120
Flue-cured	do	1,294	1,081	1,075	1,250	1,300	1,350	1,075	1,250	1,300	1,350
Burley	do	488	466	450	510	525	535	450	510	525	535

TABLE 5.—*Prices received by farmers: Estimates based on alternative farm programs, projections for 1960–63 with comparisons*

Commodity	Unit	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program				No-control program			
				1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Livestock:											
Cattle	Dollars, hundredweight	15.90	21.90	20.50	19.50	18.00	16.25	20.00	19.00	17.50	15.75
Hogs	do	15.70	19.60	14.00	13.75	13.50	13.00	13.50	13.25	12.50	12.00
Milk, wholesale	do	4.12	4.12	4.15	4.15	4.15	4.15	4.05	3.97	3.79	3.74
Butterfat	Dollars, pound	.592	.585	.570	.570	.570	.570	.557	.585	.660	.660
Eggs	Cents, dozen	37.8	38.3	38.0	34.5	34.1	33.3	38.0	34.0	32.6	31.3
Broilers	Cents, pound	21.2	18.5	17.6	17.5	16.9	16.8	17.4	17.3	16.3	16.1
Crops: [1]											
Corn	Dollars, bushel	1.25	1.11	1.00	.98	.97	.95	.97	.95	.90	.85
Oats	do	.66	.58	.53	.52	.52	.50	.52	.50	.48	.46
Barley	do	.95	.89	.78	.75	.75	.73	.75	.73	.70	.67
Sorghum grain	Dollars, hundredweight	1.93	1.76	1.50	1.45	1.45	1.40	1.45	1.40	1.35	1.30
Wheat	Dollars, bushel	1.96	1.72	1.61	1.51	1.42	1.32	1.58	1.46	1.36	1.23
Cotton	Cents, pound	31.22	33.10	29.16	28.10	26.20	26.20	27.27	26.10	24.50	23.36
Soybeans	Dollars, bushel	2.16	2.00	1.75	1.70	1.65	1.60	1.75	1.60	1.60	1.60
Cottonseed	Dollars, ton	49.70	43.80	34.00	34.00	34.00	34.00	39.00	35.00	30.00	32.00
Rice	Dollars, hundredweight	4.93	4.81	4.79	4.56	4.32	4.34	4.65	4.57	4.48	4.41
Peanuts	Cents, pound	11.1	10.6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Tobacco, all	do	54.3	59.5	53.7	52.8	50.7	50.0	53.7	52.8	50.7	50.0
Flue-cured	do	53.2	58.2	53.0	52.0	50.0	50.0	53.0	52.0	50.0	50.0
Burley	do	60.8	66.1	58.0	57.0	54.0	52.0	58.0	57.0	54.0	52.0

[1] Except for the 1955–57 average, prices are for crop years.

TABLE 6.—*Cash receipts: Estimates based on alternative farm programs, projections for 1960–63 with comparisons (million dollars)*

Commodity	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program				No-control program			
			1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Livestock:										
Cattle and calves	5,500	7,403	7,350	7,300	7,025	6,750	7,350	7,250	6,950	6,600
Hogs	2,809	3,416	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,800	2,800	2,775	2,750	2,700
Milk, wholesale	3,906	4,094	4,308	4,474	4,631	4,826	4,188	4,200	4,090	4,163
Eggs	1,723	1,770	1,753	1,729	1,741	1,743	1,753	1,704	1,686	1,654
Broilers	856	1,002	987	1,019	1,004	1,017	976	1,008	982	999
Total	16,518	19,301	18,896	19,000	18,872	18,751	18,651	18,569	18,126	17,780
Crops: [1]										
Corn	1,489	1,479	1,405	1,360	1,355	1,335	1,360	1,310	1,245	1,185
Oats, barley, and sorghum grain	682	956	645	610	605	595	580	535	510	495
Total feed grain	2,171	2,435	2,050	1,970	1,960	1,930	1,940	1,845	1,755	1,680
Wheat	1,740	2,253	1,444	1,382	1,323	1,254	1,713	1,616	1,512	1,368
Cotton	2,049	1,928	2,114	1,995	1,821	1,847	2,536	2,427	2,278	2,161
Soybeans	883	1,117	989	978	957	944	989	923	946	966
Rice	241	222	242	234	225	230	342	342	340	340
Peanuts	160	203	99	102	105	108	132	132	132	132
Tobacco, all	1,119	1,007	920	1,045	1,040	1,060	920	1,045	1,040	1,060
Flue-cured	685	629	570	650	650	675	570	650	650	675
Burley	321	294	261	291	284	278	261	291	284	278
Total	13,463	14,259	12,903	12,822	12,592	12,613	13,759	13,536	13,197	12,968
Grand total	29,981	33,560	31,799	31,822	31,464	31,384	32,410	32,105	31,323	30,748

[1] Except for the 1955–57 average, cash receipts are for crop years.

TABLE 7.—*Exports and year end carryover: Estimates based on alternative farm programs, projections for 1960–63 with comparisons*

Item and crop	Unit	Average, 1955–57	1958	Transitional program				No-control program			
				1960	1961	1962	1963	1960	1961	1962	1963
Exports:											
Feed grain	Million tons	8.6	12.5	13.0	13.0	13.5	14.0	13.0	13.0	13.5	14.0
Wheat	Million bushels	433	434	450	475	500	525	450	475	500	525
Rice	Million hundredweight	24.8	19.7	27.0	26.4	26.8	27.4	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0
Cotton	Million bales	5.2	2.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.5	6.0
Carryover:											
Feed grain	Million tons	50.4	67.4	84.6	87.3	87.6	87.7	80.4	77.2	70.9	62.9
Wheat	Million bushels	941	1,277	1,289	1,194	1,091	981	1,437	1,511	1,564	1,592
Rice	Million hundredweight	24.3	15.7	11.2	11.0	11.0	11.0	28.5	44.6	61.7	79.8
Soybeans	Million bushels	12	62	50	55	50	35	55	60	65	70
Peanuts	Million pounds	375	488	350	350	350	350	400	425	450	475
Cotton	Million bales	11.5	8.9	9.6	9.8	9.3	8.8	13.7	17.9	21.2	23.6
Tobacco:											
Flue-cured	Million pounds	2,359	2,210	1,880	1,895	1,900	1,925	1,880	1,895	1,900	1,925
Burley	do	1,295	1,237	1,130	1,095	1,065	1,060	1,130	1,095	1,065	1,060

RULES OF ORDER FOR AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have just received in my office a copy of a little booklet which I hold in my hand, entitled "Rules of Order Simplified," which is deserving of the attention of every Member of Congress, as well as those who attend public meetings where decisions are determined by majority vote. This booklet though small in size is large in purpose.

"Rules of Order Simplified" has been designed to complement those sections of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which establish for the first time certain minimum standards of democracy in labor organizations. Some union constitutions have provided such protection for some time. Others have not. This booklet, which is an abridgment and simplification of "Roberts Rules of Order," explains for the benefit of union members how to practice the democratic rights, which are now guaranteed by Federal law.

The innovator of this valuable booklet is Mr. Maurice Franks, president of the

National Labor-Management Foundation; its author is Mr. Frederick C. Jonas, a distinguished and able member of the Chicago bar. It is being distributed by the National Labor Management Foundation located at 737 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Franks, who served over 20 years as a national officer with the railroad brotherhoods, recognized early the vital importance of union members understanding the basic rules of parliamentary procedure if they were to make effective use of the democratic guarantees contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill's bill of rights as recommended by the McClellan investigating committee. So he set to work with Lawyer Jonas to prepare this handy pocket-size booklet, containing a simplified yet thorough explanation of the fundamental and most-used rules of orderly parliamentary procedure. The finished product is a masterpiece of brevity and practicality, and I am confident that it will contribute much to the cause of democracy within the ranks of organized labor.

This booklet is small enough so that any union member or any citizen in any other meeting governed by parliamentary procedure can put it in his vest pocket and carry it with him. It gives him a quick and ready reference as to his rights as an individual citizen seeking to convince his associates, by democratic processes, of the justice of a position which he holds.

The table of contents suggests that the little book contains a Foreword, Rules of Order, Their Importance and Use; Who's in Charge? The Order of Business; Reading of the Minutes; Reports of Offices and Committee; Unfinished Business; New Business, Your Powers as a Member; Making a Motion; Discussion and Debate; Amending the Motion; Leave To Withdraw a Motion. It lists Privileged Motions; Appeal From Decision of the Chair; Voting; Balloting; Majority Vote or More; also a Ready Reference in Regard to Motions; Allowable Interruptions; Charges and Complaints; Effect of Charges; The Trial; Parliamentary Terms; Legal Rights of Union Members. There is a chapter entitled "Know your Rights"; and one entitled "How To Assert Your Rights."

Starting at page 51 there is a chapter entitled "Legal Rights of Union Members." It explains the specific rights guaranteed by law which every union member now has in every labor union of America as a consequence of the bill of rights which was included in the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that starting at page 51 of this little booklet, and running through page 59, the text be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

RULES OF ORDER

(By Frederick C. Jonas)

LEGAL RIGHTS OF UNION MEMBERS—SPECIFIC RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY LAW

While many organizations operate under their own adopted rules of procedure, free of Government regulations, others, including labor unions, are exceptions and are controlled in some degree by law.

A bill of rights for union members is written into Federal law to insure certain basic rights to union members within their union. So, regardless of parliamentary procedure under which union organizations are operated, these basic rights must be respected as the law of the land and override all other rules inconsistent therewith.

If you belong to a union, these rights are yours as guaranteed by Federal law:

1. Equal rights for all union members: As a union member in good standing, you have the right to attend meetings, nominate candidates, vote in election and have a voice in business transactions (subject to reasonable rules and regulations of the union).

2. Freedom of speech and assembly: You are guaranteed the right to meet and assemble freely with other members, express your views, arguments, and opinions at meetings, express views on candidates or business coming before the meeting (subject to reasonable rules and regulations of the union).

3. Dues, initiation fees, and assessments: In the case of a local labor organization, you are guaranteed the opportunity to vote on dues and initiation fees, and these cannot be increased except by majority vote and by secret ballot. You are entitled to notice of the intention to vote upon such questions.

4. Protection of the right to sue: You are guaranteed the right as a union member to sue in court or bring an action before an administrative body, even if the officers of the labor organization are defendants. You have a right to appear as a witness in any such suit or action. You have a right to petition any legislature or communicate with any legislator.

The only restriction as to suits is that you must first bring up the matter in the union meeting, provided the union has a reasonable procedure to take care of such suits or actions, and then the union must dispose of your action within a period of 4 months. If it does not, you can proceed on your own, without being placed in jeopardy.

5. Safeguards against improper disciplinary action: As a union member, you cannot be fined, suspended, expelled or disciplined by the union or its officers (except if you did not pay your dues); unless you have been (a) served with written specific charges; (b) given a reasonable time to prepare your defense; (c) afforded a full and fair hearing.

No union can deny a member these requirements and any provision in its constitution or bylaws inconsistent therewith is of no force and effect. Furthermore, the union cannot limit the right to sue, by its own rules, constitution or bylaws. These rights are guaranteed by law.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS—YOUR UNION MUST RESPECT THEM

Your union is required by statute to furnish information concerning the new labor law of 1959 to its members. You are also entitled to a copy of your bargaining agreement under which you work. The law requires certain reports to be filed with the U.S. Secretary of Labor which you may examine, and in order to verify the report, you may examine the books, records, and accounts of your union.

Fair elections

You are entitled by law to a reasonable opportunity to nominate candidates for office in your union.

Every member in good standing is eligible, provided he meets reasonable qualifications and provided he is not disqualified by other provisions of the law.

You have a right to one vote, and you may support the candidate of your choice without danger of any penalty or interference by anybody.

You are entitled to 15 days' notice of the holding of an election. Such notice shall be sent to you by mail at your last known address.

If you are a candidate for office

You can request your union, to distribute campaign literature, at your expense, to your membership by mail, or otherwise. The union must do this for all candidates who request it, so long as the candidates are willing to assume the expense.

If your union has a contract requiring membership as a condition of employment, it is required to keep a list of the union membership at its principal office. You, as a candidate for office, are entitled to inspect such membership list in the course of your campaign.

Also, as a candidate for office, you are entitled to have an observer at the polls and at the counting of the ballots.

HOW TO ASSERT YOUR RIGHTS—RESORT TO COURTS OR TO DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

If your rights are violated, you may sue in the Federal court in the district where your local union office is located.

If an elected officer of the union is guilty of serious misconduct, and the union, under its constitution and bylaws, does not have adequate machinery for his removal, you may apply to the U.S. Secretary of Labor to remove such officer. A letter addressed to the Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C., stating your case is sufficient. The Secretary of Labor will then conduct a hearing and the officer may be removed for cause shown in a secret-ballot election by the members. The Secretary of Labor may compel a vote to remove such officer by legal process.

After an election, a member may file a complaint with the Secretary of Labor charging a violation of the law or of the union's constitution and bylaws. The Secretary of Labor will investigate the complaint and, if it is meritorious, he may take appropriate legal action and the court may order a new election to be held under the supervision of the Secretary.

Should any union agent misappropriate union assets and should the union fail to take action against him, you, as a member, may sue in court for an accounting and other appropriate relief. Before doing so, you must obtain consent of the court to bring the suit. If you are allowed to proceed, you may, in a proper case, recover attorney's fees and expenses incurred.

Aside from any civil action, the law also provides a criminal penalty for misappropriation of union assets.

The foregoing are only the highlights of your rights as a union member under the present law. They are not intended as a complete presentation. For further information, reference is made to the complete text of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

TIME TO END HIGH INTEREST RATE POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve Board has been following a policy of credit stringency and restraint. Interest rates have been deliberately increased by the Fed. They have done this by keeping the supply of money strictly limited, as the demand for money swells with the surging rise of the gross national product that measures the uses of money.

The effect of this policy is to discourage the building of homes, hospitals, schools, and everything else that is bought with borrowed money. The policy has also greatly increased the cost of all of this building.

The Fed justifies this policy on the ground that the economy is suffering from an excess of demand. They contend that the availability of more money now would mean lower interest rates that lower interest rates would mean more borrowing to build with pressure on limited supply of manpower, factories and raw material capacity, a pressure that would shove up prices—causing inflation.

Is the Federal Reserve Board right? It there an excess of demand? Is there powerful pressure today on a limited supply of manpower? Are our factories going full blast? Is the buying pressure heavy in raw materials?

First Mr. President, there is certainly no excess of demand for manpower. The fact is that the latest figures available show that last month a seasonally adjusted 5.2 percent of the work force were out of work. This is more unemployed than our Nation has suffered during the past 10 years except in 4 obvious recession years.

Are our factories being pushed by demand near capacity? Of course the classic example is the steel industry. In the wake of a record long steel strike, the steel industry is now busily at work. But even here it is apparent that capacity is not being strained. Indeed, two steel executives last week estimated steel output this year at 120 million tons and 130 million tons—well below capacity of 149 million. Present near capacity production is obviously temporary. To replenish strike-exhausted inventories to meet current consumption 80 to 85 percent of capacity would be required.

The auto industry this year will operate far below its demonstrated 1955 capacity of 8 million cars.

Machine tools are expected, on the basis of new orders, to move along at only about two-thirds of capacity.

In raw material resources, generally falling or stable prices clearly show that there is no significant demand pressure.

The Nation's investors foresee all this. During the past few weeks the stock market has taken a serious nosedive.

This may very well foretell a significan industrial cutback in a few months. As the New York Times pointed out yesterday:

> Since 1948 market breaks have had "lead-times" over industrial breaks of 2 months, 7 months, and 7 months.

With a number of exceptions, the stock market has generally been as reliable a prognosticator of what is going to happen to jobs and profits in the future as there is available.

Mr. President, it is time to end this tight-money policy. It is doubtful if the excess demand that troubled the Fed so in the past has really been there in recent years. At any rate, it appears more obvious daily that there is no excess demand now. I have consistently said that the Fed should follow policies which will reduce interest rates so that homes and schools and hospitals can be built at less cost. Now I point out that even those who are indifferent to this objective should favor low interest rate policies so that the jobs of working people and the welfare of industry can be fostered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from yesterday's New York Times entitled "Action of Market Has Quick Trigger," be printed in the RECORD at this point and an analysis of current prospects for business this morning's Wall Street Journal also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

ACTION OF MARKET HAS QUICK TRIGGER—STOCK DIPS OFTEN PRECEDE DROPS IN FACTORY OUTPUT, LOOK AT CHARTS SHOWS PAST YEARS SCANNED—INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY AND SHARE PRICES FREQUENTLY MOVE IN OPPOSITION

(By Burton Crane)

Many new investors, if one may judge by letters and telephone calls to newspaper offices, are puzzled because industrialists are happy and brokers are gloomy.

"How," they ask, "can business go up and stocks go down at the same time?"

A hasty look at the past shows that industrial activity and stock prices rise together only about 36 percent of the time and fall together about 15 percent of the time. The rest of the time they are moving, as they are moving now, in opposite directions. These calculations, of course, ignore minor fluctuations. Only those of 5 percent or more are counted.

The normal procedure is for the market to try to look ahead. It listens when Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp., predicts booming production for the first two 1960 quarters but a drop in the third quarter as inventories near optimum levels. Which, investors ask themselves, do they want to buy, the present or the future?

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

In the past, the record shows, stocks have rather regularly dipped from their peaks before industrial production has eased off. The record also shows that, now and again, investors have been too nervous and have sold stocks long before the economy was ready to coast downhill.

In June 1946, for example, stocks reached a peak and began to move lower. Measured by the New York Times industrial stock average, they didn't get back to that level for 47 months and in between they had a break (in 20 months) of 26.3 percent. But the peak in the stock market came 26 months before the peak in the industrial production index of the Federal Reserve Board. In fact, stocks started upward from their trough 6 months before production hit its high for the time being.

If the investor were to ignore what happened in 1946 and start his researches with 1948 he would discover what looks like a more normal relationship. And perhaps that is the wise thing to do, because almost everybody was wrong about the postwar situation. The economists did not expect the people to spend their wartime savings for cars and refrigerators and television sets, giving the apparently valid reason that they never before had had net dissavings except in time of dire necessity. But the people spent and the experts were wrong.

The word dissaving is used by economists to describe a condition in which the savings of past years are drawn down. Thus the figure for savings in the tabulation of personal income would appear with a minus sign when spending topped income.

The stock market dipped from its high in June 1948. Two months later the economy was also on the way down. The market fell for 12 months and took 16 months to get back to its old high level. The dip from peak to trough was 15.4 percent.

The market lost 15.7 percent from its December 1952, high, starting downward 7 months before the industrial index. It took 15 months to regain that old high.

The collapse in September 1955, caused by President Eisenhower's heart attack brought about a 13.1 percent loss but the market was back to its prebreak level by the end of the year. Industrial production had no bearing here.

The next two market breaks are a little confusing if considered separately. The one that peaked out in August 1956, had a lead time over the break in industrial production of 7 months. From peak to trough, it lost 11.7 percent. The market that peaked out in July 1957, dropped 22.4 percent in 5 months. The industrial production peak to which it must be related, however, was the same as that for the 1956 break. It came in March 1957, which means that stocks had a minus lead time of 4 months. It is easier, perhaps, to consider the 1956 and 1957 markets as one. That would give a lead time of 7 months and a break of 23.3 percent over 16 months. Stocks took 24 months to return to the August 1956 high.

The following table, using the Times industrial stock average and the Federal Reserve industrial production index, shows these two markets that need to be considered as one:

Stocks

High, August 1956	596
Low, February 1957	526
Recovery,[1] November 1958	605
High, July 1957	589
Low, December 1957	457
Recovery,[1] November 1958	605

[1] Date of return to old high.

Industry

High, March 1957	155
Low, April 1958	132
Recovery,[1] March 1959	157
High, March 1957	155
Low, April 1958	132
Recovery,[1] March 1959	157

[1] Date of return to old high.

The present situation is complicated by the recent steel strike. In June 1959 the industrial production index was 166. In December it was 165, climbing back, and probably has made a new high in January,. The industrial stock average had its high in August at 737 and fell to 651 in September, a loss of 11.7 percent. Last week it slipped back enough to threaten those old September lows.

Since 1948, market breaks have had lead times over industrial breaks of 2 months, 7 months, and 7 months. If stocks drop below their September low and if industry now moves above its June high, the technicians can say that a lead time of 5 months has already been established.

But investors can always remember what happened in 1946. Perhaps business can continue on upward for another 21 months and force them to reconsider all their policies.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 1, 1960]

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Several news items in recent days have added considerably to public knowledge of the current status of business in the United States. But unfortunately, this new information throws no fresh light on prospects for the year as a whole, which remain quite uncertain.

As most readers know, a pretty high rate of activity is fairly well assured for the early

part of the year, but a big question mark hangs over the later months. During the first 5 to 7 months, inventory rebuilding in steel itself and in numerous steel products is likely to give an extra stimulus. But after that, production may actually fall a bit below current consumption if businessmen decide to adjust their inventories by cutting down where accumulation has been heaviest.

At that time, many analysts hope, capital spending for improvements and expansion of plant and equipment will take up the slack. This hope is based in part on the fact that the trend of such outlays is upward. From the 1957 high of $37 billion they fell to $30 billion in 1958, then rose to $32 billion last year, with each quarter showing a small advance over the preceding one. A further increase to an annual rate of $34 billion is indicated for the current quarter.

Another encouraging factor is that such outlays generally swing up and down with business profits, and the first half of this year is expected to be highly profitable, which would tend to expand capital spending in subsequent months. And finally, estimates of a number of industries—except the huge petroleum industry—are for a substantial gain in capital spending for this year over 1959. The steel companies, for instance, expect to invest $1.6 billion this year against less than $1 billion last year.

However—and this is where the news items cited above have a bearing on the outlook—there is widespread evidence of ample capacity for the production of major goods, both raw and finished. Obviously, it is when capacity is being strained that business managers are most likely to plan new plants and facilities. When capacity is sufficient, this pressure to expand relaxes and capital spending is more likely to concentrate on improvements in efficiency.

That seems to be the case today. Two steelmakers this past week estimated their industry's output this year, one at 120 million tons and the other at 130 million. Both figures are well below capacity of almost 149 million. The current high rate of output is concededly due in part to restocking of inventories which were almost completely used up during the strike that ended November 7. To meet current consumption, steel output of 80 or 85 percent of capacity apparently would be sufficient.

In copper and nickel, whose markets are worldwide but in which American capital is heavily engaged, indications of ample capacity are clear. Free world nickel use in 1959 was estimated a few days ago at about 400 million pounds, or 25 percent more than in 1958, but capacity exceeds the 1959 consumption by 150 million pounds, and more capacity is being added. The copper trade insists that with the past year's long strikes ending, output is going to be substantially greater than consumption while inventories, as in steel, are being built up again.

The automobile industry produced almost 8 million cars in 1955, and since then has added to its capacity. But last year's output in this country was only a little more than 5.5 million cars, and even the most optimistic projections for this year fall well short of the 1955 figure.

Machine tool orders in 1959 totaled only $660 million as compared with shipments of almost $1.1 billion in the most recent big year, 1957. And the recent rate of new orders does not suggest any sharp expansion. This fact is important, not only as another example of capacity greater than demand, but also because upsurges in spending on plants and equipment are often led by upsurges in ordering of machine tools. Thus the most recent figures in this industry do not suggest any big increase in capital spending ahead.

With this whole background, it seems likely business executives will be pretty careful about their capital spending. Knowing that production during much if not all of the first half of the year will probably be in excess of basic demand, they are likely to wait and see. They may want to know by how much production outruns consumption before coming to any decisions on major expansions. They may decide to wait not only until the first 6 months are past, but also until the trend of business after that has become clear, which might mean waiting through much of the second half.

None of this means, of course, that capital spending will shrink to a trickle. Major industries nowadays plan such outlays on a long range basis to a great extent. They feel that regardless of the yearly ups and downs of business they must plan through the years for a very large minimum of annual spending to meet the demands of a growing population and an even more rapidly growing economic system.

But what we are discussing here is the prospect for an upsurge in the later months of this year that would offset the almost certain stoppage of inventory building in late spring or in summer. It is such an upsurge in capital spending that there is doubt about, and the doubt is not likely to be resolved for quite a few months.

This doubt, furthermore, tends to be intensified by the fact that this is not only an election year, but one where a substantial change in the political background is possible. The Eisenhower years have been for the most part years of prosperity. If the Democrats win the Presidency, sharp changes in national policies may well have to be faced. And if the Republicans win, there will also be a new man in the White House, whose policies in the detail of their application cannot be made known fully in a political campaign, no matter how openly he may lay his ideas before the people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). 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.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, "freedom of the press" is a phrase which by constitutional mandate has been an integral part of the American idea and purpose since the enactment of the Bill of Rights. Americans take it for granted.

However, we ought occasionally to note that freedom of the press connotes and stimulates excellence in the reporting and interpreting of current events.

An example, in my view, of such superlative craftsmanship appeared yesterday in the New York Times, in an article written by one of its ablest Washington correspondents, James Reston, entitled "The Strings in Mr. NIXON's Bow."

Mr. President, my interest in this article arises not from any political or partisan motives, for I believe this article to be a balanced presentation, free from bias. As a former newspaperman, my appreciation of it is based on its masterful literary qualities. It is an example of the kind of lively, penetrating analysis, spiced with wit and humor, which makes James Reston's columns such pleasant reading, and otherwise notable.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE STRINGS IN MR. NIXON'S BOW

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—At 8:20 p.m. last Wednesday in Chicago Vice President NIXON threw down the gauntlet to the spenders at home, and promised to leave no stone unturned overseas.

Until merrier cliches come along—and they will—these will have to serve both as an indication of Mr. NIXON's style and his problem.

His problem in this election is to have two strings to his bow, to come out flatfooted for Eisenhower and still be cock of the walk; to carry water on both shoulders without upsetting the applecart; to fish in, and pour oil on, troubled waters; to defend the past and take time by the forelock without falling between two stools; and, of course, to bring home the bacon through thick and thin.

All this is enough to make strong men quiver, but Mr. NIXON is the kind of fellow who can steer between Scylla and Charybdis and take both precincts. His performance in Chicago was a masterpiece of political gymnastics and illustrates once more that, as a tactician, he is about the best in the business.

MASTER AT WORK

Not many men can both condemn and outpromise the spenders and get away with it, but Mr. NIXON made a good try in Chicago. He virtually canonized the President. He scorned the opposition. He defended the past as the best 7 years of our lives and then painted a picture of the future that made these 7 years look like a depression.

For the last month the Democrats have been scattering boobytraps for Mr. NIXON all over the landscape. He dodged them, every one.

Defending the President's leadership in the present mood of the country is about as difficult as praising George Washington, but Mr. NIXON rushes to his defense, anyway.

Shame, he says, painting a word picture of the President stamping out war in Korea, rushing to the defense of Lebanon, Quemoy, Matsu, and Suez, flying off to Panama when he was sick, keeping his head when all around were losing theirs. And who do you suppose was at the President's side when he was doing all this?

Not since the days of Red Grange has the State of Illinois seen such agility in a broken field. We do not have a second-rate defense, he asserted, but we must submit our national security programs to a searching, month-to-month reexamination.

The American educational system is the best in the world, but inadequate classrooms, underpaid teachers and flabby standards are weaknesses we must constantly strive to eliminate.

American agriculture, he added, is the most productive on earth but there is no higher priority than a complete overhauling of obsolete farm programs.

In short, he managed to call for many of the things the Democrats are demanding without any suggestion that he was criticizing the President on defense or schools, or the Secretary of Agriculture on the farm policy. Bigger programs were advocated and more Government spending condemned, and this may not be as contradictory as it

seems, for with revenues rising, the next President may have a substantial surplus in the Treasury.

A SKILLFUL ARGUMENT

Mr. NIXON's argument was not only skillful but in a way it was unavoidable. He cannot avoid defense of the present level of spending.

He must support his President's policies, but at the same time he has to keep from being sideswiped by the Democratic charges that he is satisfied with everything as it is.

He dealt with this effectively in Chicago:

"We shall look upon our record not as our ultimate achievement but as the solid foundation upon which to build even greater accomplishments in the future. Why is America a great nation today? Because we Americans have never lived in the past. We are never content to rest on our laurels. We never like to settle for being second best in anything."

Against this kind of thing, the Democrats have their problems. They think the country is sick, but it is like a sick man who feels good and is told constantly by his doctor that he's in wonderful shape.

Mr. NIXON is exploiting this feeling to the hilt. We're living the life of Riley, he says (forgetting that Riley was probably a Democrat), so why look a gift horse in you know what, or change horses in you know where?

FRANCE UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENT DE GAULLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Friday I made some remarks about the importance of France being able, under the great leadership of President de Gaulle, to carry out his farsighted plan for self-determination in Algeria. Unfortunately, a minority of the minority of Algerians of French descent, with the assistance of a small group of military dissidents, launched a revolt against the Fifth Republic using as a pretext General de Gaulle's enlightened proposal to let all the people of Algeria determine—once peace has been reestablished—their own destiny, whether it be complete independence, association with France in a commonwealth status or integration with France.

Mr. President, what should be understood is that if this rebellion were to succeed—it might mean the fall of the De Gaulle government, the ending of the Fifth Republic and a return to the administrative chaos which has afflicted France in the 15 years since World War II. During this period, governments fell every few months.

The coming of De Gaulle to head the French Republic has demonstrated anew and most strikingly the patent, but not always appreciated, fact that democracy in order to function well must have leadership. General de Gaulle, who became President by the free choice at the polls of the French people, has furnished just such leadership. As a result of it France has acquired a political and economic stability which should be heartening to the free world. For without France the free world—the Western World in particular—would be in a tragically weakened position.

Mr. President, there has been some criticism on the part of this administration because of what it deemed France's presumed inadequate participation in NATO. I grant that a fuller participation is desirable, but I submit that that cooperation is far more likely to be obtained, as under De Gaulle's inspiring leadership France is strengthened, and that U.S. support of De Gaulle's policies will contribute substantially to that strengthening. It would seem to me fairly apparent that President de Gaulle's lesser participation in NATO has been caused in no small degree by our own Government's coolness toward France's obvious requirements as seen by that nation's chief, and it must be crystal clear that if the government of De Gaulle were to fall, France's contribution to NATO and the Western alliance would probably cease to exist.

Fortunately, the news from France and Algiers indicates that while the situation is still full of peril, France is winning out, the revolt of the "colons" is obviously lacking in support and that order and peace will again be established.

President de Gaulle's radio address to the people of France on his Algerian policy is a document of historic importance. It may determine the course of history not only for France, but for much of Africa, and because of France's key position in the turbulence of contemporary events for the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that General de Gaulle's speech be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GENERAL DE GAULLE ON ALGERIAN POLICY

If I have put on my uniform today to address you on television, it is in order to show that it is General de Gaulle who speaks, as well as the chief of state.

In Algeria, we are fighting against a rebellion which has lasted more than 5 years. France is valiantly continuing to exert the necessary efforts to put down that rebellion.

But she wants to arrive at a peace that is peace; to do what has to be done so that the tragedy does not begin all over again; to act in such a way as not—when all is said and done—to lose Algeria, which would be a disaster for us and for the West. The world, a prey to vast crises and movements which are well known, is watching this struggle which disturbs it and in which the various opposing camps seek to take a hand. It is obvious that the unity, progress, and prestige of the French people are at stake, and that the future of this people is blocked as long as the Algerian problem remains unsolved.

Taking all this into consideration, I, in the name of France, made the following decision: The Algerians shall have free choice of their destiny. When, one way or another—through the conclusion of a cease-fire or through total defeat of the rebels—we shall have put an end to the fighting, when later, after a prolonged period of restored peace, the populations will have had a chance to understand what is at stake and, moreover, thanks to us, to achieve the necessary progress in the political, economic, social, educational, and other fields—then, it will be the Algerians who will say what they want to be. This will not be dictated to them. For if their response were not really their response, then while for a time there might well be military victory, basically nothing would be settled. On the contrary, everything can be settled and, I believe, settled in France's favor, when the Algerians will have had an opportunity to make known their will in all freedom, dignity, and security. In short, self-determination is the only policy that is worthy of France. It is the only possible outcome. It is the policy which has been defined by the President of the Republic, decided upon by the Government, approved by the Parliament, and adopted by the French nation.

Now then, there are two categories of people who do not want any part of this free choice.

First, the rebel organization, which maintains that it will cease fire only if I negotiate with it beforehand, by special prerogative, on the political destiny of Algeria, which would be tantamount to building it up as the only valid representative and to elevating it in advance to being the government of the country. That I will not do.

On the other hand, some persons of French descent demand that I renounce the idea of self-determination, that I say that everything has been done and that the fate of the Algerians has already been decided. That I will not do either. Self-determination is the only means by which the Moslems can themselves cast out the demon of secession. As to the terms of this or that French solution, I mean to have them worked out at leisure, when peace has been restored. After which, I reserve the right to commit myself—when the right time comes—for whatever I shall consider good. You may be sure that I will do this thoroughly.

It was then that, trying to force their pretended claims on the nation, on the state, and on myself, certain people in Algiers started an insurrection; it was then that they fired on the forces of law and order and killed fine soldiers, and they are now rising up in arms against the authority of France. Aided in the beginning by the accommodating uncertainty of various military elements, and profiting from the fears and feverish passions stirred up by agitators, they have thus far obtained the support of part of the European population; they have instigated a forced strike, the halting of transportation and the closing of stores. Because of them, there is danger that a disruption of the national unity may occur, to the indignation of the French nation and in the very midst of the struggle being waged against the rebels. There is not a man with any common sense who does not see what the inevitable consequences would be if this dreadful secession carried the day.

In face of the foul blow that has thus been struck against France, I speak first of all to the community of French descent in Algeria. This community has known me for many years. It has seen me many times in its midst, especially during the war, when its sons, in great numbers, were serving in the ranks of the Army of Liberation, or else when, following their upheaval of May 1958, I once again assumed leadership of France in order to rebuild the unity of Frenchmen on both shores of the Mediterranean. Whatever any agitators are trying to make this community believe, there are, between it and myself, very special ties that are very dear to me and very much alive. I know perfectly well what services this community renders France through its century of toil in Algeria, what cruel trials it is undergoing, what moving sorrow it has for the victims it mourns. But I must speak to this community in plain and unmistakable words.

Frenchmen of Algeria, how can you listen to the liars and the conspirators who tell you that in granting a free choice to the Algerians, France and De Gaulle want to abandon you, to pull out of Algeria and hand it over to the rebellion? Is it abandoning you, is it wanting to lose Algeria, to send there and to maintain there an army of 500,000 men equipped with tremendous amounts of materiel; to consent to the sacrifice there of a good many of our children; to pay out there,

this very year, civil and military expenditures amounting to a thousand billion (old francs), to undertake there a tremendous program of development; to draw from the Sahara, with great difficulty and at great expense, oil and gas in order to bring them to the sea?

How can you doubt that if, some day, the Moslems freely and formally decide that the Algeria of tomorrow must be closely united to France—how can you doubt that anything would bring greater joy to our country and to De Gaulle than to see them choose, between one solution or another, the one that would be the most French? How can you deny that all the work for the development of the Moslem populations, which was initiated 18 months ago, and is now still being pursued and which, after pacification, will have to be expanded yet more—how can you deny that this work tends precisely to create new and manifold ties between France and the Algerians? Above all else, how can you fail to see that, in rising up against the state and against the nation, you are surely heading toward ruin and at the same time you are running the risk of causing France to lose Algeria at the very moment when the decline of the rebellion is becoming evident? I solemnly appeal to you to return to law and order.

Next, I speak to the army, which, thanks to its magnificent efforts, is in the process of winning the victory in Algeria; however, some of the elements of this army might be tempted to think that this war is their war, not France's war, and that they have a right to a policy which would not be France's policy. To all our soldiers I say: In your mission there is no room for any equivocation or interpretation. You must liquidate the rebel force, which is seeking to drive France out of Algeria and to impose upon that land its dictatorship of want and sterility. At the same time that you are conducting the battle, you must contribute to the material and spiritual transformation of the Moslem populations so as to win their hearts and minds to France. When the time comes for the people to vote, it will be your responsibility to guarantee the complete freedom and sincerity of this vote.

Yes, that is your mission, as France gives it to you, and it is France that you serve. What would the French Army become but an anarchic and absurd conglomeration of military feudalisms, if it should happen that certain elements made their loyalty conditional? As you know, I have the supreme responsibility. It is I who bear the country's destiny. I must therefore be obeyed by every French soldier. I believe that I shall be obeyed, because I know you, because I have a high regard for you, because I feel affection for you, because I have confidence in General Challe whom I have placed at your head, soldiers of Algeria, and finally, because I have need of you for France.

This having been said, listen to me carefully. In the presence of the insurrection in Algiers and in the midst of the agitation—bordering on a paroxism—the Delegate General, M. Paul Delouvrier, who is France in Algeria, and the commander in chief may, on their own responsibility, not have wanted to give the signal themselves for a pitched battle, but no soldier, under penalty of being guilty of a serious fault, may associate himself at any time, even passively, with the insurrection. In the last analysis, law and order must be reestablished. The methods to be employed so that law and order will prevail may be of various sorts. But your duty is to bring this about. I have given, and am giving, this order.

Finally, I speak to France. Well, my dear country, my old country, here we are together, once again, facing a harsh test. By virtue of the mandate that the people have given me and of the national legitimacy that I have embodied for 20 years, I ask all men and women to support me, no matter what happens.

And while the guilty ones, who dream of being usurpers, take as a pretext the decision that I have made concerning Algeria, let it be known everywhere, let it be clearly understood, that I do not intend to go back on that decision. To yield on this point and under these conditions would be to destroy the trump cards that we still hold in Algeria, but it would also be to make the state bow before the outrage that is being inflicted on it and the threat that is aimed at it. Thus France would become but a poor broken toy adrift on the sea of hazards.

Once again, I call upon all Frenchmen, wherever they may be, whoever they may be, to reunite themselves to France.

Long live the Republic.

Long live France.

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY BEFORE THE JOINT ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE ON JANUARY 30, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the body of the RECORD a very notable address made by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, before the joint assembly of the Virginia Legislature commemorative session on January 30.

This address was delivered in the old hall of the House of Burgesses at Williamsburg, Va.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ROBERT B. ANDERSON BEFORE THE JOINT ASSEMBLY OF THE LEGISLATURE, COMMEMORATIVE SESSION, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., JANUARY 30, 1960

I am honored to participate in this commemorative meeting of the oldest continuous elective body in existence in the free world.

With every nation, the edifice of government, like the structure of buildings, rests on certain essential foundations. Every nation from time to time must reaffirm its values and its sense of purpose by reexamining the principles on which its structure of government stands.

You in the Virginia Legislature have a distinguished ancestry in the history of our Government. The Virginia House of Burgesses, which once met in this hall, became the pattern for many of the States of the Union and for the United States. Certainly no area of the country has contributed more to the foundations of our Government than the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I should like to pay a special tribute to the contribution to maintaining the foundations of our Government provided by the leadership of the distinguished delegates of Virginia to the Congress of the United States. Your Senators serve as outstanding chairmen on some of the most responsible committees of the Congress and several Members of the House of Representatives contribute with equal significance in their chairmanship of committees with whom the Treasury is directly concerned. The congressional delegation from Virginia and the other distinguished leaders of your State represent the highest traditions of sound government in action.

A Virginian wrote the Declaration of Independence, which placed clearly before the world not only the justification for our revolt against foreign tyranny, but the "new guards" which were to be established against tyranny in the future. A Virginian inspired the fighting spirit of the American Army through the ringing words of Patrick Henry. And from Virginia came the great American who was first Commander in Chief, first President, and for many years before that a member of this legislative body.

We may be sure that almost every phase of the Government which later emerged as that of the United States of America was carefully weighed by the distinguished group serving in the Virginia House of Burgesses in the years just before the formation of the Union. Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee—these were among the illustrious citizens of Virginia who met together informally in this city and worked together in the House of Burgesses to the end that the first truly free government in the history of the world should "stand firm on its bottom."

"To form a new government requires infinite care and unbounded attention," Washington wrote, shortly after he had left Virginia to take command of the Army, "* * * for if the foundation is badly laid the superstructure must be bad. Too much time, therefore, cannot be bestowed in weighing and digesting matters well." Commenting later on the Virginia act for religious freedom, Jefferson wrote to Madison from his post in Paris that Virginians should be proud of having produced "the first legislature who had the courage to declare, that the reason of man may be trusted with the formation of his own opinions. * * *" And considering these matters later, Jefferson added, "* * * *No experiment can be more interesting than that we are now trying, and which we trust will end in establishing the fact, that man may be governed by reason and truth."

A free people, governing themselves on the basis of reason and truth—that was the foundation stone of the new edifice. But let us remember that those who formulated the principles of the new Government were eminently practical men. They had to be. For they were not only building a structure which was entirely new, and which they meant to last; they were building for humanity. "Our cause is noble. It is the cause of mankind * * *" wrote Washington during the dark days of 1779. And again, in his first inaugural address, the President reaffirmed his deeply felt belief that liberty itself, as well as "the republican model of government," is "finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

It was in this spirit of dedication to the future that the members of the new Government settled down to tackle the hard problems of the present. Not the least of these was the question of sound money and the public credit.

Does this issue sound familiar? Not only today, but on many other occasions in the past 175 years, the sound money question has been in the forefront of public discussion. The persistence of this issue in the changing economic scene is simply another illustration of the fact that the great principles of political freedom and self-government do not perpetuate themselves automatically. Each generation must earn all over again its heritage of freedom. A government of reason means that its people must make the hard decisions, under ever-changing circumstances, to grapple with difficult problems as they appear. They cannot delude themselves with the mistaken belief that such problems can safely be passed on to the future.

Today, there are indications that the sound money question may become one of the great issues of the 1960's. Because of the far-reaching implications of this issue, we cannot remind ourselves too often of the basic principles which are at stake. It is for this reason that I would like to review

with you today some of the financial traditions which we inherited along with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

The first financial principle which had to be established in word and fact by the new Government of the United States was that all proper debts incurred during the revolutionary period must be acknowledge in full and "funded" into obligations of the Federal Government.

No patriotic American of those days regretted the cost of the war. It was "the price of liberty," as Hamilton put it. There had been a serious inflation. Credit was virtually destroyed, both at home and abroad. The States were strongly opposed to taxation by Federal authority. Bonds representing the national debt were selling in the market at 10 cents on the dollar or less. Money was needed immediately both to pay the expenses of the new Government and to meet the demands of foreign creditors.

Backed by the President, and in the face of an often hostile public opinion, Hamilton set out not only to establish the public credit and the currency of the United States on a sound basis, but to educate the Nation on the importance of this step. The French statesman Talleyrand, returning to France after a visit to America in the early days of the Republic, remarked to friends that it was one of the "wonders of the world" to see Alexander Hamilton—whom he called "a man who has made the future of a nation"—laboring all night at the problems he was trying to solve. Passing the Secretary's office in Philadelphia late one evening, Talleyrand had seen the light burning—and then had found Hamilton hard at work early in the morning. To appreciate this incident—and many similar ones—we may recall Washington's words:

"Whatever my own opinion may be," the President wrote "it always has been * * * my earnest desire to learn, and, as far as is consistent, to comply with, the public sentiment." But "it is only after time has been given for cool and deliberate reflection, that the real voice of the people can be known." Hamilton, in his "Reports on the Public Credit," set out to provide the strongest possible basis for cool and deliberate reflection.

First of all, he strove to make clear the fundamental importance to the new Nation of an unassailable credit position. On the day that Hamilton took office the Government was faced with bills for $78 million—a towering sum in those days, and a burden of debt which many people felt the country would be incapable of undertaking. Repudiation of the debt in whole or in part was strongly urged.

Perhaps no more courageous step was ever taken by a financial statesman than Hamilton's action committing the country to accept its obligations in full. "* * * The true definition of public debts is a property subsisting in the faith of the Government," Hamilton wrote. "Its essence is promise. Its definite value depends upon the reliance that the promise will be definitely fulfilled."

We may take note of that phrase, "definitely fulfilled" not evaded or postponed in some vague way to the future. Nor settled in a currency debased by inflation. And in this as in other matters affecting the public credit, Hamilton was supported by the great moral force of George Washington. Debts may be incurred in "unavoidable wars" the President observed at a later time, looking back over the early problems of the Government. But the country should make "vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts—not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden, which we ourselves ought to bear." Good faith, responsibility, trustworthiness, these were the precepts which the leaders of the new Nation felt must be built into the very foundation of a Government resting on reason and truth, if that Government was to last.

Then as now, there was no magic formula. "* * * it is essential that you should practically bear in mind," Washington told his fellow citizens in his Farewell Address, "that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised, which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant."

Hamilton, in his second "Report on the Public Credit," had expressed the same thought a little differently. "To extinguish a debt which exists, and to avoid contracting more," he observed rather drily, "are ideas always favored by public feeling and opinion; but to pay taxes for one or the other purpose is always, more or less, unpopular." Hence it is common, he added, "to see the same men clamoring for occasions of expense," who are also "declaiming against a public debt, and for the reduction of it as an abstract thesis; yet vehement against every plan of taxation which is proposed to discharge old debts, or to avoid new." Allowing for the formality of 18th century language, it must be admitted that this comment is pertinent to many situations encountered today. But, as Hamilton adds, "These contradictions are in human nature."

The second financial principle then—following on a sound funding of all just debts—was a public revenue sufficient to cover the debt management program as well as the necessary expenses of Government. And finally, there was the inescapable third measure—"true economy and system in the public expenditures" which would make it necessary to resort to credit, as Washington pointed out, "as sparingly as possible." Even Jefferson, whose views differed from those of Hamilton in so many respects, stated in unequivocal terms: "I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the public debt."

These, then, were the essentials of the program of financial integrity which the President and the Secretary of the Treasury put before the Nation—restoration of public credit, the adoption of adequate measures for maintaining it in a sound condition, and economy in Government thereafter. On this program, Hamilton was convinced, depended not only the Government's financial soundness, but the future prosperity of the entire country. Hamilton, in fact, was far ahead of his time in perceiving the importance of credit in fostering the growth of a new and underdeveloped Nation as well as the close relationship between the Government's financial condition and monetary conditions in the private economy. "Public and private credit are closely allied, if not inseparable," he wrote in his second report urging support for sound financial principles. "A shock to public credit * * * by the * * * disorders, distrusts, and false principles, which it would engender and disseminate," would undermine private credit also; for "Credit is an entire thing; every part of it has the nicest sympathy with the other part; wound one limb, and the whole tree shrinks and decays."

In the light of our long experience in wrestling with monetary and credit problems in the years since Hamilton's program was undertaken—and in the light of experiences in other countries also—it would seem that we should have arrived at a more profound wisdom on these matters than the founders of our country could have possessed. But I believe that it would be difficult to find anywhere a clearer statement of principle applicable to our own times than was set forth in the documents and programs of Washintgon's first and second administrations. The details of the programs required for fiscal and economic soundness have indeed changed. But the guiding precepts are as applicable to current problems as they were 175 years ago.

We are hearing now, for example, that inflation has little or no bearing on prosperity; that we should, by public expenditure, force an ever more rapid expansion in the American economy—regardless of whether these expenditures can be paid for out of revenue or not. We are being told that inflation in modern times is a new inflation, and that old principles for maintaining price stability do not apply.

But the plea for excessive deficit spending as a national policy is far from new. I suppose really it is about as old as Government itself. But to look back only into our own history, we find Hamilton toward the end of his first report on the public credit speaking out against those who urge that, once the war debts are funded, public debts are public benefits. In the view of Hamilton, this is a position inviting to prodigality, and liable to dangerous abuse; a position that holds the possibility of undermining all that had been accomplished in building the financial character of the Nation up to that time.

In the years since the formation of the Union we have passed from the position of a small and weak debtor Nation to one of world leadership—financially, economically, and in a military sense. Yet it is still true—and possibly in a more immediate sense than ever before—that the future of freedom is entrusted to the hands of the American people.

What does this mean in practical terms, in our times? It means that we must maintain an economic position of impregnable strength. Now, as in 1789, fiscal soundness is basic to economic strength. History shows us that every nation which has ignored this lesson has had to pay for its mistake in a long and bitter battle to retrieve position. I can see no evidence whatever that our own generation can provide an exception.

Just as the founders of our country perceived for their own time, so we, too, must recognize that a government can do none of the things which are necessary and desirable for a sustained period unless it is supported by a sound economy based on sound money. Only under these conditions can the necessary and desirable programs of the Government—be they military security, general services to the public, or mutual assistance to our allies—long be maintained for the enduring benefit of all Americans.

Moreover, we must recognize that not growth as an end in itself but growth in the output of goods and services people want and need must be the primary goal of economic policy. Sustained growth of this nature in the future depends heavily on a high rate of saving and capital formation today. It requires that the monetary unit in which investments are made and savings accumulated command confidence at home and abroad. Our rate of growth will be small indeed if fear of inflation is allowed to impair the will to save in traditional dollar forms. Inflation, either creeping or rapid, is the enemy of growth.

With prudent management of our affairs, both public and private, there is every reason for great confidence in our future. Certainly our economy is growing vigorously. Certainly our vast natural resources, and the vision and inventiveness of our people, give real hope for tremendous progress in the years ahead. If we act properly, there is no reason why we should not move strongly ahead, on the foundations established by our early leaders, to the greatest opportunities in our history.

As we go about our present tasks, both at home and in the performance of our international duties, we would do well to recall the words of Washington in a letter addressed to Lafayette in 1783: "We stand, now, an independent people. We are placed among the nations of the earth, and have a

character to establish; but how we shall acquit ourselves, time must discover." Thirteen years later, in his farewell message, Washington addressed this question to the people: "Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. * * * It is well worth a full and fair experiment."

We in our generation can have no higher goal than that of performing our part in this experiment in a manner worthy of our great heritage.

NEED FOR CLOSER TIES BETWEEN AMERICAN AND AFRICAN PEOPLES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during my recent trip to Africa, I had the great honor of meeting with the leaders of some of the newly independent, developing nations of that continent. None was more impressive than President Sekou Toure of the Republic of Guinea.

President Toure knows and understands the problems which an emerging nation must face. He has the determination and foresight which, I am sure, will meet the challenges of the future in a manner that will benefit his nation and the world.

President Toure made a lasting impression on those who met him during his recent tour of this country. This trip was an example of what can be done between nations if there is a mutual exchange of ideas and plans.

I hope that there will be many more such visits and exchanges between our peoples and those of the African nations.

We must also send our best representatives to serve in these countries—men like John Morrow, who is doing such a fine job as our Ambassador to Guinea.

President Toure gave me a message of thanks to our people for the reception accorded him and the delegation from Guinea on their recent trip to the United States. In this message he expresses the hope that the mutual understanding which resulted from the visit will lead to closer ties between the American and African peoples.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of December 16, 1959, from President Sekou Toure of the Republic of Guinea to the American people and Government be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT, SEKOU TOURE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA

We were very happy to receive, on the 14th of December, a visit from Mr. SYMINGTON to Conakry during his short stay in Guinea.

We shall use this occasion to express again the absolute gratitude toward the American Government and people for the enthusiastic and sincere reception paid to the delegation of Guinea during that highly memorable tour to the United States.

This tour, as well as our contacts with diplomatic, economic, and cultural circles, and also labor leaders, have brought us to the firm conclusion that the mutual understanding gained through these contacts will enable us to promote a further and closer cooperation between the American and African peoples.

We are convinced that this cooperation will establish happiness and peace for our respective continents, and the rest of the world.

This is the message we address to the industrious and sympathetic people of America and her Government.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of its unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the joint resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, rarely has a piece of major legislation come before this body with the broad, diverse support that the pending proposal—the so-called Holland anti-poll-tax amendment—appears to command. The list of sponsors of the amendment reads almost like a rollcall of the Senate. All wings of all parties seem to be well represented among the proponents. This amendment, above any others which have been before the Senate in several years, calls to mind the old adage about strange bedfellows.

It is seldom a comfortable feeling to be in a hopeless minority. It is even less comfortable to face a majority which includes many good friends and staunch allies in other important, hard-fought legislative battles. That, unhappily, is the painful predicament in which I find myself today. It is a predicament from which there is no escape. From the distinguished and formidable support announced for this measure, I have not the slightest doubt at all that it will receive the requisite number of votes if it is submitted to the Senate for its approval. Yet I would be compelled to cast my vote against the amendment, even if I were to stand alone in doing so.

The proposed amendment, if approved by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States, would say to five States of the Union: "You are no longer permitted to devise your taxes in accordance with the judgment of your State legislatures. You cannot levy a tax as a prerequisite for voting, as the Constitution has allowed you to do since 1789. From now on, you are compelled to conform to the policy which we have devised for you outside the borders of your State. From this day hence, you will do what the majority tells you to do, whether you like it or not."

Mr. President, I have stated bluntly exactly what the pending amendment proposes. It is an effort by the majority to impose and enforce its will upon the minority by rewriting a provision of the Constitution of the United States.

I, for one, refuse to be a party to any attempt at constitutional coercion and to enforce compulsory conformity. I regard such measures as inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution, incompatible with the philosophy of the Founding Fathers, and hostile to the fundamental precepts of our dual system of government.

Certain factors regarding the proposed amendment should be made clear from the outset.

First, the State of Georgia would not be directly affected by the passage and ratification of the amendment. The poll tax as a requirement for voting was abolished by the legislature and the people of Georgia 15 years ago. Georgia is not one of the 5 States which this amendment seeks to coerce.

I may say that until the time I served as Governor of my State in 1931, the Constitution of Georgia required that all taxes due the State—not simply the $1 head tax, but all taxes—be paid before any person would be qualified to exercise the franchise. During my administration, that practice was changed by the people of the State of Georgia; and later, in 1945, the poll tax itself was eliminated.

Second, I myself hold no brief for the poll tax, either as a qualification for voting or as a revenue measure. I think it is an outmoded method of raising revenue, and I do not approve of the general policy of applying it as a qualification for voting. That is my feeling now, and it was my feeling in 1942, when the same issue was before the Senate prior to the time Georgia abolished the poll tax. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the debate in 1942, in which I stated:

The poll tax provision should perhaps be repealed, but insofar as Georgia is concerned it should be repealed by the people of Georgia. * * * If a measure to that effect were submitted to the people of Georgia on a vote, as a voter in that State I should vote to repeal the poll tax as a State function.

I made that statement to show that I was not then—as I am not now—an advocate of the poll tax. I supported a change in my State's constitution to remove it.

Third, the issue here has nothing to do with the question of Negro voting which has touched off so much sound and fury in certain political quarters and in certain elements of the press.

The requirement on the part of certain States of the payment of a poll tax is a prerequisite for all voters and prospective voters, without regard to creed or color. I have never heard it charged that the poll tax was applied in a manner so as to discriminate against any race. We may be certain that if that had been done in any one instance, we would have heard loud screams from the

minority pressure groups, and the case would have been before the Supreme Court long ere this.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Possibly the Senator from Georgia may recall that in the most recent case involving the poll tax in Virginia, the court held that inasmuch as the poll tax is levied in a nondiscriminatory way against everyone in the State, it is perfectly legal and constitutional.

As to the Senator's reference to whether the poll tax is used in any State for the purpose of discriminating along racial lines, let me say that recently I obtained statistics on the registration of voters in the bordering State of North Carolina, which has a population slightly larger than that of Virginia. The statistics deal with the proportion of nonwhites who register to vote. From the statistics we find that in North Carolina, where there is no poll tax, the percentage of those who voted was only four-tenths of 1 percent higher than in Virginia, which requires the payment of a poll tax. Furthermore, the North Carolina statistics were not for the entire State, whereas the Virginia statistics were for the entire State.

In other words, so far as I can ascertain, the poll tax requirement in Virginia has had no effect from a racial standpoint; and the accuracy of that statement is shown by a comparison of the situation in Virginia, which requires the payment of a poll tax, with the situation in the adjoining State of North Carolina, which does not require the payment of a poll tax.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the importance of the poll tax as a deterrent to voting has been blown up out of all proportion. In my own State, a decade and one-half ago, the payment of a one dollar a year poll tax was required. The revenue from the tax was used to support the common schools of the State, just as I believe is the case in practically all the States which at the present time require the payment of a poll tax. There may have been a time in the early days of the Republic, when property qualifications for voting were common, that a $1 poll tax might have deterred someone from voting. But to state that such a nominal sum would deter anyone from voting today would be to reflect upon the patriotism of anyone who really desired to vote.

After all, Mr. President, one dollar is less than the cost of keeping a man in cigarettes for a week. In a State which has high taxes, a citizen could do without drinking three bottles of beer and be able to save sufficient money to pay the poll tax and be able to vote. Or if he would walk to work four days during the entire year, he would be able to save enough to be able to pay this allegedly "onerous, burdensome poll tax of one dollar a year"—which is said to be keeping thousands of citizens from the polls. Mr. President, this is simply one of the little political playthings with which our friends toy while they make charges to the effect that the poll tax prevents citizens from going to the polls.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia recalls, I am sure, that under the Minimum Wage Act, which was passed by the Congress, the minimum wage is now $1 for 1 hour of work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator from Alabama has called attention to that point. If a citizen is not willing to work for 1 hour in order to support the common schools and to be able to vote, I do not think he is a very desirable citizen in the first place.

Mr. President, this whole charge is fantastic. It has been blown up out of all proportion.

It so happens that all five of the States that have not removed the poll tax are in the South. Every day some of our friends from other parts of the Nation examine the Southern States with a magnifying glass—in an attempt to find some flyspeck which, when magnified, might look as large as Stone Mountain. If they find something, they say: "Look at what the southerners are doing." Then they run to Washington and complain about it.

As a matter of fact, a $1 payment certainly is not a serious deterrent from voting, if, indeed, it is a deterrent at all.

Mr. President, there is no question that two-thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the States have the legal authority to amend the Constitution in the manner now proposed. That is granted. However, the question here is whether it is proper, prudent, and a desirable precedent to begin to tinker with our fundamental law over such a small matter.

The poll tax is a matter of small moment to the individual whom the advocates of this proposal claim they wish to protect. But an amendment to our organic law is a matter that should never be taken lightly.

It is clear and uncontrovertible that each and every one of the 50 States under the Constitution has the right to prescribe qualifications for voting. Even the proponents of the pending amendment, I am gratified to note, recognize this basic concept of our constitutional system. At least the proponents of this amendment are seeking their objective through the process of an amendment to the Constitution, instead of through the palpably unconstitutional process of a mere statutory enactment.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell at length on the suggestion which has been brought forward here, in the form of the so-called Javits amendment or substitute, that the Constitution can be amended by statute. I realize that it means a great deal to some persons to hasten the process, so that they may attempt to show their constituents that they will get at the throats of the southerners faster. They propose to repeal the poll tax by statute, whereas if such action is to be taken at all, it should be taken by means of a constitutional amendment.

If we in this body ever surrender to the expedient of seeking to short circuit the Constitution of the United States in order to gain an objective which today may seem desirable to some of us, we may be sure that on tomorrow we will lose some fundamental right at the hands of one who is willing to be equally inconsistent with the entire philosophy of our constitutional system.

In the first place, Mr. President, the Constitution could not be more emphatic in delegating to the States the right and the authority to fix the qualifications for voting for Federal elected officials as well as for State and local elected officials. That is spelled out in the Constitution, not once, but twice. It appears first in section 2, article I.

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It should be remembered that at the time when the Constitution was adopted, Members of the House of Representatives were the only Federal officials who were to be elected directly by the people. Therefore, that was the only office over which the question of voter qualifications could have arisen at that time. Undoubtedly the Founding Fathers thought they were settling that question once and for all.

Later, however, the 17th amendment was ratified in 1912, providing that U.S. Senators should be elected directly by the people. Again, the authority to prescribe voting qualifications was specifically delegated to the States.

At that time—even as late as 1912—there was still some respect in the Congress for the Founding Fathers. It was still thought then that they knew how to use language to express their purpose. So the authors of the 17th amendment simply used, without change, the identical language which appears in article I, section 2; namely, that—

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The other day I said here, in a colloquy with my friend, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] that this is the only instance in which identical language appears twice in the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is significant that the 17th amendment was adopted and ratified almost 50 years after the adoption of the 14th and 15th amendments, which related to the rights of the newly freed slaves. If either of those amendments had been intended to restrict or to amend the right of the States to prescribe voter qualifications, that intention surely would have been reflected in the later language of the 17th amendment.

Although the Constitution itself is explicit about the right of the States to fix voter qualifications, we also have the words of several prominent members of the Constitutional Convention to assure us of this intent of the Founding Fathers.

The question of qualification for voting was discussed and debated at some length in the Convention. James Madison, in his journal of the Convention proceedings, records that Gouverneur

Morris proposed that the right to vote be restricted to freeholders. According to "Madison's Journal," James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, argued vigorously against this proposed Federal qualification for voting. In defending that part of the draft Constitution which was to become article I, section 2, Wilson declared:

> This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and he [Wilson] did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same person at the same time to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature.

Oliver Ellsworth, a delegate from Connecticut, also supported the provision to empower the States to prescribe voter qualifications. According to Madison, Ellsworth told the Convention that:

> The right of suffrage was a tender point, and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised. The States are the best judges of the circumstances in temper of their own people.

Mr. President, that last sentence—"the States are the best judges of the circumstances in temper of their own people"—is certainly applicable today. There have been dramatic changes over a relatively brief period of time in the extension of the right of suffrage. For example, we have done away with all the property qualifications as they originally existed and have broadened the right of suffrage. The States and the people of the States have shown that they are capable of making their own changes themselves without having to obey one set of rules made for all in Washington.

Morris' attempt to prescribe a qualification for voting in the Constitution was decisively defeated. Subsequently, the Convention approved the proposed language which now constitutes section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution.

Nor does the matter end there. Any lingering doubt that the Founding Fathers intended voter qualifications to be a State—not a Federal—function was demolished by Madison and Hamilton in the "Federalist Papers."

In a discussion of the role of the House of Representatives, Madison declared in "Federalist Paper" No. 57:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

Hamilton examined the voter qualification question more directly in Federalist No. 52. He explained why the Constitutional Convention decided to let the States prescribe voter requirements in the election of Members of the House.

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one of uniform rule, would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such manner as to abridge the right secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, the clearly defined right of the States to prescribe qualifications for voting has been affirmed time and again by the Supreme Court. The question was before the court as recently as last June; it was again resolved in favor of the States.

In a unanimous decision upholding the right of North Carolina to apply a literacy test as a qualification for voting, the Court said:

> The States have long been held to have broad power to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * * absent of course the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution in its provision for the election of Members of the House of Representatives and the 17th amendment in its provision for the election of Senators provide that officials will be chosen "by the people." Each provision goes on to state "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." So, while the right of suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution * * * it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed.

Not only has the Supreme Court upheld and affirmed the right of the States to prescribe voter qualifications, but it has also declared the poll tax to be a perfectly legitimate and legal qualification for voting. In *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U.S. 77), the Court said:

> To make payment of a poll tax a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the 14th amendment.

No more need be said to establish firmly and clearly the right of the States to prescribe qualifications for voting—within, of course, the broad framework of the Constitution itself. This vital provision of our elective process is basic to the American system constitutional government—a government of divided powers, of checks and balances, dual form and delineated functions.

Under our system certain powers to govern are specifically delegated to the Federal Government while all others are reserved to the States and to the people. The States are accorded wide latitude under the Constitution to devise a plan of local government best suited to each's individual needs and circumstances. In a very real sense, the States are the testing laboratories of our democratic Republic.

It was within this context that the Founding Fathers wisely left to the States the task of prescribing voter qualifications. From the earliest days, this was a big and diverse country with a multitude of widely varying conditions and problems.

The establishment of a uniform and inflexible system of voting standards for every State and section of the country would have been as unwise and impractical as the establishment of a uniform system of local police or health protection. The Founders of the Republic wisely refrained from attempting to impose such uniform standards on the people; instead, each State was left to devise its own standards for voting consistent with the Constitution.

This system has worked exceedingly well. Under the broad powers granted to them, the several States have established individual standards that best fit their own circumstances and conditions.

At one time or another, virtually every State has had a poll-tax or property-ownership requirement as a prerequisite for voting. Both of these requirements are gradually disappearing through action by the States themselves.

According to the "Book of the States" for 1958–59, five States still levy some form of poll tax. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. The same publication lists seven States that cling to some vestige of property requirement for voting. Those States are: Michigan, Montana, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, and Utah.

There are, however, many other voting requirements maintained by individual States. I am informed, for example, that our newest State of Hawaii requires a voter to be able to speak, read, or write either the English or Hawaiian language as a prerequisite for voting. Obviously, this is a requirement which would be most appropriate for a Hawaiian, but it would be a very difficult requirement for citizens of the other 49 States, if they had to be able to read or write the Hawaiian language.

Some 18 States have other forms of literacy requirement as a prerequisite to voting eligibility. Five require that the voter be able to read a section of the State or Federal Constitution and write his own name. Arizona requires, for example, that a person must be able to read the Constitution of the United States in the English language in such manner as to indicate that he is neither being prompted nor reciting it from memory.

Wyoming has a requirement that the prospective voter must be able to read the State constitution in order to be qualified. Connecticut provides that in order to be qualified for voting one must be able to read any article of the U.S. Constitution or any section of the Connecticut statutes in the English language. Connecticut also requires that a prospective voter must be of good moral character and of a sound mind.

Two of the States of the Union, Mr. President, have made a dramatic change in the voting qualifications. My own State of Georgia led the way by amending the State constitution to permit all citizens of Georgia to vote at the age of 18. In other words, we lowered the voting age from 21 to 18 many years ago. Within the past 2 years Kentucky followed that example, and lowered the voting age from 21 to 18.

The States of the Union have developed and devised their various standards for voting entirely in accord with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. In so doing, they have carried out the intent of the Founding Fathers.

We are now asked to alter this system which has served the country well for more than a century and a half. It is now proposed that we restrict the right of the States and enlarge the power of the Federal Government over the sensitive area of voter qualifications.

To be sure, it is not proposed—at the present time—to discard altogether the constitutional concept that the States should prescribe voting qualifications, but the fact that an amendment has been offered, undertaking to change the Constitution by statute, in the case of the proposed legislation which is pending, shows that this is only the start. It is here proposed only to prohibit—no, to order—five States to cease levying a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

It is not proposed, just now, to tamper with and restrict the rights of the remaining 45 States.

In other words, under the Holland anti-poll-tax amendment it will be all right for Vermont to continue to require a voter to take a "Freeman's Oath" but it will be unlawful for Alabama to levy a poll tax. Connecticut may continue to permit only those citizens adjudged to possess a sound mind and good moral character to vote; but Virginia may not collect a tax of $1.50 a year from its citizens who wish to exercise the franchise.

This amendment, if approved by Congress and ratified by the States, will be only the first in a series of moves to upset the delicate balance of State and Federal powers within our system. It is a part of the insidious and unceasing campaign to transfer all powers of government to Washington and to reduce the States to mere geographic entities.

Does anyone doubt that this amendment, if successful, will be followed by other proposals to extend still further the strangling grip of Federal control over the elective process? Already the shadowy outline of Federal election control may be seen in some of the so-called civil rights proposals which have been advanced.

One such proposal undertakes to authorize the Federal Government by statute to prescribe the type of literacy or educational tests a State may require as prerequisite for voting. Another would bar the States from fixing any voter qualifications at all except age and residence requirements.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TALMADGE. My distinguished colleague made reference to one of the recommendations of the so-called Civil Rights Commission, which has proposed and has drafted a constitutional amendment which would limit, as the Senator pointed out, the power of the States to regulate the right of franchise solely to age and residence requirements. Is it not true that if such an amendment were submitted by the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the States it would permit idiots to vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. It would permit idots to vote and criminals to vote. Nearly all the States have some disqualifying clauses affecting those who have committed crimes involving moral turpitude. Such an amendment would wipe out all that body of State law. If a man could escape from a penitentiary and get to the polls, no matter how heinous a crime he had been convicted of, under the proposal which bears the name of "civil rights," such a criminal would be entitled to walk up to the polls and to vote.

Mr. TALMADGE. In line with what the Senator has pointed out, is it not true that if someone were in the penitentiary awaiting execution for treason against his country, and that person escaped from the penitentiary on election day managed to find his way to the polls, he would be entitled to vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. He would be entitled to vote in the election, no matter how grievous his crime may have been. This simply shows how, in the hysteria generated every time anybody pronounces the two words "civil rights," people come forth and suggest cures for ills which do not exist, but which cures, if applied, would cause the whole body politic to sicken and wither away.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator think that the so-called Civil Rights Commission, which has proposed a constitutional amendment which would permit lunatics, idiots and convicted felons to vote, is better qualified to dictate to the 50 sovereign States of the Union how they ought to handle their elective franchise than the 50 legislatures of the 50 States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will take my stand with the 50 legislatures of the 50 States.

I was honored to serve in the House of Representatives of my own State for a period of 10 years, and during that time we had some rather unusual and bizarre suggestions made in the form of proposed legislation.

Georgia has a very large house of representatives. At the time I served in it it had 209 members. A great many bills are introduced. Not all of them are wise and easy to justify; but never in that period did any member make a suggestion so farfetched and foolish as the proposal of the Civil Rights Commission, that the States be denied even the privilege of preventing those convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, and idiots, from exercising the right of franchise.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his query, and for his contribution to this discussion.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not know of a greater student of the Constitution or an abler expounder of that document than the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. HILL. I know how carefully, thoughtfully, and painstakingly through the years he has studied the debates which took place at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia at the time the Constitution was written, and how carefully and painstakingly he has studied the debates which took place in the various State conventions which were called for the ratification of the Constitution.

Is it not the Senator's opinion that, had the Founding Fathers, when they wrote the Constitution, not left the matter fixing the qualifications of electors to the States, and if they had indulged in any such proposals as the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia has described, there would never have been any settled Constitution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. The distinguished Senator knows that the Constitution was ratified by a mere hair. Two or three of the States ratified it by a very few votes, and two of the States after the other eleven had ratified. If it had ever been proposed that the Central Government should undertake to prescribe the qualifications of those exercising the right of franchise in the Thirteen Original States, there would never have been a Constitution, and a great many of those who signed that document could not have gone back home to the people who sent them there to represent them in the Constitutional Convention.

In those days people had some faith in themselves. They believed that they were able, within the States, to do some things. They believed that the city council could meet and come to some agreement as to the parking problems or the police problems of the community. They believed that the State legislatures had enough wisdom to grapple with the question of the qualifications of voters.

In this new day we have a new doctrine. The policy is to bring everything to Washington and let the Great White Father, sitting on the banks of the Potomac, write the parking regulations for the small communities, and prescribe the rules for voting in the various States. Let the Central Government decide what kind of health laws there shall be. Let there be one law in Washington which will settle all the issues disturbing local units of government, such as the question of whether to put fluoride in the water system. The new doctrine is to bring all those questions to Washington, the city of all wisdom.

I am proud to serve in the Senate. I have a very high opinion of the Senate when it is dealing with purely Federal problems. But I know that the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States get beyond their depth when they undertake to prescribe rules of conduct for all the 170 million people living in more than 3,000 counties of the 50 States of the Union.

It is contrary to the purposes of our Government to follow any such policy. If these insidious efforts to whittle away,

bit by bit, the powers of the cities, counties, and States, continue, the day will come when this great device which has given us the greatest way of life and the finest system of government any people have ever known under the canopy of God's heaven will collapse and come down in ruins.

The affairs of government cannot all be handled from Washington. I care not how noble the purpose or how pure the motives, or how great the intelligence of those who direct the Government in Washington. They simply cannot apply a fixed rule of conduct to every one of the 170 million people in the United States, wherever they may live, without bringing about disaster and the loss of our liberties.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. At the time the Constitution of the United States was written and adopted the people knew the history of mankind; they knew the history of governments and of nations; they knew the history of the rule of tyrants and dictators; they knew that the rights, the liberties, and powers of the people were safe, and could only be safe, as such powers were held in the hands of the people themselves. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Providence has been kind to this country. One of its great benefactions was in the character of the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States. Those men knew tyranny. They had endured it, and they had put their all on the altar of freedom to break the chains of tyranny, and to step into a new day with a form of government for themselves.

I doubt whether there was ever any group of the same number of men anywhere with greater familiarity with the history of mankind and the influences that bring about a totalitarian form of government. Those men were scholars. They were students. They knew that the shores of human history were littered with the wrecks of civilization which had sprung up and flourished and then declined because the people had become indifferent and had entrusted all the powers of government to one source. There has never been a dictatorship that did not take power under the guise of doing great benefactions for the people.

The Founding Fathers knew that if all the powers of government were ever placed in one set of hands in Washington, Philadelphia, New York, or wherever else the seat of government might be located, it would mean the end of their dream of the American way of life and of the great civilization which we enjoy—the greatest that has ever existed. They took every possible precaution to avoid giving any one source of government in this country power enough to stifle the freedoms and liberties of the American people. Only within recent years has it become popular to tamper with that system in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I wish to assure the Senator from Georgia that, as a fellow Member of this body, it has been a treat to me to sit here and listen closely to his exposition of the very fine fundamental points of government which he has made in his remarks today. I know that he is a real apostle of the faith, and a believer in the Constitution. He expresses himself so clearly, firmly, and sincerely that one listening to him receives an additional great lesson. I thank him for his willingness to come here and speak with reference to these measures. Even though his State is not directly involved in the letter of the proposed legislation, the spirit of it certainly involves his State. The Senator from Georgia has been willing to espouse a cause.

A few weeks ago a very fine lady, who was raised in one of the States, asked me, in all sincerity, this question: "Why have the States any more?" I told her that if the proponents of the new doctrine were to continue to whittle away at the States, as they have done for several years, we might not have any more States. I feel sure the Senator agrees with that conclusion. I appreciate his remarks very much. I should like to have him address himself further to any phase of the subject he may see fit to discuss.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. The Senator is correct. My State does not levy any poll tax, and to that extent this simple proposal does not affect it; but the threatened Federal control of elections strikes at the jugular vein of our freedom. It strikes at the electoral processes in the several States which have 50 different programs relating to the holding of their elections.

Senators may recall that in 1954 it was proposed that we amend the Constitution so as to lower the voting age from 21 to 18 in every one of the 48 States. It so happened that my State was the only State at that time which had the 18-year-age requirement for voting. However, I opposed that proposed constitutional amendment, because I did not propose to put the rights and freedom of the people of the various States into a Federal vise here in Washington. I did not propose to take away from the people of Georgia the right to change still further the voting age requirement if, for example, they wished to lower the age to 17 or to raise it to 19.

Although my State was the only one which had the 18-year age voting requirement, I vigorously opposed the proposed constitutional amendment, which would have fixed the voting age at 18 all over the United States. Every State has the power to fix the voting age of its own people. States that wish to lower the voting age to 18 can do so.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I remember quite well the fine speech the Senator from Georgia made on that very vital subject. That shows that he practices what he preaches with reference to the principles he espouses.

Does the Senator not think also that in the Senate, to which Senators are elected to represent the States, and where we have been talking about the powers of the States being whittled away, that this should be the last place where those rights should be whittled away or changed? If States cannot make their stand here, where else may they hope to be successful?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, under the old concept, when a man was sent to the Senate from a State, he was its ambassador. Senators were the ambassadors of their States sent to the Central Government.

This Chamber is the last citadel of individual rights and liberties in this country. I hope Senators will recognize the fact, not only with respect to this proposed legislation, but other proposed legislation as well. While I do not undertake to fix the standards for anyone else, this Chamber is the place where the States must be preserved if they are to be saved from degenerating into mere geographical entities.

I do not think any threat to our system is greater than that posed by the federalization of our elections. If the day ever comes when all the ballot boxes in the States are brought to Washington in order to count the votes, absolute control will then be centered in Washington. We will find that eventually a man will come along to assume absolute power.

I do not believe that the threat of Federal election control is either academic or farfetched. It lurks in this Chamber here today. It is found in committees and in legislation which has been proposed. The proposal now pending, regardless of how sincerely it has been advanced, is a part of that threat. Senators may choose not to recognize it as such, if they so desire. However, they cannot wish it away.

There is yet another disturbing implication in the pending proposal. The amendment is another attempt by a majority to club a minority of the States into conforming to the majority's wishes.

Five States, acting through their duly constituted governments, are engaging in a practice that is not immoral, unlawful, or contrary to the Constitution. But the practice apparently does not meet the approval of many of their sister States. Therefore, the majority is undertaking to change the Constitution in order to compel the five States to abolish the practice.

Mr. President, I do not believe in political coercion. I do not believe such a proposal is in keeping with the American tradition of fair play. It cannot be squared with our historical respect for minority rights and dissenting views, or with our determination to give the dissenter the right to present his views and to hold to them. That is in accord with our Constitution. All of the changes which are proposed fall into the pathetic pattern which prevails in many areas of our national life today, a pattern that demands conformity and penalizes individuality.

The demand for conformity, of course, is usually made in the name of "the people" or in the name of the "wishes of the majority." In observing this modern-day cult of conformity, I am reminded of a warning sounded a century

ago by the liberal English philosopher, John Stuart Mill. In his great essay, "On Liberty," Mill declared:

> It was now preceived that such phrases as "self-government," and "the power of the people over themselves," do not express the true state of the case. The people who exercise the power are not always the same people with those over whom it is exercised; and the *self*-government spoken of is not the government of each by himself, but each by all the rest. The will of the people, moreover, practically means the will of the most numerous or the most active part of the people—

He might have said the most vocal, if he had wished to describe the present-day pressure groups—

> the majority are those who succeed in making themselves accepted as the majority; the people, consequently may desire to oppress a part of their number, and precautions are as much needed against this as against any other abuse of power.

Mr. President, I suppose I am too old fashioned to see the proclaimed virtues of the pending amendment. I must confess ignorance of what its proponents expect to gain from it, except the dubious satisfaction of forcing 5 States to fall into line with the other 45.

On the other hand, I do see a great deal that can be lost by the adoption and ratification of the pending amendment. The loss will be to the Constitution which we love and revere.

In the final analysis, the issue at stake here boils down simply to this: Shall we preserve the Constitution as it was written and intended, or shall we revise the work of the Founding Fathers according to someone's contemporary notion of what he would like the Constitution to say and mean?

I hold no brief for the poll tax. I believe it is outmoded. However, I can find things in the statutes of almost every one of the 50 States of the Union which are more objectionable to me than the requirement that a person shall pay a dollar, which goes into the common school fund for the benefit of education, to entitle him to vote. When the question is presented to me whether I shall vote to amend the Constitution to force the will of 45 of the States on the remaining 5 States in a matter of this kind, the answer for me is clear. I, for one, possess neither the omniscience nor the genius that qualify me to improve on the efforts and wisdom of the Founding Fathers in leaving to the States the right to control their own election process.

I shall, therefore, in this instance, as I have in the past and as I shall in the future, so long as providence permits me to stay in this body, support the Constitution as it stands. I will defend the rights of the States, and the integrity of each of the 50 States of the Union, to control their own local affairs. Feeling as I do about the matter, I shall cast my vote against the pending amendment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I correctly interpret what the Senator has said to this effect: First of all, that he does not particularly approve of the poll tax; that he does not view the poll tax, where it exists, as a device to prevent people from voting; that his own State of Georgia has repealed the poll tax; but that he objects to the proposed legislation because it would be the imposition of Federal law upon the powers of the States, which he believes should be sovereign? Is that a correct statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the States have sovereignty in every instance. The Federal Constitution contains vast grants of power in which the Federal Government has control over the States. But in this instance it was clearly designed to give the States the power. I do not see any condition in this country which justifies 45 States imposing their will upon 5 States which have levied the poll tax for so many years. I do not regard such a tax as being any burden on the right of suffrage. I do not think the imposition of a $1 poll tax in this modern day is any deprivation of the right of suffrage.

Mr. GRUENING. In my judgment that is a very important point, because I think the belief is widespread that the poll tax, as it was used in certain States, was a device to prevent certain people who were poor from voting. I think it is important to have the assurance of the Senator from Georgia that that is not the case. I think that fact is buttressed by the statement that only five of the great number of States have such a tax. In other words, if this tax had been a device to prevent people from voting on the basis of race, or otherwise, it might have been so held by the courts.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may be sure that if it had been used as a discriminatory device to prevent any special class of persons from voting, particularly those of the Negro race, it would have been stricken down by the Supreme Court long ago. I have never heard a charge that the poll tax was levied unfairly or in a discriminatory fashion in any State, or that any State used it as a device to circumvent the 15th amendment, which prohibits States from practicing any discrimination on the ground of race or previous condition of servitude in voting.

Mr. GRUENING. Coming as I do from a State which, when it made the transition from a Territory, received certain powers from the Federal Government, I find myself in great sympathy with the proposal to leave these powers to the States. Alaska has some legislation of which we are quite proud, such as that which regulates the erection of billboards on highways. Certainly Alaska would resent any requirement by the Federal Government that we as a State would have to permit the erection of billboards simply because 49 other States had so decided.

The question sometimes arises, How far should this practice be carried? If it is found that, because an injustice existed in certain States, some persons have been consistently denied the right to vote, does there not come a time when that becomes an issue of some importance, which perhaps presents a question to be determined by the Federal Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not one of those who believes the Constitution is so sacrosanct that it should not be amended under any circumstances.

Mr. GRUENING. I am simply seeking light.

Mr. RUSSELL. The women's suffrage amendment and amendments of that kind were the natural consequences of changes in our civilization. I say there are no facts which have been brought forward to justify our saying to the legislatures, the Governors, and the people of the five States in question that they have not the intelligence, the integrity, or the ability which they should have to conduct the affairs of their States. The Constitution gives the Federal Government some broad powers over the States. The Federal Government guarantees each and every one of them a republican form of government, and Congress has the right to legislate in that field. There are very definite powers in that respect vested in the Central Government.

But no statement has been made, nor has it been charged, that the poll tax is levied in a discriminatory fashion. The commonsense of any Senator should tell him that $1 or $1.50 a year is not an amount which would cause hardship. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has rightly pointed out that the minimum wage law provides for the payment of $1 an hour, so the payment of the poll tax would not require more than an hour or an hour and a half's work for the lowest paid person under that law.

There cannot be any great burden caused by the poll tax which would prevent people from voting. I sometimes think we take too much for granted—our great blessings, such as the right to exercise the franchise. I do not know but that it would be a good idea to make us appreciate the right of suffrage. I am not defending the poll tax. It is outmoded. It is the oldest tax known to man. It really is a head tax.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Georgia consider the method of dealing with the question by means of a constitutional amendment to be just as objectionable as by the statutory method?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I would regard such a statute as a rape of the Constitution. It would be most obnoxious.

If two-thirds of the membership of Congress and three-fourths of the States wish to force five States to change their laws, they have a right to do so. But I say no circumstances have been brought forward to justify the Federal Government's entry into the field of compulsion against these five States.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. My State of North Carolina formerly had a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. The tax was collected from all male citizens alike, regardless of race or color. North Carolina many years ago abolished the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. The abolishment of

the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting had no perceptible effect upon the voting practices in North Carolina.

I agree with the observation of the Senator from Georgia that if a statute were passed by Congress purporting to abolish the poll tax, such a statute would be clearly unconstitutional. The Supreme Court itself held, in a case from Georgia, the case of Breedlove against Suttles, that when Georgia had a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, the imposition of a poll tax by a State as a prerequisite for voting was sanctioned by the Constitution. That case has been cited several times later by the Supreme Court with apparent approval.

It seems to me that the Senator from Georgia has made a very vital point in asserting that what is sought to be done by the amendment of the Senator from Florida is simply a manifestation of another attempt to centralize government in Washington.

My position about the poll tax is that, except as a revenue measure, I should like to see it abolished. Most of the States used to impose the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. The great majority of them which at one time levied it have abolished it. Only five States have it now.

I think the Senator from Georgia has made a very valid point in saying that the power to provide qualifications for voters was left by the Founding Fathers to the States. I feel that an important situation is now developing in that respect. A recommendation was made some time ago by the Civil Rights Commission that the Constitution should be amended so as to concentrate that power in the Federal Government. The recommendation was that it be declared by constitutional amendment that every person possessing the State's requirements as to age and length of residence should have an absolute, constitutional right to vote in any election held for any purpose in any of the 50 States, or in any of their political subdivisions, if the person possessed a living, physical body, was regardless of whether he was with or without intelligence and with or without character, provided he was not confined in an institution for mental defectives or a prison on the day of registration and election.

That was a proposal to take away from the States the power to disfranchise idiots, lunatics, and persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said, "Unless he was confined to prison." Was that spelled out in the proposal?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know it was provided that unless the person was actually confined to prison, he could vote. I rather apprehended that if such a constitutional amendment ever were adopted, it would allow a person who was in prison to be taken from prison, in order to have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, the proposal would allow a person to vote unless he was actually confined in an institution at the time of registration for the election.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not aware that it was thus proposed that such a person be allowed to register and to vote unless he was actually confined—although perhaps that was the proposal.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, it was.

But under this proposed constitutional amendment, if a man who was confined to a penitentiary was able to break out of it, or if one confined in an insane asylum was able to break out of it, on the day of registration or election, he would have a constitutional right to register and to vote, even though he was an idiot, one totally without intelligence, or even though he was serving a prison sentence or was under sentence of death for treason to his country.

All this goes to show the lengths to which some would go in their desire to centralize in the Federal government all the powers in regard to registration and voting, instead of leaving them where George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, and the other Founding Fathers left them—namely, in the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his contribution.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. However, I wish to say again that I am not a defender of the poll tax, per se. I do say there has been spread over the country more misinformation about the effects of the poll tax than about almost any other subject of which I have knowledge.

I think the poll tax is outmoded. In my secret heart I wish the five States now having it would abolish the poll tax. But so long as they stand on their constitutional right to impose this tax, under my concept of the Constitution of the United States, I shall stand here in the Senate and defend their right to impose it. I shall not seek to impose my views regarding the right and wisdom of laws passed by the various States.

Furthermore, if a day comes when the poll tax is imposed by only one State, instead of five, I would still defend its constitutional right, under our form of government and under the concept of the Founding Fathers, to impose a tax of that nature.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the proposed amendment, not because I favor the poll tax, but, rather because I feel quite strongly that the question of whether such a tax should be levied is one which properly addresses itself to each individual State.

I do not object to having any particular State remove the poll tax. As a matter of fact, my State of Georgia did so in 1945. The results have been good, and the people of Georgia have had no reason to regret the change.

However, Mr. President, let me emphasize that Georgians would not presume to advocate or recommend that other States should do as it has done in eliminating the poll tax.

The people of Georgia believe the framers of the Constitution of the United States were correct in reserving to each State the power to determine voter qualifications; and they feel that anything which dilutes or circumscribes that right results in a weakening of our cherished Federal-State system and the time-proven constitutional checks and balances which serve to preserve it and keep it vital.

In a Nation so vast and diverse as ours, it is impossible to prescribe uniform rules which will serve the best interests of all States. Attitudes, conditions, and circumstances vary from State to State; and it must be recognized that what is good for one State is not necessarily good for all other States. On questions such as the one under consideration, for example, it is possible for two neighboring States to have totally opposite views and yet both be right.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment under consideration is another example of the alarming trend to substitute compulsion from Washington for the wisdom and good judgment of the elected representatives of the people serving in their respective State legislatures. I submit that the experience of the past has proved that it is impossible to enforce conformity of human thought and action from the national level, and that compulsion is not an answer to any question embracing public policy and governmental philosophy.

The question of whether a poll tax should be required as a prerequisite for voting is one which should be answered by each legislature. It is an issue with which State legislators are better acquainted and, therefore, better qualified to deal. I, for one, intend to vote to leave it in their able hands.

I will say, Mr. President, that I consider it to the credit of Congress that it has at last recognized that a proposed constitutional amendment is the only constitutional vehicle through which it can act on this subject. I hope that the consideration of this question in the form of a constitutional amendment will serve as a precedent for any other proposals for congressional action in the field of voting.

However, for reasons I have outlined—and feeling as I do that this issue properly should be determined by each State for itself—I cannot in good conscience support the proposed amendment; and I urge the Senate not to give its approval to it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as one who represents in part a State which does have the poll tax, I thank the Senator from Georgia for giving the Senate the benefit of his views.

So long as the States are represented by men of his viewpoint and his qualities, I believe the States will continue to grow, and that the Senate will continue to serve the purpose it should serve, namely, the purpose of being a great fortress of strength to preserve the individual States of the Union.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the generosity of the comment my able and distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, has made.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I simply wish to say that I share the views which have been expressed by both the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

North Carolina, like Georgia, has abolished the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting; and if I were a member of the legislature of a State which had a poll tax as a prerequisite of voting, I would urge its abolition by that State.

But if we are to preserve the kind of government given us by the Founding Fathers—namely, a government which has a constitution which, as Chief Justice Chase said in the great case of Texas against White, looks in all of its provisions to an indestructible union composed of indestructible States—then I believe we should leave some of these basic rights to the States, and that the most basic of all of them which ought to be left to them is the right to declare the qualifications for voting.

The fact that most of the States which had a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting have abolished such tax on their own volition gives rise to the expectation that the five States now retaining a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting will also take such action in the near future. It seems to me that to resort to a constitutional amendment to abolish a poll tax in such a small number of States is about like using an atom bomb to get rid of a mouse, if I may express the analogy in that manner.

While I oppose a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and while my State has long since abolished it, if we are going to preserve the kind of country the Founding Fathers gave us under the Constitution, I think we ought to leave to the States the power to prescribe qualifications for voting, rather than concentrate such power in a highly centralized Federal Government.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator. I certainly share his views. There is no more reason for the 45 States in the Union to say to the 5 States in the Union that have poll taxes, "You may not levy a poll tax," than there is for the 50 States of the Union to submit a constitutional amendment saying to all 50 States, "You shall not have on your highways a speed limit in excess of 50 miles an hour."

There is probably more justification for submitting a constitutional amendment relating to the speed limit, because hundreds of thousands of people are being killed on our highways year after year, some of them because they drive too fast; but is a problem which the States recognize can best be solved by State action without Federal interference.

Certainly, the electoral process is just as close to the people on the State level as is the fixing of speed limits on the highways, or any other matters which are determined by the Legislature of Mississippi, North Carolina, or any other State of the Union, every day.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stated in his extremely able speech, this is just another effort to transfer power from the counties and the State legislatures to Washington, D.C., because some of us here think we are better qualified to exercise the power than are the people on the local level who live with their problems every day. Yet, as I look about me and consider the problems which are constitutionally imposed upon us and note our rather frequent failure to handle adequately the job the Constitution imposes on us, I seriously doubt if we are as well qualified to handle those problems as are the State legislatures.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DOUBLE TALK IN POLITICAL SPEECHES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is seldom in this stolid and humorless era that an observer of our political scene sees through the absurd double talk of so many of the political speeches with which we are entertained. It is even more rare that such an observer who does grasp the inner meaning of such speeches has the talent to express the flimflammery in an amusing and unanswerable manner.

Mr. James Reston's column in the Sunday Times of January 31 is a classic, worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed 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:

"THE STRINGS IN MR. NIXON'S BOW

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—At 8:20 p.m. last Wednesday in Chicago Vice President NIXON "threw down the gantlet" to the spenders at home, and promised to "leave no stone unturned" overseas.

Until merrier cliches come along—and they will—these will have to serve both as an indication of Mr. NIXON's style and his problem.

His problem in this election is to have two strings to his bow, to come out flatfooted for Eisenhower and still be cock of the walk; to carry water on both shoulders without upsetting the applecart; to fish in, and pour oil on, troubled waters; to defend the past and take time by the forelock without falling between two stools; and, of course, to bring home the bacon through thick and thin.

All this is enough to make strong men quiver, but Mr. NIXON is the kind of fellow who can steer between Scylla and Charybdis and take both precincts. His performance in Chicago was a masterpiece of political gymnastics and illustrates once more that, as a tactician, he is about the best in the business.

MASTER AT WORK

Not many men can both condemn and outpromise the spenders and get away with it, but Mr. NIXON made a good try in Chicago. He virtually canonized the President. He scorned the opposition. He defended the past as the best 7 years of our lives and then painted a picture of the future that made these 7 years look like a depression.

For the last month the Democrats have been scattering boobytraps for Mr. NIXON all over the landscape. He dodged them, every one.

Defending the President's leadership in the present mood of the country is about as difficult as praising George Washington, but Mr. NIXON rushes to his defense, anyway.

Shame, he says, painting a word picture of the President stamping out war in Korea, rushing to the defense of Lebanon, Quemoy, Matsu and Suez, flying off to Panama when he was sick, keeping his head when all around were losing theirs. And who do you suppose was at the President's side when he was doing all this?

Not since the days of Red Grange has the State of Illinois seen such agility in a broken field. We do not have a second-rate defense, he asserted, but "we must submit our national security programs to a searching, month-to-month reexamination."

The American educational system is "the best in the world," but "inadequate classrooms, underpaid teachers and flabby standards are weaknesses we must constantly strive to eliminate."

American agriculture, he added, is the most productive on earth but "there is no higher priority than a complete overhauling of obsolete farm programs."

In short, he managed to call for many of the things the Democrats are demanding without any suggestion that he was criticizing the President on defense or schools, or the Secretary of Agriculture on the farm policy. Bigger programs were advocated and more Government spending condemned, and this may not be as contradictory as it seems, for with revenues rising, the next President may have a substantial surplus in the Treasury.

A SKILLFUL ARGUMENT

Mr. NIXON's argument was not only skillful but in a way it was unavoidable. He cannot avoid defense of the present level of spending.

He must support his President's policies, but at the same time he has to keep from being sideswiped by the Democratic charges that he is satisfied with everything as it is.

He dealt with this effectively in Chicago: "We shall look upon our record not as our ultimate achievement but as the solid foundation upon which to build even greater accomplishments in the future. Why is America a great nation today? Because we Americans have never lived in the past. We are never content to rest on our laurels. We never like to settle for being second best in anything."

Against this kind of thing, the Democrats have their problems. They think the country is sick, but it is like a sick man who feels good and is told constantly by his doctor that he's in wonderful shape.

Mr. NIXON is exploiting this feeling to the hilt. We're living the life of Riley, he says (forgetting that Riley was probably a Democrat), so why look a gift horse in you know what, or change horses in you know where?

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR NANCY BUTTFIELD, OF AUSTRALIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have a distinct honor and pleasure today. We have with us a fellow senator from Australia, who is visiting the Senate. She is Senator Nancy Buttfield. She is visiting the United States under the program of the International Exchange Service of the Department of State. She is a member of the Liberal Party. She comes from south Australia. She has been a senator since 1955. She is the chairman of the select committee on the promotion of tourism of the Australian senate, and is a member of the federal parliament standing committee for foreign affairs, the only woman to hold this position.

Senator Nancy Buttfield represented Australia at the All-Indian Women's Conference in 1958 and the UNESCO Conference on Children's Television in 1959. She is connected with numerous civic organizations in her home area, where she and her husband operate a 600-acre farm. She was born in Adelaide.

It was my high honor to preside at a luncheon which we gave for Senator Buttfield, at which were also present the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. We had a very fine discussion of problems in which we are mutually interested.

Senator Buttfield tells me she has two sons who are in their twenties. She is a very interesting as well as a very lovely person. It was my privilege yesterday to be at the Australian Embassy at a luncheon, when the Australian Embassy entertained her. It is my extreme privilege and pleasure to present her to the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to meet Senator Buttfield and to have the opportunity for an exchange of views with regard to many of the problems which we mutually face. Australia and the United States have been friends and allies through dark days. We continue to be firm friends today. The Australian Forces in World War II gave an account of themselves which was unexcelled by the forces of any other country.

I can assure Senator Buttfield that we in the Senate are delighted to have her with us today. It was my pleasure to be a Member of the Senate delegation which attended the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in Australia last year, where we were observers, in accordance with past invitations. It is therefore a particularly great pleasure to greet Senator Buttfield. I know I express the feelings of all of us in saying we hope she will enjoy her stay in this country and will profit from it as much as we have profited from our exchange of ideas with her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). On behalf of the Senate the Chair bids Mrs. Buttfield welcome. Australia has sent us a most attractive as well as a very able representative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is always interesting to have a visitor from a country with whom we have a community of language. The identity of the Anglo-Saxon language always makes it interesting and very pleasant to visit with one from what we often refer to as "Down Under," I believe.

I have never had the privilege of visiting Australia. If the Lord is willing and if He crowns me with sufficient years, I hope to have that pleasure.

I am delighted always to notice in our own press the stories of the pioneering experiments in the whole field of government which are conducted in Australia. Australians have taken a great lead in that field. We watch them with great interest.

Permit me to say to our visitor that not the least of the things which has always entranced me about Australia is that in order to make sure that their people get out and vote the Australians do not offer them something by ways of a little gesture in the form of a polite little bribe; instead, they make them give a good excuse, I understand, or fine them for not voting. I rather like the idea of so compelling people to exercise their responsibilities as citizens. Perhaps we can learn something in that field also.

It is a delight to have Mrs. Buttfield here with us.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, it was the pleasure, which I am sure has been expressed earlier, of four Members of this body to visit the great Commonwealth of Australia last fall. It was the first visit there by the junior Senator from Delaware, whose impressions were deep, and I am sure will live long in his memory.

I sincerely hope that I may be able to make another trip to Australia. One of the most important aspects of our visit, of course, was that we were able to see the operation of the Government of Australia. We did not see the action as the people of Australia see it or hear it day by day, but we saw the Parliament building, and, most important, Mr. President, we saw the members of that body. One who made a very lasting impression was the lady senator who is our guest today. She not only lives up to the reputation of women in Australia, but she exemplifies it. Throughout the world her travels and her activities are very well known.

Mr. President, I somehow wish that Senator Buttfield could impart some of the great characteristics of her country to the little State of Delaware on the east coast of the United States. I believe if we could get her to come to Delaware for a little while, she could become one of the strongest supporters of the Democratic Party in our State. [Laughter.]

She has the striking characteristics we all seek. They are very wonderful. We are grateful Senator Buttfield, that you could come and visit us.

Again I express to you our thanks for a great reception, and for the cordial and warm greetings we received in Australia. We would like to enjoy them again some time in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express to our guest the thanks of one American—and she is sitting next to another [Mr. KEATING]—who enjoyed Australia's hospitality during the war. I was on duty in New Guinea and had leave to visit Australia for a short time. I went to the great cities of Melbourne, Brisbane, and Sidney and enjoyed the beautiful trees in Brisbane particularly. I cannot remember the name of the trees at present, but they were exquisite. Perhaps the senator remembers.

Senator BUTTFIELD. Poincianas.

Mr. JAVITS. Poincianas; yes, that is the name. It is a memory I shall always treasure. The recollection is very deep in the hearts of all Americans who served in that area of the world and who had the great privilege of having the opportunity to spend some leave in Australia.

I also wish to say I was much pleased to learn that my dear friend and colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] actually has been to Australia after the war, in an official way, to bring to Australians the warm feelings and respect which we have for their country.

I also admire tremendously the leadership which the leaders of Australia have given in the United Nations.

For all those reasons and many others we bid you, Mrs. Buttfield, a very warm welcome. We are indeed happy to have you here with us.

WEST VIRGINIA HAS A FUTURE BECAUSE THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH THE PEOPLE—"THEY'RE INTELLIGENT AND CONSCIENTIOUS AND WANT TO GIVE A DAY'S WORK FOR A DAY'S PAY," SAYS SATURDAY EVENING POST WRITER—SENATOR RANDOLPH TELLS OF STATE'S PROBLEMS AND PRAISES ITS CITIZENS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginians are determined to solve the economic and social problems of the State which have been accentuated by new production methods, especially the ever-increasing mechanical mining of bituminous coal.

We have been, by and large, courageous enough to recognize our economic status and we have been striving to solve the problems out of which it has grown.

Building a better West Virginia is our determined goal.

Writer Roul Tunley, whose article, "The Strange Case of West Virginia," appears in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, has written about "the paradox of want and plenty living side by side" in West Virginia.

It is, indeed, a paradox when want and plenty live side by side; but it does not occur in West Virginia alone. Here at the seat of the National Government there has been much squalor and poverty existing almost under the shadows of the Capitol and other Government buildings. In some urban centers of the country there are unhealthy, overcrowded tenements and conditions of economic and social distress within a few city blocks of the Wall Streets, the Broad Streets, the Michigan Avenues, and many hubs of finance and commerce. In most States of the United States—and certainly in numerous countries of the world—there are living manifestations of the paradox of want and plenty living side by side.

West Virginia is singled out in the current edition of the Saturday Evening Post. Other States and cities within several States have been singled out in periodicals of national circulation many times in the past—and doubtless it will happen to others in the future, unless and until more is done to strike at the root evils and to provide appropriate alternatives for conditions which bring about economic and social decline in this era of fast-changing events and technological developments.

Although the Saturday Evening Post article by Mr. Tunley portrays much of the gloomy side of our State under prevailing circumstances, it is, nevertheless,

one which likewise indicates that West Virginia does have a future. It is always best that, in discussing a State, the portrayal should be factual. There seems to be no reason to doubt that Mr. Tunley attempted to be factual, but surrounding the core of facts there have been added here and there certain exaggerations.

Where the author seems to have downgraded the abilities and work habits of West Virginians there are valid facts to offer in rebuttal. But, of course, the writer of the magazine article contradicted some of the earlier quotations within that article when he wrote that "any unbiased observer must agree that the people—of West Virginia—largely native-born, Anglo-Saxon stock, are gentle, proud, polite, and full of kindness to strangers." And he quoted an Ohioan who settled in West Virginia after World War II and became a successful operator of a small industry as having declared:

> There's nothing wrong with the people. They're intelligent and conscientious and want to give a day's work for a day's pay.

That accurately describes West Virginians.

While there is economic and social depression in predominantly mountainous coal-mining areas of the State as a result of rapid and necessary mechanization of coal production, there has also been considerable industrial expansion in the principal river valleys.

Industrial giants in the chemical and allied fields, such as DuPont, Union Carbide, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical, Monsanto, Food Machinery & Chemical, Allied Chemical & Dye, Goodyear, American Viscose, and the Celanese Corp., as well as others, have found it advantageous to situate and expand in West Virginia, utilizing the skills and the labor of adaptable West Virginians to good advantage. Even now an international chemical enterprise, Montecatini, with headquarters in Milan, Italy, and sufficiently aware of the quantity and quality of the West Virginia labor market to be in the process of preparing a site for the construction of a multi-million-dollar plant in one of the State's southwestern counties.

Yes, West Virginia, as a State, and many of its citizens are victims of vast technological changes which have occurred more rapidly than alternatives could be created as counterbalances. This is likewise true in other existing pockets of labor surplus and economic depression in the United States.

But the basic fact remains that West Virginia is a State of rugged beauty, scenic grandeur, and sturdy, adaptable citizenry. There will emerge a better West Virginia, because we will build a better West Virginia.

My home community of Elkins, Randolph County, which is the site of the headquarters for the Monongahela National Forest and where the famous Mountain State Forest Festival is held annually, affords excellent examples of these facts.

Before I came to the U.S. Senate, I participated with other individuals in the founding of the Elkins Industrial Development Corp. Among our activities, we sought new industries for the community, and were successful in procuring one which would utilize both West Virginia natural resources and our citizens' skills and labor.

I refer to the Metalab-Labcraft division of the Norbute Corp., manufacturers and engineers specializing in scientific laboratory furniture and equipment. Our industrial development corporation procured a site and erected a plant facility for the enterprise.

On November 9, 1959—2 years after Metalab-Labcraft established and began operations in Elkins—I received a letter from the plant manager, Mr. John P. Russo, who clearly believes in the industriousness and the adaptability of West Virginians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point extracts from the text of Mr. Russo's communication to me.

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

METALAB LABCRAFT DIVISION,
NORBUTE CORP.,
Elkins, W. Va., November 9, 1959.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Let me again say it was a distinct pleasure to spend a few minutes with you at the Rotary luncheon on November 9. My only regret was that I did not have an opportunity to convey to you some impressions which I feel must be described. As you probably may remember, Metalab Labcraft settled in Elkins just 2 years ago this month. At that time we had a backlog of orders which amounted to several million dollars. We had no trained source or labor and were in reality engaged in fulfilling these contracts with no qualified personnel. The most remarkable fact concerning this situation was that we employed immediately approximately 75 persons, with no past experience or skills in our industry and within the period of 6 months produced all of the items required for our backlog of work at that time.

Perhaps this feat is not impressive to you, since you are probably not aware of the necessary skills and training that are involved in the manufacture of our products. To me, as the operating head of this division, it will always stand out as a tribute to the native intelligence and capabilities of the workers in our areas. Primarily, our personnel had a background and experience in the mining industry and in timber production.

Please believe me, Senator, I am not trying to sound like a representative of the chamber of commerce, nor do I have any prior obligation, either moral or otherwise, which would initiate this letter. I have, however, felt for a long time that some official notice should be taken of our achievement as it affects, and has been affected by, the local labor population.

During the past 2 years we have developed our status in our industry from a new entrant in a very competitive field to a position commanding authority and respect by the leaders in our industry. At the present time we are employing approximately 250 local people. We have just recently completed an expansion to our local facilities giving us approximately 50,000 additional square feet of working space. Our annual payroll at the present time is approximately $750,000 and the anticipated payroll in perhaps another year will probably reach $900,000 annually.

As a personal observation let me state the following: I have been involved in our industry for the past 24 years. During that time I have been located in approximately eight different parts of the country and exposed to the qualifications, capabilities, and aptitudes of the labor pool in those areas. I also estimate that during this period of time that the number of people that have been under my direction either directly or indirectly approximate 5,000 persons. I say without equivocation, that I have never before seen a group of people who have combined their zealousness, attitude, cooperation, and native capabilities, to achieve the measure of performance that we have here.

Metalab Labcraft had conducted an intensive and thorough survey of new plant locations prior to our selection of Elkins. This survey was based on conditions that are generally sought in industry when a factory is being established or moved. We selected Elkins primarily because it is in the heart of the basic raw material for our product. It was expected that the labor supply would be of such a caliber that a training period would be necessary, and it was calculated that before we reached the competitive level in our industry, insofar as quality of production was concerned, that at least a year would be required. I am delighted to say that it took us just about half that time to arrive at a point in production which made us competitive with others in the industry.

Once again, Senator, let me repeat, I have no purpose in submitting this information to you other than to let you know that it is possible, and in our case, has been proven, that plants locating in our State are not taking a calculated risk, but are assured that good management can find capable and qualified labor, which, when combined, give as much chance for success in this State as in any other part of the country.

Please feel free to quote any of the facts stated herein.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

JOHN P. RUSSO,
Plant Manager.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, 6 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives. Four years of that time I was a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. During my 6 years in the House of Representatives I voted five times in favor of the mutual security appropriation bill, each year reluctantly for certain reasons. In my sixth year, I voted against the foreign aid bill.

The things I saw and heard while serving on the House committee convinced me that the time had come for the United States of America to take a new look at the program. I was convinced that we were scattering the tax dollars of the American people in too many countries, and that the returns from those tax dollars did not merit our continuing to engage in such a gigantic program in so many countries; I was also convinced that we should participate in programs only where we could be more sure of the cooperation and assistance of the native governments when the chips are down.

I have never believed that the United States could buy friends, nor do I mean to imply that the announced purpose of the mutual security program is to buy friends.

The mutual security program is just what the name implies. The purpose of

it is to strengthen the security of our own country and at the same time to strengthen the economies and the military potentials of the other countries in the world which we hope would stand with us in fighting communism, whether it be in the form of outright aggression or in the form of subversion and infiltration from within.

I believe this is a laudable purpose, but I feel that the mutual security cloak has been used to cover a multitude of things that are not necessarily in the best interests of our own security or the security of our friends.

I cannot believe that it is in the best interests of our country that we continue to lavish upon more than 60 countries of the world the hard-won fortunes of the American taxpayer, particularly at a time when our own public debt is greater by far than the combined public debt of all the other countries of the world.

I have said many times that there is waste in the program which should be eliminated, and that the program has been mismanaged. When I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House I was in touch with facts and information upon which I could base my position. I am not a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nevertheless, I feel that we are still going too far in the wrong direction, without a compass and without a chart.

I have often said that I think we should take a new look at the foreign aid program. I am positive that it could be reduced. I am certainly in favor of helping countries which cannot help themselves, and which, by their actions, their words, and their past deeds have shown that they will help America stand against the wave of communism.

I have not been in favor of supporting dictatorships when American tax dollars are used, not so much to stem the progress of communism as to solidify the hold of a dictator upon his own people.

So I see in this program something that is good and something that is bad. As we say down in the hills of West Virginia, there is never a pancake so thin but that there are two sides to it. I have never maintained that the program is all bad, but I have been sincerely opposed to the operation of it as it has been carried out in recent years.

I am nonplused and disappointed, of course, when the Chief Executive of our Nation continues to plead the cause of the foreign aid program, while at the same time he seems to be oblivious, as it were, to the needs of a great State and a great people located almost within a stone's throw of the Capitol. I find it hard to understand his attitude and the attitude of the administration in this regard.

On last Thursday the President opened the 1960 Republican national campaign. He denounced spending. I, too, am against spending. I am against squandering the American taxpayers' dollars promiscuously all over the face of the globe, at a time when nearly 300,000 West Virginians are living on "mollygrub," the term given to commodities that are in surplus as a result of our price-support program. Many thousands of families in West Virginia are existing on this inadequate diet of rice, meal, flour, dried eggs, and lard.

I have often taken notice of the fact that the President is in favor of spending a dollar anywhere in the world where apparently it is recommended to be spent by the International Cooperation Administration, while he is opposed to a coal research bill, an area redevelopment bill, Federal money for school construction, flood control dams, and other public works projects here in America.

It reminds me of a poem I learned a long time ago:

Woodman, spare that tree.

I like to think of it in this instance as the foreign-aid tree—

Woodman, spare that foreign-aid tree!
Touch not a single bough!
In youth it sheltered me,
And I'll protect it now.

West Virginians, who have given of their fortunes, who have given their sons and daughters in the service of their country, simply cannot understand stories which appear in newspapers which read like this one from the Washington Post:

Pakistan today, January 28, signed an agreement with the United States to buy 350,000 tons of American wheat for $26,000, payable in Pakistan rupees.

That amounts to less than 7½ cents a ton, and it is payable in Pakistan rupees, which means really that we get nothing.

Nor can West Virginians understand headlines such as this: "Poland To Get $40 Million in U.S. Aid."

The Associated Press article in today's Washington Evening Star reads thusly:

The United States is about to give $40 million more in economic aid—the third such installment in the past 8 months.

At the same time, the Polish Communist regime is reported nearly ready to sign an agreement compensating Americans for property seized in Poland immediately after World War II.

This will raise to slightly more than $300 million the amount of economic assistance given Poland in the past 3 years.

The State Department is reported ready—

The State Department is always ready—

to consider more such aid in the months ahead.

The Eisenhower administration supports the measure but has not been pressing it as a matter of urgency.

Yet, the President in his speech opening the 1960 GOP campaign denounced spending.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator's remarks today remind me of the information I put into the RECORD dealing with one phase of this subject, when I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that a number of foreign countries, particularly European countries, had applied our foreign aid money in so-called counterpart funds, after our money had been invested in those foreign countries, to the reduction of their national debts. In a great many cases that money completely wiped out their national debts. I believe it involved more than $2 billion. That was our money which we generated with our foreign aid. It was created by our dollars in the first instance—and it amounted to more than $2 billion—and that money was being used to reduce or pay off entirely the national debts of a large number of foreign countries.

Oddly enough, with regard to most of these countries, we today owe them in dollars amounts of money which exceed again the amounts we gave them to apply against their national debts. As the Senator has pointed out, the United States is deeper in debt than all the rest of the countries of the earth put together. We have virtually retired the national debts of some of these foreign countries by heaping those debts on our own back, when they were much better able to pay them to begin with than we are today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. His remarks are as usual—cogent and perspicacious.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my distinguished senior colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for my colleague's kind indulgence to give me this opportunity perhaps not to engage in colloquy but to bring additional information to him in connection with his very illuminating address today.

At the outset, I wish to say in good humor that when he speaks of pancakes in West Virginia, I should like to reinforce what he says by reminding our friends that in West Virginia the best buckwheat cakes in the world may be had. I know my colleague will agree with me when I say that a certain section of West Virginia raises the best buckwheat in the United States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If my colleague will permit me to supplement his statement, I should like to say that we also produce the finest maple syrup in the country to go with the buckwheat cakes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. If we are to speak about the good food produced in West Virginia, which we would like to make possible to place on the tables of all our people, we would certainly wish to add that delicacy, West Virginia ham.

However, in connection with the very pertinent information which the Senator brings to his colleagues this afternoon, I would refer to an address I made on the floor of the Senate on January 21, which I believe reinforces the remarks the Senator is making, and which I believe is appropriate for me to note at this point. I said:

I doubt not that if General Eisenhower had spent as much time touring our own underdeveloped and distressed areas as he already has done in Asia and Africa, he would have an awareness of the problems of West Virginia and of other States in the same degree as he seems to have toward those of India and other countries.

I emphasize that there is need for a sympathetic and realistic approach by the White House to domestic matters, which was the central theme of my remarks on distressed areas. I ask the further indulgence of my colleague to read the next paragraph of my speech of January 21:

Now, I have never been one to declare that I will oppose economic assistance abroad until my claims and appeals for domestic development are met. But surely, in the interests of commonsense and national security, as well as humanitarianism, we must acknowledge our responsibilities to our own people at least as much as to those of Asia and Africa. In fact, I have said—and I declare with renewed emphasis—it is my opinion that for every dollar we make available for assistance abroad we have a double obligation to our fellow citizens in the United States.

I commend my colleague for the diligence with which he attacks the problem.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, in the United States, as of November 1959, there were 172 distressed labor markets. This number compared with 119 such markets in January 1959. We must note that these figures would have been much higher had complete data been available for the State of Pennsylvania, a State so ably represented, in part, by its distinguished senior Senator [Mr. CLARK], who presently presides over the Senate.

West Virginia had 18 such distressed labor areas in November. The State has a civilian labor force of more than 643,000, but of that number more than 85,000 are unemployed at present. These are those for which there are records. The actual number undoubtedly is well above 100,000. Thus, a total of 13.3 percent of the labor force is unemployed, a figure which is well above the national average.

As of November 1959, 5.3 percent of the total national labor force was without work across the country. However, three major metropolitan areas in my State are well above the national unemployment rate: Charleston, with 9.1 percent; Huntington-Ashland, Ky., with 13.4 percent; and Wheeling-Steubenville, Ohio, with 11.2 percent.

Perhaps the smaller areas are even more disheartening. For instance, Beckley, which is the county seat of my home county, Raleigh County, has 29 percent of its labor force idle; Bluefield, only 50 miles away, has 21.9 percent of its labor force idle; Logan, 70 miles away, has 19.7 percent of its labor force idle. These communities are in the southern section of the State—the largest coal producing area of the world.

Of course, such figures are not limited to the southern portion of West Virginia. In the center of my State, in the cities of Clarksburg and Fairmont, the unemployment figures are 9.2 percent and 17.8 percent, respectively. In the once thriving railroad town of Grafton, 31.6 percent of the available workers are idle—almost one out of every three.

On the western border, the picture is duplicated. In the Point Pleasant-Gallipolis area, 11.7 percent of the labor force is without work.

So this unemployment cancer, as it might be referred to, figuratively, is spread throughout the whole frame of the State. Eighteen distressed labor areas constitute a picture which is discouraging.

Only one other State, Pennsylvania, has more distressed labor markets; but the percentage of unemployment in the Keystone State is lower due to the fact that it has many more citizens.

Mr. President, this is the time for assistance. The Apostle Paul said in his First Epistle to Timothy:

But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith * * *.

It seems to me that we are ever ready to participate in programs to assist our brothers across the sea, while at the same time those of our household here at home, who contribute to the Treasury from which must come funds to help those abroad, are forgotten. The people of West Virginia are not looking for a Government handout; they are merely seeking the opportunity to create their own means of support. The Area Redevelopment Act, which passed the Senate last year, would have made possible this opportunity. Similar legislation passed by Congress was vetoed by the President upon a former occasion. So it is difficult not to be a bit skeptical of the idea of handing out taxpayers' dollars to 65 or 70 countries throughout the world, some of them ruled by Communist regimes, loyal only to the Kremlin, while our own people are unemployed and in need of help.

If the President and his advisers were to have the solemn experience of seeing small children receive one balanced meal a day, and that meal the school lunch which is provided for them; if he and his advisers could see men with holes in their shoes, going from one place to another searching for work; if they could talk with fathers whose household utilities have been stopped—simply because of inability to pay the service bills; if they could see some of the mothers as they feed their infant children on the powdered milk which is being supplied through the Surplus Commodity program; I feel that they would better understand why those of us who come from these blighted areas oppose further foreign giveaways and why we want action dedicated to the interests of our own people. Mr. President, this is not a partisan matter with me. Of course, I could be strongly partisan about it. I represent the greatest coal-producing State in the United States. The greatest coal-producing county in the United States is one in which my father worked in the mines 35 years ago. Those mines no longer operate. The tipples no longer run. The steam engines no longer plow the valleys. Whole towns are deserted. Families are living in penury and want and privation.

Children are forced to quit school because they do not have adequate clothing. I visited some schools recently in West Virginia, and I found numerous instances of children taking the half pints of milk which are supplied in the school lunch program, putting them in their pockets or their bags, and taking them home to the babies. Yes, they would take food home to the babies. Imagine this if you can. Children willing to do without food themselves and taking food home from the school lunch program for the benefit of younger children.

Mr. President, I could relate many dismal pictures which I have seen in my visits around the Mountain State in recent months. West Virginia has for a long time leaned largely upon its coal industry, about which I have already spoken. West Virginia has the finest coal in the world—bituminous coal, soft coal, smokeless coal, from which thousands of by-products can be derived.

The coal industry is a sick industry. Mechanization has come to the coal industry; and the old pick-and-shovel miners of whom my dad was one, have departed from the scene, never to return. West Virginia can still produce as much coal, but with fewer men.

The coal industry in West Virginia needs help. This is why I was so strongly in support of the coal research bill which President Eisenhower vetoed last year.

I say the administration is blind and deaf to the needs of the coal industry, an industry that is basic to the Nation's security.

Mr. President, I shall state to the Senate what the Government of our country is doing for some of the mining industries of other countries. I shall take the time—long though it may be, and laborious though the effort may be—to read into the RECORD the amounts of money our Government has been spending in the past 5 years to assist the mining and minerals industries of other countries of the world. The figures I shall present have been provided by the International Cooperation Administration.

In the fiscal year 1955, the United States gave to China $5,000 for coal exploration, $715,000 for petroleum exploration, $5,000 for hard rock mining, $2,000 for coal production techniques, $4,000 to be used under the item of geological techniques, and $2,000 for mining engineering.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I take it that the aid to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred was not given to Communist China, even though some aid was given to some Communist countries. Instead, I take it that that aid was given to the little island of Formosa, or to so-called Nationalist China. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad the Senator from Alaska has emphasized that fact. I consider myself a friend of the Chinese Government on Formosa, but at the same time I believe we should be conscious of the needs of

our own coal industry here at home. And the Eisenhower administration has thus far shown little concern for its needs.

In the same year—the fiscal year 1955—we gave to Indonesia, for mining operations, $32,500.

In the Philippines we spent $28,000 on a nonmetallic minerals survey, $37,000 for a strategic minerals survey, $22,000 for technical assistance to the Bureau of Mines in the Philippines, and $35,000 for coal surveys.

I say to my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that in Thailand we spent $52,500 for a geological survey.

In Vietnam we graciously contributed $7,000 for a coal strip mining survey.

In Afghanistan we contributed $67,000 for mineral resources and coal production.

In Egypt—and the mention of that name brings back memories of Uncle Sam's being kicked in the teeth, not once, but several times—we spent $8,000 for industry and mining, and $4,500 for industry and mining photogeology training.

In Greece we spent $22,624 for technical support to the mining industry, and $34,300 for a study of mining methods and ore dressing.

To India, one of our neutral friends, we gave $519,600 for exploratory lignite excavation and development, and $83,873 for minerals survey and development.

In Iran in the fiscal year 1955 we spent $17,124 for mineral resources development plans; and after the plans are prepared, heaven only knows how much we shall have to spend to implement them.

In Israel we spent $4,000 for petrochemistry, $43,600 for economic geologists, $12,500 for the appraisal and development of mineral resources, $38,034 for mineral technologists, $40,000 for minerals development, $15,000 for a Dead Sea brines survey, $3,000 for mineral resources, potash and salt extraction participantship, and $3,000 for petroleum exploration methods participantship.

In the same year we spent $50,000 in Liberia for mining and minerals exploration, and $20,000 for mines and geology.

In Nepal we spent $20,000 on a project for mineral deposit surveys.

In Pakistan we contributed $5,450 for metal mining engineering.

In Turkey we spent $10,000 for cobalt recovery processes and $204,400 for the Zonguldak coal basin development.

To the United Kingdom we contributed $4,000 for "U.S. bituminous coal-mining methods," whatever that means.

In Austria we spent $10,000 for coal mining experts.

To France we contributed $6,000 for iron mining experts.

In Spain—and how we do love to build castles in Spain—we spent $8,640 for a coal-mining study.

Now, as to Latin America—at last we are turning our attention to our friends to the south of us—we spent $10,828 in Bolivia on geology.

In Brazil, we spent $190,213 for geological survey mineral resources investigations.

In Chile we spent $64,400 for geology.

In Colombia we spent $19,238 for the development of coal resources of the Department of Cauca and the Cauca Valley.

In Cuba we spent $38,600 for mineral analysis and development, in the fiscal year 1955; and we spent $28,700 for basic geological research.

In Honduras we spent, for coal resources survey and development, $7,950.

In Mexico we spent $850—a small token of our good feeling—for an instrument calibration technician.

In Peru we spent $78,961 for advisory services, mineral resources. We spent in the same year $81,905 in Peru for advisory services in mining and metallurgy.

In the same year we spent $10,400 in British Guiana for a mining and minerals project.

So much for fiscal year 1955.

In 1956 we spent, in Cambodia, $25,000 for mineral development.

In China, again, in that year, we spent $103,000 for coal mine improvement; $10,182 for solid fuels and minerals exploration survey; $25,000 for coal exploration; $7,000 for petroleum exploration; $100,000 for coal mine demonstration; $27,000 for geological equipment.

In Indonesia we spent $154,959 on mining operations.

In Korea we spent $1,800 for coal mining operations and management.

We spent a bare $550,000 for the development of the Hambaek coalfields there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if I may interrupt my colleague, did he say a bare $550,000?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It was a niggardly sum of $550,000. We also spent $500,000 on test drilling of the same coal field. In the Philippines we spent $53,000 for a nonmetallic minerals survey; $240,000 for a strategic minerals survey; $29,500 for technical assistance to the Bureau of Mines; and $53,000 for coal surveys.

In Thailand we spent $45,900 for a geological survey; we spent $30,500 on a minerals experimental center; and we spent $10,000 for experimental metal mining operations.

In Afghanistan, in the year 1956, we spent $93,000 for mineral resources and coal production.

In Egypt we spent $1,500 for industry and mining; mining and minerals; and $58,750 for minerals resources development.

In Greece we spent, in the fiscal year 1956, $13,720 for technical training in the minerals field.

In India we spent $9,100 for exploratory lignite excavation and development; and $133,723 for a minerals survey and development.

In Iran we spent $2,500 for mineral resources.

In Israel we spent $39,000 for petrochemical research; $105,200 for mineral exploration and development; $40,000 for the Department of Metallurgy; and $45,000 for conservation techniques in oilfield development.

Now we come to Jordan. I do not recall that we spent any money there in connection with mining in 1955, but we spent $51,200 for Dead Sea mineral resources in 1956.

In Lebanon, we spent $30,000 on a mineral survey.

In Nepal, we spent $5,000 for Nepal American Minerals Cooperative Service; and $74,000 on minerals deposit surveys.

In Pakistan we spent $502,000 for the development of Makarwal collieries; $53,700 for the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey Advisory Service; and $75,000 for surveys of chemical and industrial potential of Sui gas.

In Turkey we spent $661,000 for the Zonguldak coal basin development; $401,000 for a copper mine expansion program; and $100,000 for a copper mine sulphuric acid sea line.

Now, as to Africa, in Liberia, we spent $20,000 for mining and minerals exploration demonstration and training project; $23,000 for mines and geology.

Returning to Spain, we spent $3,840 for a coal mining productivity study; $11,925 for coal mining consultants; $12,800 for a lead and iron ore mining productivity study and $100,000 for laboratory equipment.

To Yugoslavia—one of our tried and trusted friends—one upon whom we cannot depend—we gave $35,700 for nonferrous metals and metallurgy; and $12,700 for fuels.

In Bolivia we spent $162,000 for a mining survey——

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. To refer to Turkey for a moment, I have no desire to be critical of that friendly country, but I note that in the figures assembled for 1956 we spent $661,000 for coal basin development.

I should like to refresh the recollection of my colleague by saying this is about one-third of the amount of money which was called for, for the fiscal year 1959, when we passed the Coal Research and Development Commission bill last year, and which, after the session had closed, the President failed to sign.

It is noteworthy that in the United States we ask for a reasonable amount of money for a domestic research project, but even this reasonable amount was thought by the President to be not justified.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I notice the long list of countries which are receiving aid for coal surveys, coal exploration, coal development—all kinds of assistance to the coal industry and to those engaged in it—while the President vetoed a modest bill to provide a survey which would enable the people of West Virginia, perhaps, to find a way to develop their coal industry and put their coal miners back to work and enable them to have a little food on the family's kitchen table.

The Senator mentioned Bolivia. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia has read the recent report of the

Committee on Government Operations to show how shockingly our program in Bolivia has been mismanaged. The report indicates that program after program, involving the expenditure of large amounts of the American taxpayers' dollars, proved to be utterly worthless and had to be abandoned, and that millions of dollars worth of food had been lost, strayed, or stolen in transit to Bolivia.

I recommend that report to the attion of the Senator from West Virginia, in view of the fact that for 4 or 5 years, while he was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, he supported the foreign aid program. I think that how the Bolivian program has been mismanaged is something the American people should know about. I think the Senator is to be highly commended for bringing to their attention today the fact that we are spending millions of the taxpayers' dollars abroad for industry and relief, when our own people are denied the smallest measure of relief by this administration.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows of any previous administration in which the interest of foreign countries was considered superior to or as having priority over the needs of our own people.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not. I do not know of any previous administration which gave foreign countries priority over our own people.

I am grateful for the Senator's contribution concerning the report as it pertained to Bolivia. I am sure the Senator will have something to add concerning the manner in which we have attempted to rehabilitate the fishing industries of other countries, some of which were engaged in fishing before Leif Ericson or Columbus came to America. At the same time, perhaps the Senator's own good State of Alaska is having difficulty with its fishing industry.

Mr. GRUENING. I will say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that we do not have to single out any particular industry in which foreign countries are favored, and our people are told, "we cannot appropriate money for things for our own country because the expenditures are wasteful; they are extravagant; they will be inflationary; they will tend to unbalance the budget."

We can name any human activity, whether it be reclamation, irrigation, road construction, housing, classrooms, or what not for which we are not allowed money. We can name many domestic activities for which we cannot have appropriations, or can have them only in limited amounts, whereas we find American money being expended for such activities in 50 countries all over the world.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

In fiscal year 1956 we gave to Brazil $204,500 for U.S. Geological Survey mineral resources; and $85,400 for mineral resources development.

To Chile we contributed $86,500 for geology.

We gave $23,000 to Colombia for coal resources development.

It seems to me that some of our chickens are coming home to roost, when I think of Cuba. The example of Cuba is an example of the ingratitude which men can show toward those who have given assistance. There we spent $29,900 for basic geological research and $32,000 for mineral analysis and development.

To Mexico we gave $38,000 for minerals technology cooperation, Bureau of Mines; and $116,800 for industry and mining, and to Honduras we gave $29,107 for a mining coal resources survey.

To Peru we gave $98,338 for advisory services mineral resources; and $49,390 for advisory services mining and metallurgy.

To British Guiana we gave $6,000 for mining and minerals.

In the fiscal year 1957 we gave $15,000, for the purpose of mineral development, to Cambodia.

We gave $782,000 to China, again, for coal mine improvement. We gave $25,000 to China for solid fuels and mineral exploration survey; and $5,000 for petroleum exploration.

To Indonesia we gave $122,000, under the item of mining operations, in the fiscal year 1957.

We can see that the figures have been increasing for Indonesia, and for China.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Are we not being asked by the administration steadily to increase the foreign aid program at the very same time when we are enjoined to stop spending at home?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. GRUENING. How does the Senator reconcile this strange contradiction?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think it simply reveals to us the crazy world we live in. I simply cannot understand the asinine policies of the administration, which lead more and more in the direction of giving more and more abroad while we deny our people at home what they need.

We continue to talk about a balanced budget and about the national debt. The President conveniently overlooks the fact, as I said a moment ago, that our national debt is already far larger than all the national debts of the other countries of the world put together. The President conveniently overlooks the fact that the interest on the national debt is partly the result of American tax dollars appropriated in past years for foreign aid.

All the cost of the foreign aid program is not embodied in the item itself. A part of it is in the form of interest that we are annually being called on to pay on the moneys which have been expended for foreign aid in the past.

Mr. GRUENING. And are we not borrowing money from our own people in order to give foreign aid, when at the same time we deny our own people what they need?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are. We are borrowing money from our own people.

Mr. GRUENING. And while we are borrowing it we constantly increase our costs, through the higher interest rates which the administration is now seeking to make even higher.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are contributing to the inflationary spiral.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In Korea in 1957 we spent $139,000 for test drilling of Hambalk coalfields; and $100,000 for test drilling, Han Kook Geological Industrial Co. We spent $475,000 for geophysical survey and test drilling, ROK Office of Geological Survey. We spent $150,000 for mine development of the Monazite ore separating plant. We spent $3,247,000 in the fiscal year 1957 for mine development of the Dae Han coal mines in Korea. We spent $136,000 for geophysical survey and test drilling.

In Laos we spent $8,000 for mining and minerals survey.

In the Philippines we spent $41,000 for nonmetallic mineral survey. We spent $25,000 for technical assistance, Bureau of Mines. We spent $24,000 for coal surveys.

In Thailand we spent $58,000 for geological survey, $22,000 for minerals experimental center, and $130,000 for an airborne geophysical survey.

In Vietnam we spent $56,000 for Nong Son coal exploration survey.

In Afghanistan we spent, in the fiscal year 1957, $875,000 for minerals resources and coal production.

In Ceylon we spent $56,000 for minerals exploration.

In Egypt we spent $22,000 for minerals resources department.

We spent $14,000 in Greece for technical training in the minerals fields.

We spent $113,000 in India on minerals survey and development.

In Israel we spent $78,000 for minerals development, $25,000 for the department of metallurgy, and $2,000 for conservation techniques in oilfield development.

In Nepal we spent $137,000 for mineral deposits surveys.

In Pakistan we spent $593,000 for Makarwal colleries.

We spent $50,000 for the Bureau for Mines and geological survey.

Next is Turkey. I want to make it emphatically clear that I consider Turkey to be one of our stanchest friends. I believe that the spending of American dollars in Turkey redounds to the best interests of our own country.

The Turks were fighting their neighbors to the north a long time before America became a republic, and they have shown by their words and deeds that they will stand on the side of the free world. I merely wish to point out the expenditure of moneys in scores of countries abroad for mining, mining surveys, coal mine development, and so forth, while our own native domestic coal industry has suffered.

In Turkey, we spent $380,000 in fiscal year 1957 for Zonguldak Coal Basin development; and $178,000 for the copper mine expansion program.

In Turkey we also spent $450,000 for western lignite mines in the fiscal year 1957, and we spent $500,000 for private mining development. We also gave $20,000 for preventive maintenance advisers which makes a total of $1,528,000 spent in Turkey in the fiscal year 1957 in the mining industry.

In fiscal 1957 we gave $10,000 to Liberia for mining and geology. We gave $24,000 to Libya—this is a new one—$24,000 to Libya for a minerals investigation, and again $42,000 for a minerals investigation to the same country.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In mentioning Libya the Senator said this is a new one.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is new because I do not recall having read the name in the two prior fiscal years.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. The situation appears to be this. In this wave of nationalism and desire and aspirations of countries for independence with which Americans naturally sympathize—because we were the originators in modern times of the movement for independence and liberty—I would assume that these new nations seeking independence would try to wait at least for a year of two. However, what happens is that the mother country, the old colonial power, in yielding to the request of a prospective independent nation, says, in effect, "All right, kid, you are now on your own."

What happens then? The mother country stops the subsidy to her former colony, and then good-natured Uncle Sam rushes in immediately, hardly able to wait for the new country to be spawned before offering the new country our taxpayers' dollars. We do not even wait to see whether the country can support itself. We do not even go to the mother country and say, "You should take care of this infant for a few years." The Senator will find, as he proceeds, that in subsequent years there will be additional countries added to the list every time a new country is spawned. New countries are being spawned at a very rapid pace, and those countries will be added to our assistance rolls as soon as they are spawned. That list consists now of 70 countries. By the time the Senator has concluded his research he will probably find that there are 75 countries.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The list may have increased by one or two countries in the time that I have been reading these figures.

Mr. GRUENING. It is entirely possible, because the list of beneficiaries is so long it would be entirely possible that several countries have been born in the interval.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In fiscal year 1957, we gave to Southern Rhodesia for metallurgical chemistry, $3,000. We gave to Spain, in fiscal year 1957, $90,000 in laboratory equipment, and $6,000 for an iron ore mining productivity study.

To Yugoslavia we gave $138,000 in fiscal year 1957, for industry, mining, and minerals.

To Latin America we gave $199,000 to Bolivia for a mining survey. We gave $44,000 to Brazil for a geological survey and mineral resources investigation, which was a nonferrous project. We also gave Brazil $209,000 for a geological survey and mineral resources investigation, a ferrous project. We also gave Brazil $44,000 for mineral resources development.

To Chile we gave $130,000 under an item called geology.

To Colombia we gave $13,000 for coal resources development in the department of Cauca and the Cauca Valley.

To Cuba we gave $18,000 for mineral analysis and development, and $19,000 for basic geological research.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Was that B.C.?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That was in fiscal year 1957.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was thinking of before Castro.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are both interested in what we are giving A.C., after Castro.

We gave $75,000 to Honduras for industry mining coal resources development.

To Mexico we gave $35,000 for minerals technology cooperation, bureau of mines; and $59,000 for industry and mining.

To Peru we gave $76,000 for advisory services in mineral resources geology, and $42,000 for advisory services in mining and metallurgy.

In fiscal year 1958 we gave to Taiwan $689,000 for coal-mining development, and $13,000 for mineral development, other than coal.

To the Indonesian Republic we gave $154,000 for mining operations.

In fiscal year 1958 we also gave $245,000 to Korea for coal-mining development; $630,000 for development of metals and minerals mining; and $79,000 for mining and geological training.

To the Philippines we gave $52,000 for a nonmetallic minerals survey; $397,000 for a strategic minerals survey; and $25,000 for technical assistance to the Bureau of Mines.

To Thailand we gave $52,000 for mining development. To Vietnam we gave $12,000 for the Nong Son coal exploration survey.

To Afghanistan, in fiscal year 1958 we gave $164,000 for mineral resources and coal production.

To Ceylon we gave $14,000 for mineral exploration. To India we gave $18,000 for exploratory lignite excavation and development; $279,000 for a geological survey; $41,000 for an oil and gas commission; and $10,000 for assistance to the coal industry.

That does not take into consideration the amount of money that we have given to India for the purchase and supply of railroad cars and other hauling equipment. The same holds true in the case of the other countries as well. That is a pertinent factor in coal production.

Mr. GRUENING. Nor do those extensive figures which the distinguished Senator has been reading into the RECORD take into account numerous contributions by other foreign loan and spending agencies of which the International Cooperation Administration is only one.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In the Near East and South Asia, during fiscal year 1958, we gave Israel $82,000 for minerals exploration and development, and $6,000 for conservation techniques in oil field development.

To Nepal, in fiscal year 1958 we gave $130,000 for a project for mineral deposit surveys. To Pakistan we gave $246,000 for geological survey advisory service. It does not say whether it is East Pakistan or West Pakistan, but we can be sure that we are giving to both.

To Turkey, in fiscal year 1958, we gave $62,000 for the Zonguldak Coal Basin development, and $20,000 for a preventive maintenance adviser.

In Africa, we gave Ghana $8,000 during fiscal year 1958, and we gave $66,000 to Libya. We gave to the United Kingdom, for overseas territories, $15,000 for increasing the productivity of the wolfram mining industry.

We gave to Spain $12,000 for civil aviation "POL laboratory equipment;" and $11,000 for a copper mining productivity study.

To Yugoslavia for fiscal year 1958, we gave $308,000 for mining and minerals—coal mining, coke and coke byproducts; $33,000 for mining and minerals; $20,000 for mining and minerals; $3,000 for mining and minerals; $33,000 for mining and minerals; and $10,000 for technical inquiry service support.

The philosophy seems to be that the harder a country kicks Uncle Sam in the teeth the more money Uncle Sam takes out of his pockets to help that country. In Latin America, we gave $24,000 to Argentina for geology and mining training.

We gave $120,000 to Bolivia for her mining industry.

To Brazil, we gave $23,000 for geological education project; $62,000 for geological survey mineral resources; $246,000 for geological survey mineral resources; and $28,000 for mineral resources development.

It will not be long, I say to my colleague from West Virginia and to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], until we may be buying coal from other countries. Their mining industries will be in far better shape than our own.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from West Virginia believe that an interesting concomitant of this foreign spending is that we are not only helping foreign industries—giving them help which we deny our own industries—but are erecting competitors of our own industries? As the Senator from West Virginia has suggested, before long we will be buying coal, food, fish, and all kinds of agricultural products from those countries where we have created new industries and helped to build them up.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There is no doubt about it.

To Chile we gave $217,000 for geology.

To Colombia we gave $25,000 for coal resources development.

To Cuba we gave $21,000 for mineral analysis and development and $6,000 for basic geological research.

We gave $13,000 to Honduras for coal resources development.

We gave $38,000 to Mexico for minerals technology cooperation and $19,000 for geological survey.

To Peru we gave $66,000 for advisory services, mineral resources; and $60,000 for advisory services, mining, and metallurgy.

To British Guiana we gave $2,000 for training in prospecting for materials.

In the fiscal year 1959 we gave to China $966,000 for coal mine development.

My, what that would do for West Virginia, I say to my distinguished colleague. What $966,000 would not do to stimulate the coal industry in West Virginia. We gave almost a million dollars for coal mining development in China.

In 1955, may I point out, the total amount of money spent on coal research in this country was $17 million. Yet we give in 1959—in 1 year—almost $1 million to China for coal mining development. But the $17 million spent in this country was spent by the coal industry itself, not by the Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. An industry which could not afford to spend it, from the standpoint of the return on its capital investment; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Because of the growing tide of imports of residual oil from Venezuela and other countries which are dumping this product at almost any price in the United States, our domestic coal industry is further jeopardized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. To Indonesia, we gave $162,000 for mining operations.

To Korea, in fiscal 1959, for coal mining development, we gave $963,000; for development of metals, minerals, and mining, other than coal, $1,249,000; and $29,000 for mining and geological training.

To Laos, we gave $215,000 for mining and mineral surveys.

To the Philippines, we gave $29,000 for nonmetallic minerals survey; $228,000 for strategic minerals survey; and $38,000 for technical assistance to the Bureau of Mines.

To Thailand, we gave $48,000 for mining development and $30,000 for airborne geophysical survey.

To Vietnam, we gave, for the Nongson Coal Mine development project, $1,630,000.

To Afghanistan, we gave $82,000 for mineral resources and coal production.

To Ceylon, we gave $17,000 for minerals exploration.

To India, we gave $8,000 for exploratory lignite excavation and development; $137,000 for geological survey; $12,000 for oil and gas commission; and $27,000 for assistance to coal industry.

To Israel, we gave $78,000 for minerals exploration and development, and $6,000 for conservation techniques in oilfield development.

To Nepal, we gave $148,000 for mineral resources development.

To Pakistan, we gave $164,000 for geological survey advisory service.

To Turkey, we gave $3,000 for undersea coal mine operations, and $5,000 to Institute of Applied Geology.

To Ghana, we gave $168,000 for geological survey project, and $11,000 for industrial education project.

To Libya, we gave $74,000 for minerals investigation.

To Spain, we gave $2,000 for POL laboratory; $4,000 for USGC School of Photogeology; and $8,000 for oil exploration and production study.

Yugoslavia, our never-failing friend, received $266,000 for coal mining, coke, and coke byproducts; $72,000 for mining and minerals; $81,000 for mining and minerals; $18,000 for mining and minerals.

In Latin America, Argentina received, for geology and mining training, $26,000.

Bolivia received $127,000 for increasing and diversifying mining production.

To Brazil, we gave $120,000 for geological education projects, $93,000 for mineral resources investigations, $198,000 for mineral resources investigations, and $31,000 for mineral resources development.

To Chile, we gave $274,000 for geology.

To Colombia, we gave $19,000 for coal resources development in the Department of Cauca and the Cauca Valley.

I may be pronouncing some of the names incorrectly. I am familiar, however, with the value of the American dollar. I am not quite so familiar with the pronunciation of some of the foreign names.

To Cuba we gave $24,000 for mineral analysis and development. That was in the fiscal year 1959. I am sure that was not "B.C."

To Honduras, we gave $18,000 for coal resources survey.

To Mexico, we gave $44,000 for mineral technology cooperation, and $37,000 for geological survey.

To Peru, we gave $71,000 for advisory services, mineral resources, and $54,000 for advisory resources, mining, and metallurgy.

To British Guiana we gave $2,000 for photogeology training.

To the West Indies and East Caribbean, we gave $4,000 for a preliminary survey of pumice and pozzuolanic earth deposits.

Mr. President, I have read into the RECORD amounts of moneys which have been contributed to foreign governments by the U.S. Government during the fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have found it necessary to be off the floor because of a long-distance telephone call, but I believe, in totaling those figures, the aggregate would be approximately $15 million in that period of 5 fiscal years which the United States has provided these countries for coal mining operations of one type or another. Would that figure be approximately correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. The figure is $14,605,900.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If that total is correct, it is the total contributed by only one of the several agencies which are engaged in spending foreign aid—the ICA. It does not cover various other agencies which are likewise engaged very actively in the same pursuit.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I think I should say to my colleague from West Virginia that the Senator from Alaska has brought to our attention a very important point. He mentioned it earlier this afternoon. Frankly, the figures assembled are not only depressing to those of us who live in West Virginia and have need for dollars there, but are startling.

I presume similar expenditure facts can be procured from the other agencies mentioned by the Senator from Alaska.

I remember that the Senator called attention to $3,000 which was given to Turkey in the fiscal year 1959. I wanted to make sure if that was for undersea coal-mining operations. I am told that is true.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the 1961 budget which has been submitted to the Congress, the administration has requested an increase amounting to $279,000 for a study of the processing and utilization of bituminous coal—a rather paltry sum as compared with some of the amounts of money which are being sent to other countries of the world to rehabilitate or to develop and strengthen their coal-mining industries.

West Virginia is not going to continue to hold the poor status it holds today. I am confident that our State, with its great people and its limitless resources, has a very brilliant and wonderful future. I am not at all discouraged about the future of West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. But my colleague is discouraged, is he not, about the attitude of the present administration, which—over and over again—indicates that we must not cut one dollar from the foreign aid appropriations it requests, but, apparently, insists that we must not give consideration to what we believe to be rather small requests for domestic coal research and development programs. My colleague calls our attention to that inconsistency, does he not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, I do.

Furthermore, I believe it should be remembered that the expenditures which some of us here on the floor have requested from time to time for various purposes, such as the area redevelopment legislation of last year, would be paid back to the Federal Government manyfold.

Conversely, much of the funds which our country is sending abroad will perhaps never be repaid. On the contrary, they will be used to stimulate industries in those countries, and their industries will compete with our own industries; and the expenditure of these sums in those countries will result in a burden which will continue to be an onerous one to the taxpayers of the United States for all of the years to come.

We now, of course, have the development loan program, which is just another rathole into which are being poured the dollars of American taxpayers. It has an innocent-appearing and fine-sounding name—"the development loan program"; and many persons are being fooled by it. However, under that program we are lending dollars which will not be repaid in dollars. Instead, they will be repaid in the currencies of the various countries, and it will not be possible for our Government to spend those currencies in this country, or convert them to dollars. This program is just another giveaway program; and it is the creation of the Eisenhower ad-

ministration. As it is becoming more and more difficult from year to year to get the foreign giveaway program approved by Congress, in view of the mounting opposition, the Eisenhower administration has found it necessary to call it by a new name. It is the same old pill but it is supposed to taste better.

I wish to emphasize that I am not opposed to spending a dollar anywhere in the world if it will benefit the United States. On the other hand, I believe that there must be some sense of balance in connection with this entire matter.

I am against giving priority to foreign aid, as opposed to domestic programs which will help our own suffering citizens.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to his colleague?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Earlier this afternoon I indicated that the administration is in opposition to the development of most aid programs in the United States, although, at the same time, it actively favors the development of assistance programs in foreign countries. We believe domestic programs should be enacted into law for the benefit of American citizens at the same time that the foreign aid programs, which have been mentioned by my colleague in the course of his very able remarks of this afternoon, are pushed forward.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to make sure that I understand the import of the speech the able Senator from West Virginia is making. As I understand, the import of his remarks is as follows: In contrast to the very large number of projects in foreign countries, including those for coal mining, coal exploration, coal surveys, colliery rehabilitation, nonmetallic studies—which would relate primarily to coal, for the only other ones in that category are sand and gravel—which are costing very large amounts of money, this administration vetoed the proposal to make a study of the improved use of this resource in the United States, in order to obtain better use of that resource and to determine whether the miners could be better used. The Senator from West Virginia, in the course of his remarks, has pointed out that these two things have happened at the same time, under the same administration. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. The Coal Research and Development Commission, as it was planned by the Congress, would have made possible a program of research, the purpose being to develop new uses for coal and new and improved methods of transporting and mining coal; and, undoubtedly, in the long run that program would have contributed to the strengthening of the industry, and to the employment of the people and the improvement of the economy, not only in West Virginia, but also in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and the other coal-producing States of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy that our colleague, the Senator from Alaska, has called attention to that legislation, which was the subject of a pocket veto by the President 5 days after the 1st session of the 86th Congress came to a close.

I believe it important for us to realize that the need for such a program as would have been provided by the coal research bill was attested to by the fact that the measure received bipartisan support and sponsorship. The distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. DIRKSEN] was one of the sponsors of that legislation, which received overwhelming support in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Notwithstanding that action on Capitol Hill, apparently the Chief Executive had a lack of understanding of this vital problem.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. Would it not be true that the veto of that measure had unfavorable effects, not only upon West Virginia, but also upon all the other coal mining States, such as Kentucky, Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Utah, and any other States in which coal is mined? Is it not a fact that the coal mining industry is sick and that the United States is treating all patients except this one? Is it not also a fact that our coal mining industry is, on the whole, in a rather depressed state?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not also true that many of the men who formerly were employed in that industry are now without employment, or else have only part-time employment, and many of the members of their families are unemployed, and that those unemployed persons constitute a problem which is at least as serious as that indicated by the hungry faces the President said he saw in the course of his recent trip to foreign countries?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Absolutely. In West Virginia, where 135,000 miners formerly were employed, today only 48,000 or 50,000 men are working in that industry. The figures vary; one organization has stated that 60,000 are employed. But I understand that according to the United Mine Workers of America, approximately 48,000 are employed.

West Virginia suffers as it does because of many factors, one of which is the importation of residual oil. Another is the dieselization of locomotives. But an adequate coal research program would go a long way toward improving the outlook and so would area redevelopment legislation such as that which the President vetoed during the 85th Congress.

Mr. President, all of this reminds one of the story of Timon of Athens. Timon, according to Shakespeare, was a wealthy lord of Athens, and he reveled in the joy of ostentatious giving as a generous friend, as a kindly master, as a liberal patron of the arts, and as a lavish entertainer. He was naturally of a frank and cordial nature, and so he dispensed his favors with an entire lack of discrimination, and he esteemed as his friends all those among the throng of flatterers, and gave to them his bountiful fortunes.

The cynical philosopher, Apemantus, ridiculed the motives of these hangers-on and he warned his credulous friend against them. Flavius, his true, honest steward, tried to curb his reckless extravagance, but Timon foolishly refused to be crossed in his generosity, and he paid a ransom to get his follower, Ventidius, out of prison. He once bestowed a fortune on a servant so that he might marry, and he gave precious stones as favors at a gorgeous banquet to his friends.

There came a time, presently, when Timon's creditors began to suspect his actual financial state, and they sent their agents to press him for the bills he owed. The importunities of these men at length forced Timon to listen to his faithful steward, who had warned him, and who proved to him that he was bankrupt and that his credit was gone. And so Timon sent his faithful servant, Flavius, to the Senate for a loan for his master, and the loan was refused.

Thunderstruck, Timon consoled himself with the thought that he could draw upon all of those wonderful friends to whom he had so graciously given and helped in the past. But, as we can readily surmise, one by one these fair-weather friends denied his request for a small loan. One of them tried to bribe the servant to say he was out. Another of his so-called friends regretted his lack of funds. Another one affected anger at not being the first to be approached.

Timon's eyes were at last opened to the parasitic nature of his worthless friends, and he invited them to a final banquet, to which they all came with lame excuses for denying his appeal. Covered dishes were brought in, filled with warm water, which Timon threw in his guests' faces as he cursed them, and, in lieu of money, he pelted them with stones.

Timon's philanthropy passed into the extreme of universal hatred of mankind, whom he bitterly denounced as he left Athens forever for a hermit's life in a cave near the sea. Much more, there is, to the story, but at the end Timon died and was buried in a rude, seawashed tomb.

I am persuaded that America could very well learn a lesson from Shakespeare's creation, Timon of Athens. America has given and given and given. She has poured out her fortunes. She has given of her best blood. She has sent her technicians abroad. She has gone in debt, herself, in order that her friends might enjoy the better life. But I fear that the time may yet come, Mr. President, when we may see America's fair-weather friends, most of them, at

least, desert her. We have already seen her embassies stoned, her leaders spat upon and cursed, and her flag torn down and desecrated. It is time that we think of our own, lest in the end, like Timon of Athens, we find, when it is all too late, that we have been cheating ourselves.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from West Virginia for a most ehlightening and most valuable presentation, which I hope will be read by every one of our colleagues. I think it goes to the heart of one of the most important problems our Nation now faces—whether we shall continue to unbalance our budget by giving aid where it is often not wanted, where it is very largely wasted, where it is producing no friends. At the very same time we are denying to our own people the very same type of projects which we are initiating and carrying out in 70 foreign countries, when, in such fields as education, housing, highway construction, power development, and almost everything that the human mind can conceive of, those programs are needed, somewhere, by the American people.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very grateful for the splendid contributions that have been made to this discussion here today by the Senator from Alaska. I have heard him speak on this subject before, on the floor and off the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia should be commended for calling attention to a matter to which serious consideration should be given by the Senate. I am appalled when I realize the extent to which our national debt has grown.

Twenty-eight years ago our national debt was approximately $20 billion. Today our national debt is approximately $286 billion. We have expended in the past 28 years almost $122 billion in interest alone. Our national debt during the current fiscal year will be carried at a cost of $9 billion, in round figures.

During recent years we have either given away, in one form or another, approximately $70 billion, or made soft loans of that amount. The truth of the matter is that every bit of the $70 billion has been borrowed money, borrowed in large part from unborn generations of future taxpayers. If an individual who is in debt should borrow money to give away, his friends and his family would demand that an inquisition in lunacy be held. The result of that inquisition would be that such a person would have a guardian appointed for him. Yet this Government stands with a lavish hand, giving away money or making soft loans.

The Senator has quoted with great eloquence from that great writer, William Shakespeare. William Shakespeare said, in this connection, "Loan oft loses both itself and friend."

That is the experience we have had on many occasions, and the experience we are going to have in the future. It seems to me that we ought to ponder the matter the Senator has discussed so eloquently, to see exactly where this is leading us and what it will do not only to our present-day economy, but also to the economy of those who are going to inherit the greatest national debt of any nation in the history of the world.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to make a comment on the pertinent remarks of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Shakespeare also said, "Neither a borrower, nor a lender be."

Never before in our history has Uncle Sam been so great a borrower and so great a lender as in the last 6 years.

THE DEFENSE OF AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I think we need sometimes to look backward to see whether the fears of the doom sayers at a given time were justified.

I recall that only a short time ago—some 3 or 4 years ago—in this Federal Legislature, there were many Members who spoke with great concern and emotion about the supposed bomber gap. We were told, in almost identical words with those with which we are now confronted concerning the so-called "missile gap," that the country was going to pot in a hand basket, that the Russians were ahead of us, that the Russians would be superior to us in uncounted numbers of bombers, and that the failure of the Department of Defense and of the President to realize this fact was endangering the national security.

Many of us will recall the very phrases used by some of the doom sayers. What actually happened?

Intelligence estimates, based on Soviet capability, indicated that the Russians might surpass us in the production of long-range bombers. Yet nobody is worrying about the bomber gap today, because what actually happened was that the bomber gap failed to materialize because the Russians, for reasons of their own, did not produce the bombers they were capable of producing.

Our intelligence people discovered this fact, and the early estimates of the Soviet bomber capability were revised downward to conform to Soviet intent, to what our information indicated the Soviets actually were producing.

There is no assurance that the same thing will hold true of the Russian missile production, but if current intelligence estimates indicate the Russians have not built missiles up to the limits of the capability estimates of a year ago, this is a legitimate factor to take into account. It does not mean, as an editorial in the Washington Star makes clear, that the administration is "dealing from the bottom of the deck," and it does not justify accusations, recently made, that "the intelligence books may have been juggled so that the budget books may be balanced."

Actually, we are in a far stronger position than the Russians with respect to long-range bombers.

Now we hear a great deal about ICBM's. I notice the tendency of some of the doom sayers to link two comments together as if they had a direct relationship. The two comments are as follows: First it is said that there is a "missile gap" and the missile gap is in ICBM's, as if this were the only deterrent weapon available to either country. Then the statement is made that the Russians could destroy our capacity to make war by firing 300 missiles at one time.

I do not suppose the distinguished gentlemen who make these statements intend to be deliberately misleading. Such statements make good scare headlines, and they do scare people. Unfortunately, this is a presidential election year and there may exist a temptation on the part of some people, including perhaps some candidates, unfortunately, to try to win an election by scaring the very daylights out of the American people, in the hope that by so doing they will scare themselves into office on the backdraft as a result of the revulsion of Americans, if listeners should conclude we are indeed a second-class power.

In my judgment, the people who say that this country is a second-class power, under all the circumstances—in the light of the President's own assurances that we are the strongest nation on the face of the earth, both economically and militarily, and in view of the superior evidence that we intend to remain so—people who seek to derogate and to sell the United States short as a second-class power, are indulging in second-rate thinking, and second-rate thinking does not qualify anybody to be President of the United States, where we require first-class talent.

I return to the unfortunate habit of linking two statements together; that the Russians are ahead of us in ICBM production—which indeed they are—and then adding the statement that 300 missiles can be fired at the United States at a given time. I think, in fairness to the American people, these speakers should carefully point out that the 300 missiles which allegedly could be fired at us—nobody actually knows whether there are 300 or not, or where they are located, which is a matter of concern—are not ICBM missiles but refer in this context to intermediate range ballistic missiles.

It is not proper to comment, except in instances in which the information has been published, on how many ICBM's there are. One weekly magazine referred the other day to the possibility that we might have between 3 and 7, or between 5 and 10; and that the Russians might have between 12 and 18.

Consider what we are talking about. If this magazine is anywhere near correct, we are talking about a very small number of very serious and powerful weapons. But it is easy to say "3 to 1" if we are talking about the difference between 15 and 5, and, in order to scare the daylights out of the American people, the figure "300" is promptly introduced into the same dissertation. I hope that such is not the purpose, but the effect is to make the American people

believe that the Russians have 300 ICBM's which they have not. If that is in any intelligence report, I am sure it will come as a great surprise to the Government of the United States, and a matter of great satisfaction to the Soviet Union, which undoubtedly has not heard this statement, as a statement of fact, and could hardly receive it as such, since it is not a fact.

We could undoubtedly bring to bear a very large number—and the number is classified—of presently existing intermediate range ballistic missiles, and we could bring them to bear from areas which are not available to the Russians. We could bring them to bear from our fast carrier task forces, in which we have some 14 fast carriers. So far as I am aware, the Russians have none.

We could bring them to bear from some 12 or 13 advance bases. Outside the satellite areas the Russians have none.

We could bring them to bear, if we agreed so to do, with the help of some of our allies; and while the Russians have so-called allies, it is fair to say, I think, that the only satellites which the Russian Government can trust are not on earth, but in the air. I doubt if any satellite of the Russians on this earth could be trusted to be loyal in time of conflict.

I do not intend to paint a rosy picture, because the picture is not rosy. The picture is one which presents the necessity for unending vigilance, for an increase in our missile program and our military spending program, which has been ordered by this administration and for an increase in our space program, which has been ordered by this administration.

I wish our orators, no matter how eager they may be to be President of the United States, or to have someone whom they favor become President of the United States, would use a little more discretion in waving such unassorted figures around, and using the figure "300" in reference to ICBM's, because there is no relationship between one and the other.

We have certain additional advantages over the Russians. Among these are the development of our nuclear submarines, the development of our Polaris missile program, and the resultant inability of the Soviets to find the moving targets presented by those nuclear submarines and by the Polaris submarines, construction of which has been ordered increased and accelerated.

I think it is about time to say a little more about the strength of the United States as a first class power determined to keep the peace, determined to promote every effort by which peace may be attained, determined patiently to go to the summit, determined patiently, as the President and Vice President have demonstrated, to go wherever in the world there is a chance of extending the possibility of following after the ways that lead to peace.

So I hope that anxiety and vaulting ambition which sometimes overleaps itself, will not ride roughshod over reason so as to lead the American people into a state of panic, frustration, or unwarranted concern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Forgotten Gap," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 28, 1960.

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

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 28, 1960]

FORGOTTEN GAP

Senator SYMINGTON says the administration has been doing tricks with intelligence information in an attempt to deceive the American people as to the seriousness of the missile gap. The Missouri Senator, a presidential hopeful, also says he realizes that his accusations might "be labeled as politically motivated by those who prefer to conceal the facts, and by others who do not know the facts."

It is not our purpose to accuse Senator SYMINGTON of playing politics with this grave question. Nor do we pretend to know all the facts concerning the accuracy of this country's intelligence estimates. If we may be permitted one comment, however, it is that we wish Senator SYMINGTON had named names and had cited hard facts to support his charge that "the intelligence books have been juggled so the budget books may be balanced." There is a certain glibness to this—and also, in the absence of supporting evidence, a certain recklessness.

If the Senator was referring to current intelligence estimates, and the methods by which they are made, a statement made the night before by Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, is worthy of note. Mr. Dulles said: "I can assure you that in preparing them [intelligence estimates] we look to nothing but the available facts, disregarding all outside considerations, political, budgetary, or other. * * * Facts have no politics. We are diligently seeking the facts without fear or favor."

Judging from the text of the Symington statement, however, his principal complaint is that instead of relying on estimates of Soviet ability to produce missiles, as was the case a year ago, we are now taking into account their intention to produce. We see nothing wrong with this. But Senator SYMINGTON says that through this process "the administration has given the people the impression that the missile deterrent gap has been sharply reduced and possibly eliminated."

This brings to mind another and almost forgotten gap—the bomber gap, about which so much was being heard 3 or 4 years ago. Intelligence estimates, based on Soviet capability, indicated that the Russians might surpass us in production of long-range bombers. Senator SYMINGTON, and others, were greatly worried. But no one is worrying about this today. In fact, most people concede that we are much superior in long-range bomber strength.

What happened to the prospective bomber gap? Simply this. It failed to materialize because the Russians, for reasons of their own, did not produce the bombers they were capable of producing. Our intelligence people discovered this, and the early estimates of Soviet bomber capability were revised downward to conform to Soviet intent—to what our information indicated they actually were producing.

There is no assurance, of course, that the same thing will hold true of Russian missile production. But if current intelligence indicates that the Russians have not built missiles up to the limit of the capability estimates of a year ago, it seems to us that this is a legitimate factor to take into account. It does not mean that the administration is dealing from the bottom of the deck, and it does not justify the accusation that "the intelligence books have been juggled so the budget books may be balanced."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARTLETT, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. DAVID M. HALL, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DAVID M. HALL OF NORTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 434), from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
February 1, 1960.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable DAVID M. HALL, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have never known a more gallant spirit than DAVID HALL, late a Member of the House from North Carolina. I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DAVID M. HALL, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair) appointed Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JORDAN members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I believe the chosen representatives of the people of Virginia, now meeting in a regular session of the State's general assembly, are competent to decide on submission to the voters whether or not the Virginia constitution should be changed to remove the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

I also believe that the right to make that decision, or any other decision as to qualifications of voters, should be left to the people of the individual States, as the framers of our Federal Constitution intended.

Therefore, I am opposed not only to the Javits proposal to outlaw by statute the poll tax or property qualifications for voting for reasons which I stated to the Senate last week, but also to the Holland proposal to ban the poll tax qualification by a constitutional amendment.

The arguments against changing the constitutional rights of the States to determine qualifications of voters were presented to the Senate so unanswerably last week in speeches by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that I shall not attempt a lengthy review of the objections.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly, however, that the precedent which would be set by eliminating one restriction which some States have chosen to place on voting can be followed by elimination of other restrictions until a uniform pattern of voting was established that could destroy the fundamental concept of a Federal Union of sovereign States.

The right to fix qualifications of voters was deliberately and carefully reserved to the States by the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention and that action was emphasized in all the State ratifying conventions and in explanations of the Constitution, reassuring doubtful States that their rights would be protected.

Proposals to outlaw the poll tax qualification by Federal action are doubly unwise because they are unnecessary.

The poll tax, or more properly, head tax, is one of the oldest forms of taxation known to the civilized world. In the days of Christ, for instance, it was the only tax imposed by Rome on Palestine and other conquered provinces. In Virginia, a poll tax was imposed upon all citizens for support of public schools long before a provision was inserted in the State constitution making payment of the tax a prerequisite for voting. The tax in Virginia which now produces from $1¾ to $2 million a year for our schools does not discriminate against nonwhites, as is demonstrated by the fact that in Virginia the percentage of nonwhites who qualify to vote is substantially the same as in our sister State of North Carolina, which has no poll tax.

In Texas presentation of a poll tax receipt is virtually the only voting registration requirement and there, as in Virginia, this is far less restrictive than the educational tests imposed by many Northern States which do not have a poll tax.

All States have laws denying the right to vote to convicted felons and several States deny the vote to publicly supported paupers or have property qualifications. It is inconceivable that good government would be fostered by removing all voting qualifications and extending the franchise to every inhabitant without any restriction. The attack on the poll tax is a move in that direction, however, and one which would seriously embarrass five States which would have inadequate time to substitute other qualifications for the tax.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will reject all the pending proposals dealing with the poll tax.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have heard extended discussion today, especially with reference to the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and the question of the States having the right to regulate the qualifications of voters.

I believe there is a good deal of misunderstanding about the amount involved in a poll tax. I do not know of any State which has a requirement in dollars of more than $2 a year. It has been stated in the RECORD by one of the speakers, who I know was honestly mistaken, that the requirement is $3. That is an error. Furthermore, the arrears can apply for only a 2-year period, or a total sum of $4. In addition, a person 60 years of age or over is exempt from the tax. There are additional exemptions such as those pertaining to people who are crippled to the extent of being limited in their ability to earn a livelihood, and so forth.

In the imposition of the poll tax absolutely no difference or distinction of any kind is made by any of the States as between the races or as between the sexes, or anything of that kind. It applies uniformly to all.

In my State the entire amount goes into a common school fund, and can be spent only for the purpose of public education and, as I recall, only in the county in which the tax is paid.

These matters seem elemental, but I repeat them because there is confusion and misinformation about the operation and the effect of the tax and the purposes to which it is applied.

The pending business before the Senate is Senate Joint Resolution 39, which is a proposal to permit the Governors of States to appoint Representatives in the House of Representatives should vacancies to the extent of one-half the membership of that body occur.

Mr. President. there is absolutely no affinity and no reasonable basis for any connection whatsoever between these two proposals. One has to do solely with the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives. In certain contingencies those who now have the right to vote for Representatives, would have that authority taken away from them, and it would be placed in the Governor of each State. No one would vote.

The second proposal, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] goes to the election laws, and deals with the qualifications of electors in the 50 respective States. Not by logic or reason at all, but only by the application of a fertile imagination can there be found any affinity or any connection whatever between the pending joint resolution with reference to appointments of Representatives by the Governors and the qualifications of electors. So it is a strange combination indeed. I submit most respectfully that it would be almost childish for the Congress in the same resolution to submit such unrelated and disjoined proposals to the States of the United States to be voted on by them as amendments to the Constitution of our great Nation.

With all deference to every one, I submit that it simply should not be done in that way, and that the Senate is not living up to its responsibilities, in the very serious obligation of passing on proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States, when it undertakes to submit to the States two proposals of such diverse character in the form of one amendment to the Constitution. Frankly, it looks to me as though one is being used as a vehicle for the other, to see if they can travel along together.

I do not know whether or not any one other Senator has done so, but in a few minutes I propose to discuss the merits and the major provision of the pending joint resolution, which proposes to transfer the authority to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives from the people of the respective districts to the Governors of the States, but only for a limited time.

However, let me say one word further about the proposal concerning the so-called poll tax. I notice there is no limitation upon the time the amendment if ratified, shall go into effect. In other words, if the amendment should be submitted by Congress to the States, it could float around before the State legislatures for 3, 4, 5, 6, or even 7 years, without being ratified by three-fourths of the States, and then the people of Texas, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, or any other State affected, might wake up some morning and read in the newspapers that some State—say Michigan or Wisconsin or California, or whatever State it was which filled out the three-fourths requirement—had approved the amendment, and the States affected by the amendment would automatically find their election laws greatly changed. There would have to be a rewriting and a revision of their entire election laws.

It would be impossible to hold elections in those States until there had been called, as doubtless there would have to be called, special sessions of the legislatures.

These provisions are interwound and intertwined with provisions of the constitutions of the States. There would have to be constitutional conventions or special legislative sessions held in the States in order to submit to the people the proposed changes in the State constitutions. I think that this matter has not been thought out sufficiently, and therefore is a reckless proposal.

Of course, if the amendment should be ratified by 38 States, it would immediately become the law of the land and would be binding on all the States. But my point is that certain provisions of the State constitutions would be affected. Many questions would arise as to what parts of the State constitutions would be affected. Practically speaking, an epidemic of lawsuits would be started, with not only Federal elections, but other elections approaching. I do not know of anything which would create greater chaos and confusion—and unnecessarily so—in the election laws of the various States affected than to have Congress submit to the States, and to have three-fourths of the States adopt a constitutional provision of this kind as the resolution is now drafted.

It occurs to me that if the joint resolution should be passed and the proposed constitutional amendment submitted to the States, an excellent opportunity would be afforded for a nationwide campaign, in which persons who were able and willing, and who could take the time and money to do so, might go before the State legislatures of our great Nation and outline in detail to them just what had been done in the past 30 years to whittle away the powers of the State legislatures, and to take away from the States their inherent powers of government, many of which have been expressly retained under the Constitution, but others of which have been taken away by interpretation. Such a campaign might result in a great awakening among the State legislatures as to just how far the Federal Government has already gone and what the trend is, and might result in a realization on the part of the States that unless that trend is stopped and the power to take away is checked, it will soon be a misnomer to say that there are States of the Union.

I was greatly shocked not too long ago when a very intelligent woman said to me, in Washington, "Why not abolish the States, anyway? We do not need them any longer."

I replied to her that we are abolishing the States pretty fast by whittling away their powers in one way or another, restricting their privileges, and invading their field of taxation and other fields of State activity.

So on the surface, at least, I am afraid her question had more application than at first blush it might seem to have.

That trend is so pronounced, and is moving so far and so fast, that whenever proposed legislation of any kind is brought before us on even a worthy subject, we shall have to ask ourselves the question, How far is the Federal Government going in regulating, controlling, and dominating the whole subject? I think we can address that question to any proposal made now with reference to Federal aid for education. Certainly there could not be a higher or more laudable undertaking of a government, there could not be any greater program for any government to underwrite than the training, improvement, and elevation of the human mind.

But even with respect to a subject like that, when a bill is introduced in the Senate and is referred to a committee, necessarily the most pressing question is not the merits of the bill, but how far will it go eventually in permitting the Federal Government to take over the subject matter with which it attempts to deal? By placing it in the control of the Federal Government, will the Federal Government eventually dominate the field?

Returning, for the time being, to the original proposal which is now before the Senate, I believe this is a matter which has been passed upon by the Senate twice before without its having been given the consideration it deserves and the attention to which it is entitled. I refer now to the proposal introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States contains a very simple, a very plain and explicit provision. With reference to the House of Representatives, we find this language:

> When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

I do not know that that provision has ever been questioned seriously before the introduction of this joint resolution. The joint resolution provides:

> On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of sixty days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives.

This proposal was before the Senate once before, on June 4, 1954, and was adopted then by an overwhelming vote. At that time I did not vote for the resolution, because I thought it was unwise, unsound, and untimely.

The history of this matter is that the joint resolution concerning vacancies in the House of Representatives then went to the House. From that time until this very moment the House has not acted on either that joint resolution or a similar measure.

The matter was again before the Senate on May 19, 1955. It was then in the form of Senate Joint Resolution 8, in which virtually the same language was used. That joint resolution was passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote. At that time I did not vote for it, because I thought it was unwise, unsound, and unnecessary. I thought then, and I think now, that such a measure only disturbs our people, is an affront to the Members of the House of Representatives, and is an encouragement to those in the Kremlin to make plans in regard to an attack upon us.

At any rate, since May 19, 1955, the House of Representatives has not acted on that joint resolution, and neither has the House held hearings on either that measure or a similar one. The House has not proposed to make the slightest gesture of any sort toward beginning to consider such a measure, much less pass it—and very properly so, I believe.

I repeat that I think it is very, very presumptuous on the part of the Senate to take the initiative in connection with a matter in regard to prerogatives and problems which primarily, and first of all, concern the House of Representatives. I believe such action by the Senate constitutes an invasion of the very great and highly respected prerogatives and rights of the House of Representatives.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I notice that not one Member of the House of Representatives has come before the Senate committee to testify in favor of that proposal. So far as I know, not one Member of the House of Representatives has evidenced any interest in it. All the Members of the House to whom I have mentioned the subject have immediately said that, so far as they are concerned, they believe the proposal to be without merit.

Since that is the situation as I have ascertained it, what logic or sense is there in continuing to bring this matter before the Senate, and continuing to agitate in the Senate for the passage of such a measure, and continuing to keep the subject in the news columns of the press? Such activities seem to me to constitute only idle gestures.

As I have said, if anything needs to be done in regard to this matter, certainly the House of Representatives should be the first branch of the Congress to take action. Simple courtesy would require that the House act on it first.

Since the beginning of the Government of the United States, each Member of the House of Representatives has taken his seat only as a result of action taken by the people of his district. I hope that will always be the case. That is one of the great strengths and foundation principles of our Government. I do not believe there could be a more far-reaching change in the basic law of our Nation than an exception of any kind to that very fine and very important principle. I believe that is the main reason why nothing has been said about this matter in the House of Representatives, and that is why the House is not interested in the new system which has been proposed by some Members of the Senate. Certainly it is to the credit of the Members of the House of Representatives that, over the years, each one of them has wanted to keep that very sound, basic principle of the Government as one of the foundations of their particular branch.

With all deference to Members of the Senate who submitted the proposal, had

it placed on the calendar, spoke in favor of it, and voted for it, I cannot see any reason or logic—top, side, or bottom—in connection with attempts to resort to the unusual procedure of repeatedly bringing this matter before the Senate.

According to statements made by the authors of the joint resolution, evidently it is based on the belief that there may come a black day when more than half of the seats in the House of Representatives will be made vacant—in short, because of the falling of a nuclear bomb or because of attack by nuclear weapons of some sort. Mr. President, that is a possibility; and I would not say we do not believe it to be possible, because in the course of time it doubtless will be possible. But if that were to happen—although of course we pray that it will not—in view of the present capacity, and even the present aim, not half or anywhere near half of the Members of the House of Representatives would be spared; if such an attack were to occur at a time when the House was in session, virtually all the Members of the House of Representatives would be incapacitated.

In addition, the chances are that in such case the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate will be hit. I mention them in that order because it is the order of succession at the head of the executive branch of the Government.

Furthermore, in the event of such an attack, there would not be time to engage in the legislative processes. Instead, someone would have to take over at the head of the executive branch of our Government, and that person would have to assume dictatorial powers; and for days and days there would be no chance to engage in the normal processes of our governmental activity.

If we wish to make a real provision to keep our Government in operation in the event of such an attack, I believe the proper approach would be to take further action with reference to the executive branch of the Government.

I am speaking of the remote possibility of such an occurrence, and of the practical approach to be taken in the event of such an occurrence. Although it would be possible, certainly it is very, very unlikely that such a thing would happen in the absence of some sort of warning. Some persons say we would have 15 minutes warning. We hope there would be more than that. Certainly at such a time, and for days prior thereto, the atmosphere would be charged with an implied notice of some kind. There would be some kind of notice or some sort of notice, by means of either the early warning system or other scientific methods of some kind, before one blast of a nuclear weapon could wipe out more than half the membership of the House of Representatives. It is just one of those possibilities on which we play here, and talk about, and imagine, for days and even weeks. I think the only practical effect of that is to encourage some adversary who may be thinking in terms of such an attack.

It is, to me, a sign of weakness to be amending the Constitution of the United States with reference to the method of selecting successors to Members of the House of Representatives, and blasting bodily one of the basic foundations of our form of government.

I was saying, before the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] came into the Chamber, that from the inception of our Government to this very day, a Member of the House of Representatives has come there only through one door, and that is through election by the people. I hope it always will be that way, with no exception of any kind, at any time, under any circumstances. That is one of the great prerogatives of the House Members, and they are to be commended for their very fine attitude. The House is not interested in this proposal, apparently. The Members have never given it the slightest attention.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Apropos the Senator's last observation, there is a slightly grim, gruesome implication to a resolution such as this when it goes to the House, because, after all, if it is brought to the House floor and discussed, they will be thinking in terms of the liquidation of one-half of that body. Somebody phrased it today in rather curt fashion. He said, "A proposal to pick out your own headstone." I suppose much of that kind of thought will enter into the discussion. But the House may not be too serious about a proposal like this.

Furthermore, I think I am on solid ground when I say that I know of no particular reason why the House cannot modify its own rules. If one-half of the membership plus one Member constitutes a quorum, the House can provide that in case of an act of God or a catastrophe, where the number is suddenly diminished, one-half plus one of the remaining number who are not incapacitated shall constitute a quorum. I should think, unless I am in error about the House rules, that would satisfy the requirement.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Illinois has made a most practical suggestion, and it meets the situation in a fine way. Having been a former and influential Member of that great body, I think that fact adds additional strength to his proposal. It certainly is in keeping with orderly business and parliamentary soundness, and would not disturb any present law, and would not make any encroachment whatsoever upon the prerogatives the House of Representatives has as the people's forum and the people's court. Nobody can get in that door except through election by the people.

Very seriously, Mr. President, it seems to me that for the Senate of the United States to keep on bringing this matter up year after year after year, based upon only an imaginary situation, is a tremendous encouragement to any adversary who may be planning or designing or thinking of perpetrating in future years such an act as seems to be the basis for the joint resolution.

Moreover, I believe, that it certainly raises a very serious question in the minds of governmental heads and legislative bodies of other countries of the world, who, we hope, look upon us as leaders, as a strong nation, with a strong Government, and not afraid to face the future. So we should not be putting up signs that read, in effect, "In case of attack, run this way. If any bomb falls, we are going to have the State Governors appoint Representatives."

I do not believe in continuing to pass resolutions and tampering further with the Constitution. I would rather stand firm on our present position and prepare for the worst, but not keep talking about it in terms of being afraid that something is going to happen or that we are apparently preparing to be wiped out.

Moreover, if the times are so demanding, if we think the pressure is so great, that something like this joint resolution should be passed, instead of doing paperwork and taking up time on a measure which it is clearly demonstrated the House is not even going to consider, we ought to be using our time in telling the people of the country that conditions are so severe and an attack is so imminent or the probability of one is so strong that there has got to be some belt-tightening done; that we will have to give up some of our easy way of life and buckle down and tighten our belts. I do not hear talk like that. If conditions are so serious, we ought to be telling the people that we must get rid of the long weekends; that we must start working harder, that we must have some crash programs, that we must stop making so many refrigerators and sport model automobiles and other products which may be classified as luxuries or semi-luxuries, or at least unnecessary, and tell them that we must buckle down and provide more missiles and guns and other implements to offset a threatening situation.

I do not believe we should be engaging in this paperwork and talking about academic matters of this kind, because of bare possibilities, but we ought to get down to the facts of life. If things are so bad, we ought to emphasize the crash programs.

Mr. President, I am sorry that this proposal has not been debated more by Members of the Senate, and that it has been passed overwhelmingly in the past. This is the first time I have said anything about it on the floor, although I have voted against it each time it has come up. I think it is one of those things to which we should pay attention, yes, but not paramount attention. We have not looked into the basic, fundamental principles that are involved, and we have not really weighed the relative importance of a proposal of this kind as against some of the other means available.

As I have said, if we really believe that this matter is so demanding and the need is so imminent, we should be putting on priority lists some of the highly necessary programs for procurement of metals, utilization of skills, and other activities which are necessary to offset such a situation. So I hope at this time there will be more debate upon the di-

rect merits of the proposal, and that it will not be adopted by the Senate.

The fact that I am opposed to the proposed poll-tax amendment, which has no affinity whatsoever to the main purpose of the joint resolution, has nothing to do with my attitude toward the latter. I have voted against it every time it has been before the Senate, and that extends over a period of almost 5 years.

The House has not given any intimation yet of having the slightest bit of interest in the matter. I do not think they will evince any interest in it, and I do not think they should. I wish we could put the matter to rest.

I think it is mighty serious, Mr. President, apart from the subject matter of this proposal, the situation becomes rather serious when every few days we undertake to talk about amending the Constitution. We have the greatest Government in the world. We have the finest outline of governmental rights and responsibilities. Fortunately, the people, I think, have shown a great deal more wisdom with reference to amending the Constitution than has the Congress. I refer to the State legislatures and to the people of the States themselves. I say that with all deference, because of the great number of proposals which have been made in Congress to amend the Constitution.

Except for the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, very few proposals have been agreed to in the many decades of the life of our great Nation.

I hope we can let matters like this rest. As the Senator from Illinois said, we can work out a simple solution within the framework of our present law. The House of Representatives itself, according to the suggestion, has inherent authority, and could simply provide what is needed under its own rules, which can be amended from time to time as the occasion demands. In that way the situation can be met.

Mr. President, the hour is nearly 5:30 p.m. I have another phase of my speech which will not take long, but with the permission of the Senate I wish to yield the floor, and when I can get the floor tomorrow for some reasonable time I shall address myself to the other matter I have in mind.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was greatly interested in the Senator's observation about the inclination to offer amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I am sensible of the fact that there is a body of thought that the Constitution is not sufficiently flexible for this civilization. With that view, of course, I disagree. The amendatory power is present, and always the country has shown the necessary spirit and inclination to approve amendments when in the wisdom of the people they were thought to be necessary.

I submit, so that it will become a part of the discussion and legislative history, that there must be at least 35 or 40 constitutional proposals now pending before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Those proposals cover a wide range of subjects, and in a way hint at an inclination, I think, on the part of the lawmakers of the country to move in on our organic law. We must depend, of course, upon the wisdom, the prudence and the restraint of the people as they come to grips with the problems. We must make sure that we do not insinuate into the organic law things which should not be there.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much for his comments. I agree heartily with what he has said. We must have flexibility in order to meet the problems of the times, but one of the great strengths of our Government is that the Constitution does belong to the people, and through their processes they can amend it. So far the people have not been quick to rush in on matters, but have always risen to the occasion when there was a real need for a basic change.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his interesting and kind remarks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE STEEL SETTLEMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 26, 1960, Mr. C. M. White, chairman of the board of the Republic Steel Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, sent a statement to all the stockholders of the corporation setting forth the company's estimate of the negotiations and settlement of the steel controversy.

When I first glanced over this statement several items promptly caught my eye. The first was the observation in the fourth paragraph of the statement which said that "the settlement which ended the long labor dispute was on terms which are a great deal better from our standpoint than the public has been led to believe."

In the same paragraph Mr. White observed that there was achieved a slowdown in the rate of increase in labor costs.

Also in the statement there appears this significant observation:

> To us, the spirit of the union leaders at all levels in working out matters in this area (working rules) is more important than language in the basic contract.

I felt on examination of this statement that it merited wider distribution than it might receive and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.,
Cleveland, Ohio, January 26, 1960.

To the stockholders of Republic Steel Corp.:

In past years it has been our practice to wait until issuance of our annual report in late March to give you the results of our business for the previous year. However, because of the unsual events which took place during the year and their climax a week or two ago, we felt that you should have the preliminary figures on the year's results as quickly as they became available. We also feel we should give you our views on the recent setttlement of the 1959 labor dispute which so greatly affected these results. More detailed, audited figures and a comprehensive report on 1959 business will be contained in the annual report which you will receive late in March.

In spite of the strike, our sales for the year amounted to $1,076,832,407. This is an increase of 18 percent as compared with 1958. Net income, however, seriously affected by the costly strike, amounted to $53,890,116 or $3.43 per share—13 percent below 1958. It was, nevertheless, more than enough to meet our dividend requirements. A statement of consolidated income, subject to annual audit, is attached to this report.

The 116-day steel strike affected our business during 1959 not only during the strike but during the 6½ months preceding it and the 8 weeks at the end of the year during which we operated under a Taft-Hartley injunction. The strike threat resulted in a very high rate of operations during the first half of 1959 as customers made every effort to build up inventories. Business in November and December was at comparably high rates as customers ordered steel to meet current production needs and at the same time to rebuild their inventories.

The settlement which ended the long labor dispute was on terms which are a great deal better from our standpoint than the public has been led to believe. While we did not fully attain our objectives of reaching an agreement which would hold added costs within the 2.6 percent increase in productivity per year which Secretary Mitchell says the steel industry has experienced over the past 10 years, we did, nevertheless, materially slow down the rate of increase in our labor costs.

In the past 10 years, employment costs in the steel industry have increased approximately 8 percent per year. The present settlement will reduce this increase to approximately 3.5 to 3.75 percent per year for the life of this contract. When one considers that the 1956 labor agreement resulted in an increase in employment costs of 81 cents per hour over the life of the contract as opposed to 39 cents for the current contract period, it is apparent that the present settlement represents a considerable improvement.

The settlement is materially better than the settlements which might have been imposed upon us based on the recent agreements negotiated by the steelworkers' union with the aluminum or the can industries or with Kaiser Steel Corp. We estimate the aluminum, can, and Kaiser settlements would have increased our employment costs approximately 4.5 to 5 percent if applied to the steel companies, or nearly 30 percent more than we actually settled for.

The cost-of-living escalator clause in the contract, which provided 17 cents an hour during the last 3-year contract period, has been materially watered down in two respects. First, the maximum increase in the cost-of-living adjustment that will be involved over the 30-month contract period on wages is 6 cents. Secondly, such cost-of-living adjustment increase may be reduced to cover increases in the cost of the group insurance program. On the basis of past experience, we estimate that insurance costs will increase over 4 cents during the period.

On the local working conditions issue, while we did not get the arbitration we desired, we did get public pledges from the union leaders that they would cooperate in increasing efficiency and eliminating waste. To us, the spirit of the union leaders at all levels in working out matters in this area is more important than language in the basic contract. We did succeed in keeping out of the contract any restrictive language whatsoever on our right to make changes in machinery, equipment, and processes—so-called automation changes.

We enjoy the advantage of a long-term contract. The wage terms run for 30 months

and the insurance, pension, and subagreements for 36 months. Such long-term contracts are of great value for they enable us to plan our operations and our capital improvement programs with full knowledge of our employment costs, which constitute more than one-third of our total costs of production.

While the long dispute has been costly, there are some collateral benefits. Our extensive program of advertising, publicity, direct mail, radio, television, and speaking has made the American people and their Government more familiar than ever before with some of the acute problems of our industry. The effect of wage-push inflation, the threat of foreign competition, and the threat of wasteful work practices and costly and inefficient local working conditions, which we are required to maintain, are, we believe, well understood by millions of citizens. Our efforts to alert the Nation to the continued threat of these problems will continue. In the face of the hot economic war being waged with the Soviet Union, our national future depends on public concern over such problems, both in the steel industry and in the other major industries.

As Vice President NIXON outlined the situation to us, we found ourselves in this position: (1) The union had made settlements with the aluminum industry and the can industry, and it would be difficult for the union to settle with us for anything less and justify it to their constituents; (2) we were coming up to a vote by our employees on the companies' last offer which the Government officials felt, and our own surveys indicated, the union would win handily, with the result that the union's position would be stiffened and strengthened; (3) Congress was about to convene, and if the dispute were thrown into the Congress it might enact legislation which would be inimical not only to the steel industry, but to all industry in the country.

The Vice President felt strongly that at the end of the road we would not make a better settlement, and probably a worse one than he and Secretary Mitchell could recommend to us then without incurring all the risks of bad legislation. Despite the fact that we were reluctant to do it, we had to admit that his logic was correct and that the wise course was to accept the recommendations made to us. In our opinion, this settlement was the best that we could have had, either before the strike, during the strike, or after the resumption of operations under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Since our employees returned to work in early November, their attitude has been excellent and their cooperation with us most satisfactory. As a result we were able to set an all-time steel ingot production record in December. We believe this attitude will continue. Union officers at all levels have pledged their cooperation in eliminating waste and improving efficiency. Their cooperation is welcome and should enable us to reduce materially the inflationary potential in the settlement.

Our immediate business outlook points to an almost unprecedented high level of business through most of 1960. We have resumed work on the many capital projects which were halted by the strike. These will materially improve efficiency, increase output and counter rising costs. Progress of these improvements will be discussed in greater detail in the annual report.

Again may I extend the appreciation of the management of our company for the splendid support given us in this trying period by our stockholders. Of the many letters we received, there was not a single one which did not support our efforts to bring about a noninflationary settlement of the dispute by free collective bargaining.

Sincerely,

C. M. WHITE,
Chairman.

Republic Steel Corp. and subsidiaries, statement of consolidated income, years ended Dec. 31, 1959, and Dec. 31, 1958

	1959	1958
Sales less discounts allowed	$1,076,832,407.00	$910,382,817.00
Dividends, interest, and other income	7,157,714.00	7,170,992.00
Total	1,083,990,121.00	917,553,809.00
Costs and expenses:		
Manufacturing cost of products sold	885,950,484.00	711,821,790.00
Administrative and selling expenses	52,186,220.00	47,087,886.00
Provision for depreciation, depletion, and amortization	34,666,022.00	33,074,198.00
Interest on long-term debt	3,849,910.00	2,619,822.00
Sundry other deductions	647,369.00	528,433.00
Federal taxes on income—estimated	52,800,000.00	60,500,000.00
Total	1,030,100,005.00	855,632,129.00
Consolidated net income	53,890,116.00	61,921,680.00
Net income per share of common stock	3.43	3.96
Shares of common stock outstanding	15,693,074.00	15,635,759.00

NOTE.—Subject to annual audit.

RECESS TO 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolution previously agreed to, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late DAVID M. HALL, a Representative from the State of North Carolina, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative DAVID M. HALL, of North Carolina, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1960, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Israel Goldstein, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, New York, offered the following prayer:

Lord, Creator, Father, we pray Thee, make Thy light to shine upon this day which we joyfully mark as the 100th anniversary of a prayer intoned within this Legislative Hall for the first time by a teacher of the Jewish faith, Rabbi Morris Jacob Raphall. It was a day as meaningful for America as for the household of Jacob, tokening not only religious freedom and equality but interreligious fellowship.

One hundred years ago our Nation was riven by strife on the threshold of a tragic Civil War.

We thank Thee that today our Nation stands before the world one and indivisible. May it stand not only in the panoply of might but in the splendor of spirit, not too proud to acknowledge its own blemishes and seek to correct them, and not too meek to aspire to the role of world leadership by example, in helping to lift burdens of oppression, poverty, ignorance, and disease, wherever the uplifting hand is needed and welcomed. May we begin at home by cleansing our own habitations from the germs of hatred and prejudice. And may we join forces with the vigilant safeguarding of goodwill everywhere, aware that the toleration of evil often paves the way for evil's domination.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that the restoration of Zion, a prayer and a dream a hundred years ago, has come to fulfillment in our time with the noble help of these United States.

In a hundred years, thanks to the progress of science, the ends of the earth have come together across the barriers of time and space. Grant Thy children the moral wisdom to match proximity with neighborliness.

In a hundred years the inventions of destruction have left us no alternative to peace. Grant us the will to pursue peace relentlessly and the inventiveness to surmount the obstacles in the way.

Sustain with Thy blessing the President of these United States and all who conduct the affairs of government. May Thy face be turned unto our beautiful America and unto Thy children everywhere.

May it be Thy will that 100 years hence America shall yet stand unsurpassed as a citadel of human fellowship and a fortress of peace and freedom in a free and peaceful world.

"Adonay oz l'amo yitain, Adonay yevaraych et amo vashalom." The Lord endow us all with strength, the Lord bless us all with peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1960, was read and approved.

INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION DESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 27, 1960.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Honorable Richard M. Simpson.

Sincerely,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

BUSINESS IN ORDER ON TUESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order today under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule, and under clause 1, rule XXVII, pertaining to suspensions of the rules, be dispensed with and that such business shall be in order on tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1960.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, without establishing a precedent, but in view of the death of our dear colleague, all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE DAVID M. HALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with much sadness that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable DAVID M. HALL of the 12th District of North Carolina. Mr. HALL was a sincere, dedicated citizen of our State; dedicated to the welfare of North Carolina, the welfare of the Government of the United States, and of his own area of our State, the 12th District.

His life was carried on with determination, for from childhood he was beset with infirmities that would ordinarily have retarded the progress that he did make.

It was with great admiration that all of us in North Carolina followed his career; the completion of his formal education, his desire to go forward and be a part of his community, of the State, and eventually to take part in the work and in the debates of this, the greatest legislative body on the face of the earth. He was a devout Christian gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to express to his family the deep feeling of the North Carolina delegation at his passing, to say how much we respected him and how much we will miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, along with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and in behalf of the citizenry of my State and my own district, I should like to pay tribute to the courage of our late distinguished friend. While I have seen other men who wore the uniform of their country which perhaps signified courage—this one man, in my opinion, wore the uniform of courage. Despite afflictions which would make stronger men cringe, he never complained.

His office was just down the hall from mine in the Old House Office Building, and I used to go down and visit with him occasionally, sometimes after various operations that he had had and seizures which put him in some of the hospitals where he spent so much of his life. He never complained to me about the fate that was his or about his difficulties.

He was interested in the work of the Congress. He loved being a Member of Congress. He loved his committee, the committee on Science and Astronautics and he used to tell me how much he enjoyed sitting with the committee and taking part in the hearings. He loved Members of this Congress as dedicated men, because he was a dedicated man.

This man was truly a courageous American, and I salute his courage and extend my sympathy to his family and friends.

DAVID HALL lived a life that would serve as an inspiration to any who knew him. He was quiet by nature, but one could sense, underneath his gentleness, great determination, and strong will. His life was no compromise with anything he thought wrong, and, aside from the magnificient physical courage I have spoken of, he had the courage of his convictions.

We extend our sorrow to his beloved and gracious family. We join them in sorrow at his passing. We who knew him here in Congress knew of the great future he had had his life been spared. We knew, and we now salute, his love for his country, and his countrymen.

DAVID HALL served his people well. His home district should be proud of him, even as we are proud to have served with him.

The world is a better place today because he lived, and today, tomorrow and for days to come, many of us, in times of trouble, or affliction, or distress, shall gain courage from his courage, life from his life, and faith from his example.

South Carolina joins her sister State in mourning. Our deepest sympathies go out to his family.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from North Carolina, and colleagues from other States who will be speaking today, in paying a personal tribute to the memory of our departed friend and colleague.

The news that DAVID HALL had passed away came as a shock because I had been persuaded to believe that he might be on the road to recovery from his most recent attack and had looked forward to seeing him return to his post of duty here in the House of Representatives. But this was not to be and, as it comes to all men sooner or later, death came to DAVID HALL and removed him from our midst.

It was my privilege on yesterday, albeit a sad one, to attend the funeral services for DAVID HALL in the beautiful little town of Sylva, Jackson County, N.C. The great outpouring of people, from all walks of life, who turned out in very inclement weather to pay their final respects to their friend and neighbor was very impressive. But the most impressive thing about the service to me was the unanimity with which the ministers and townspeople commented on the great courage and determination displayed throughout his life by this young man whose untimely death we mourn today.

As all of us could observe who knew DAVID, he was greatly handicapped by physical infirmities and disabilities. These would have caused most men to give away to despair. But not this unusual young man who was blessed with a keen mind and an indomitable determination to rise above his infirmities, to overcome his handicaps and make a success of his life. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him here know how well he succeeded in this undertaking.

DAVID HALL will be missed by many who, despite his physical handicap, looked to him for leadership and guidance. Although his service was not lengthy in the House of Representatives and on the important committee where he served so well, I am sure he will be missed by all of his colleagues here who had formed such a warm regard for him and who respected him so highly. And he will be missed by a host of friends who believed in him and followed his struggle against tremendous odds with such admiration. I should like to be numbered among those who will miss DAVID in the days that lie ahead and I join with them in mourning his passing from this earthly scene.

Mrs. Jonas joins me in expressing deep and sincere sympathy to DAVID'S beloved and devoted wife, to his lovely and charming young daughters, to his mother, his brother, and other members of the family.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the North Carolina delegation be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, circumstances beyond his control prevented our colleague, DAVID M. HALL, from participating in the wars our country has engaged in from time to time on the high seas and battlefields of the world. Even so, no soldier of fame or fortune ever demonstrated greater strength and courage.

Stricken at an early age by a blow that would have totally defeated one of lesser quality and courage, he returned to the battlefield of an active and useful life, not just once but time after time he returned. There is no substitute for courage, determination, initiative and stamina. He had all of these and more, perhaps in greater quantity, if such can be so measured, than any person it has been my privilege to know. In my estimation he was a hero in the many, many battles he had to face during his career. He faced many an armored knight, so to speak, who rained upon him blow on blow. He knew the cutting depth of many a rapier thrust, but he never fled the field. He was one of the most honorable and conscientious men it has been

my privilege to know. He was a friend and he lived "in a house by the side of the road."

A man of weaker steel could not have undertaken the hardships and sacrifices incident to a congressional campaign, but he was a pure-blooded, fighting man from the beginning. He knew no retreat; he knew no defeat. He loved freedom and justice. He fought for these all of his life. And now true freedom has come to DAVID, and from Him alone who sets the heart at rest.

I join our colleagues and the host of other loyal friends in extending to Mrs. Hall, her fine children and other members of the family my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. In this time of trial and sorrow, may they find a degree of comfort in the strength and courage that stood DAVID in such good stead through all of his adult life.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of my fellow North Carolinian, our friend and colleague, Representative DAVID M. HALL, on Friday, January 29, 1960.

In spite of DAVID'S handicap of being in a wheelchair since the age of 12, his indomitable spirit and energy propelled him through college where he earned his law degree, won for him election to the North Carolina State Senate and ultimately a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives.

DAVID'S outlook on life was refreshing, and his courage in spite of physical infirmity was an inspiration to all who knew him. His capable service in the North Carolina State Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and his dedication to duty earned for him high respect and esteem.

A man of deep principle, great logic, and ability, DAVE HALL was a distinguished North Carolinian, a great American, and a devoted public servant.

Those of us who attended the funeral yesterday afternoon in Sylva, N.C., were moved by the demonstration of profound sorrow and sense of loss of those who had loved and admired DAVE during his lifetime.

We brought back to Washington with us some of the spirit that DAVE always demonstrated, as well as his inspiring courage, which was a part of his entire life.

I join with my colleagues and DAVID HALL'S host of friends in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of sadness that I join with my colleagues today in the House in voicing my admiration and respect for the life, character, and public service of the late DAVID MCKEE HALL.

On January 29, 1960, it pleased Almighty God to call DAVE HALL to greater service in the land of everlasting life. And in his departure from our midst to gain the rich reward that awaits those who labor in good and just causes DAVE HALL has left behind a host of sorrowing friends and a vacuum in the public life of his State and Nation that will not be easily filled.

Mr. Speaker, in every generation we are blessed with men who reach great heights over seemingly insurmountable difficulties. The life of DAVE HALL is an outstanding example of the truth of this statement.

Although he was only 41 years of age at the time of his passing, he had triumphed over difficulties that would have defeated many men of less courage to make a record of outstanding service in his native North Carolina and to gain a seat in this Congress.

Our departed colleague was born on May 16, 1918. He received his education in the public schools of Jackson County, N.C. From the age of 15 he was a paraplegic confined to a wheelchair; yet this did not deter him from becoming a special student at the University of North Carolina. He received his law degree from the University of North Carolina in 1948, and from that time to the day of his death he was actively identified with the public life of North Carolina.

In spite of his physical handicap he served with distinction in the North Carolina State Senate in 1955, and from 1955 to 1959 he was an active member of the North Carolina Board of Water Commissioners.

When the Honorable George A. Shuford declined to run for Congress after the North Carolina Democratic primary election of 1958, DAVE HALL was selected as the nominee of his party and was elected to the House of Representatives on November 4, 1958.

From the very first day he arrived in Washington until the time of his death he displayed exemplary devotion to duty and an active interest in advancing the welfare of his district, State, and Nation. Though confined to a wheelchair, he carried on his demanding duties in a manner that gained the admiration of all of us who knew and worked with him.

Mr. Speaker, DAVE HALL was a close personal friend of mine. For many years we were associated together in public life of North Carolina. His undaunted spirit and devotion to the best interests of the people he was always willing to serve was a constant inspiration to me and to his many friends.

DAVE HALL came from a remarkable family long identified with the public life of North Carolina. His uncle, the Honorable Dan K. Moore, served with distinction for many years on the North Carolina Superior Court bench.

His mother for years has been keenly interested in educational work and in providing opportunities for the youth of North Carolina. She still devotes her time and energies to helping young men and women prepare themselves for the future. Without a doubt DAVE HALL received from his mother much of his indomitable spirit and sense of devotion to public duty. In 1959 his mother was selected as North Carolina's "Mother of the Year."

Mr. Speaker, we have lost an able colleague and a dedicated public servant. But all of us who knew, admired, and loved DAVE HALL can take renewed strength from the example of courage, devotion to duty, and unselfish spirit to public service that he has left behind.

To his widow and three small daughters, to his mother and the other members of his family, and to the countless hundreds of people who were privileged to call him friend, I extend my deepest sympathy on this sad occasion. May they find consolation in knowing that DAVE HALL lived a good and useful life in the service of his fellow man.

Though sadness reigns in the hearts of friends when they must take leave in this life from a friend, yet death does not ring down the final curtain. In the words of the poet:

There is no death! what seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call death.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of DAVID M. HALL has saddened the hearts of all who were so fortunate as to know him and become associated with him. His courage and determination should be a challenge to all men, young and old. His entire life was filled with adversity but this never deterred his indomitable spirit and his persistent ambition to achieve goals that are seldom in reach of capable men in good health.

My acquaintance with him was brief and not so close as I would have wished, but contacts with him left no doubt in my mind as to his keen intellect and his unusual abilities, and a wisdom far beyond his years.

His dedicated service to his State and Nation will long be remembered and his colleagues and friends will miss him acutely.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to pay sincere tribute to the memory of my good personal friend and colleague, DAVID M. HALL.

DAVE HALL was a man of unusual character—and one of the most courageous men I have ever known. He was a paraplegic from boyhood, but he worked his way through school and received a law degree from the University of North Carolina. He practiced law and was active in his home town of Sylva, N.C., in all community affairs. He was elected to the North Carolina State Senate in 1955 where he did an outstanding job.

In spite of the fact that DAVE was confined to a wheel chair he was driven by an indomitable spirit to higher and higher goals and was elected, in 1958, by the good people of North Carolina's 12th District to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Throughout his life he suffered much and went through many hardships, but was always pleasant, a regular fellow, and never lost his composure. Although he underwent two major operations last spring and an operation in New York last fall for cancer, he was planning to run again for the nomination to return to Congress from his district and, until the time of his death, exemplified Karle Wilson Baker's poem, "Courage Is Fear That Has Said Its Prayers."

I understand that my good friend DAVE HALL had undergone more than 200 major operations during his life; that on more than one of these occasions he was given no chance to recover. Nevertheless, through his own strong

will to live, his indomitable spirit and unwavering courage he always pulled through.

DAVE HALL won the admiration of his colleagues by his determined courage, the nobility of his vision, the resourcefulness and enthusiasm of his service in the House of Representatives since his election to the 86th Congress. His passing will be a great loss to North Carolina and to the Nation.

He was strongly recommended by many people throughout western North Carolina to be chosen the young man of the year, on a national basis, for 1960, by the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

May his wife and three fine daughters find comfort in the lasting honor and affection of his friends, of which Mr. Speaker, I am thankful and better for having been one.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues of North Carolina, it is with a sense of irreplaceable loss and profound regret that I learned of the untimely death of our colleague and friend, the Honorable DAVID M. HALL. Certainly, the amazing display of courage by a man who for 30 years of his young life was confined to a wheelchair, is something which could not but fail to be a powerful source of inspiration to all who knew him. Despite a crippling malady he undertook with inspiring faith a career in life which would have taxed the strength of any man who enjoyed health as an initial advantage. Never did he display despair nor did he feel that life was futile despite the fact he suffered from a persistent cancer for which he had to undergo surgery 200 times. Until the moment he was completely incapacitated by this dread disease, he carried on the duties and discharged the responsibilities of his high office. He had the qualities of greatness exemplified by a persistent and unyielding faith in the future which led him to maintain that he would seek reelection.

While it is true that he shall no longer sit with this body, his example shall, certainly, be here with us always.

To his family, I offer my deepest sympathies and sincerest condolences in the moment of bereavement.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Science and Astronautics with DAVID M. HALL, getting to know him early in his membership in this body. It took an indomitable will for a man crippled as he was to reach Congress. I think the high respect and regard in which he was held in his home community was evidenced yesterday by the great number of people who turned out to pay their respects to him. I was one of those who was chosen to go to Sylva, N.C., to represent his colleagues in this body at the funeral. Knowing DAVE HALL and seeing the group that assembled there and talking to his friends and neighbors again confirmed the statement I have made of this fine man who commanded the respect of all who knew him. I want to extend my sympathy to his very lovely wife and to the three charming daughters that he leaves behind. I know that nothing that is said here can assuage their grief, but they should know that we in the House of Representatives do sympathize with them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and a deep sense of personal loss that I arise to eulogize our departed comrade.

DAVID HALL was a member of our Committee on Science and Astronautics. In the short time he was with us, we on the committee grew to love and respect him.

He had a gentle disposition and a courage which surmounted the physical ailments which wracked his body. He was very conscientious in his work. He tended each meeting of the committee that he could and, when he had to go to a hosiptal for treatment, as he did from time to time during his all too brief stay with us, he would apologize upon his return for his absence.

But it was his unquenchable courage above everything else that impressed those of us who served with him on the committee.

Something occurred shortly before his final illness which will give you some idea of the measure of this man who, though slight in stature and constantly wracked with pain, had an indomitable will which drove him on until the last, determined to do his best to represent his constituency and his country as long as he could.

The National Science Foundation sponsored a trip last year to Antarctica to observe the progress being made there in scientific research. As the committee which has jurisdiction over science, we were invited to send a representative.

DAVID HALL heard about it. He wanted to go. He desperately wanted to go. This was not what some would call a junket. It was a trip to a cold and fearsome continent, but this man who could not even walk was ready to assay the perils of this forbidding region. It was with great reluctance that he finally gave up the idea. It was not long after this that he went to New York for the operation which was soon to be followed by his death.

This, then, was the measure of the man whose passing we mourn. He was with us for all too brief a moment, but we who grew to know and love him will always treasure his memory.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the death of my friend and colleague DAVID MCKEE HALL, the distinguished Representative from North Carolina, took something vital out of me just as it left empty a seat in this Congress which can never again be filled by a man of his great heart, mind, and energy. In the short period he served here, he demonstrated a talent and a sense of justice which made older men bow to his wisdom. This Congress and this country would have been greater in the esteem of the world had he longer lived.

I was honored to serve with him on the committee on science and astronautics. I was elated when he volunteered, in spite of his handicap which certainly did not deter his ambition and drive, to accompany me last fall to the London conference of the International Astronautical Federation. He was worried then that the Communists were infiltrating the international scientific associations, that they would eventually get control of them and use them for their own propaganda purposes.

Accordingly, he worked diligently with members of the American delegation and other free-world delegations for proper ground rules and effective regulations. His efforts were successful, as were all of the projects he undertook in committee. I am so proud of his record that I am going to request that the report on the London astronautical conference, which I am about to file be dedicated to our late colleague DAVID M. HALL.

Although Congressman HALL was confined to a wheelchair since the age of 15 and went through some 200 operations, he had great strength, character, and moral and physical stamina which enabled him to achieve great success. He studied at the University of North Carolina and received an LL.B. degree from its law school in 1948. He was a successful attorney and farmer. He served as a member of the North Carolina State Senate, and was for several years a member of the State board of water commissioners. Then came the crowning moment of his successful though brief career, when he was elected to the 86th Congress and took his seat here just a year ago on January 3, 1959.

To achieve all this in the face of such handicap requires an indomitable spirit and character. All of us who were privileged to know him and to work with him readily recognized the great strength of his character. I know that he left an indelible mark on me, and I shall always cherish my association with him.

He married the most wonderful and understanding woman in the world, who was a great source of comfort and inspiration to him. Sarah Hall is the mother of his three lovely daughters: Ann, age 11; Allison, age 9; and Hannah, age 5. I know that his great deeds, his wonderful name, his dauntless character will forever serve as a consolation in their days of great bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more apt prayer on this occasion than the famous prayer of peace by St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love. Where there is injury, pardon. Where there is doubt, faith. Where there is despair, hope. Where there is darkness, light. Where there is saddness, joy. O divine Father, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled, as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive.

It is pardoning that we are pardoned. It is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSCH.]

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, for those of us here in this Congress who became acquainted with DAVID HALL I believe the feeling is that we regret we had not known him sooner. He was one of those persons who possessed certain high qualities which make a profound and lasting impression on our lives.

He suffered from a physical affliction which in itself would have been an insurmountable obstacle to most of us. But not to DAVE. This physical disability proved to be no obstacle to his tenacious spirit, nor to his keen and alert mind, nor did it dampen his fine and lively sense of humor.

I sat beside DAVE during our committee hearings and was thus permitted to a greater share of contact with these fine qualities than most of my colleagues. I am grateful that I had that experience for my own life was enriched by it.

I know DAVID will be missed by his family. They should know that we share their sorrow. Our prayer is that God will sustain them and comfort them and that He will give our country more men like DAVID HALL.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, DAVE HALL was a member of the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman. He was a very dedicated man. I was particularly impressed last spring with the fact that during some rather important hearings he specifically arranged for his treatment out at the hospital to come at a time in the morning which would permit him to rush back to the committee. Day after day he went to the hospital early, took his treatment, and rushed back at a great deal of pain and effort on his part to do the things which he believed he should be doing.

He was truly a dedicated servant of the people. Certainly his State and the Nation have lost a great man in the passing of DAVE HALL.

I extend to his wife and to his children my deepest sympathy. May his deeds sustain them in this time of trial.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened on Saturday when I learned the news that our colleague, DAVID M. HALL, had been called to his final and eternal reward. During the short period of time that DAVID HALL served in Congress, I had the opportunity of talking to him, of exchanging stories and getting to know him. He was a man of indomitable courage and understanding. Despite an affliction which confined him to a wheelchair since the age of 15, he lived a full life. From his wheelchair he ran his service station, sold automobiles, earned a law degree; he went to Raleigh, N.C., as a State senator, practiced law and ultimately won a seat in Congress.

Those who have suffered illnesses and long confinement can appreciate the courage and idomitable will which he possessed. He submitted to over 200 major operations during a lifetime of 42 years. He never flinched nor did he waiver. He was cheerful and was looking forward to coming back to the 87th Congress as a Congressman. I, for one, was the beneficiary of his humanity and understanding. Last year, when I suddenly was compelled to rush to Bethesda Hospital and was being transported through the corridors for X-rays, DAVID HALL was there for treatment and met me and asked me about my problem. When he recognized that I had hurriedly come to the hospital, he wheeled himself along the corridors in his wheelchair and purchased for me at his own cost toothpaste, a toothbrush and a comb and brush to make my confinement a little more comfortable. He was a man who, despite his own troubles, took time out to give comfort to another person in distress. His humanity matched his courage and I shall miss him.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his widow and his three children, who have lost a loving mate and an inspirational father.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of our late colleague, the Honorable DAVID M. HALL.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we all join with the family and friends of DAVID M. HALL. We all admired him for his fortitude in his long suffering, which he bore with great bravery. He was a good and fine man.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, death, as always, leaves us a little saddened and especially so when it takes from our midst a loved and cherished colleague.

The passing of our friend and fellow public servant, DAVID M. HALL, reminds us vividly of his unselfish self-sacrificing years of service to his district and the people of these United States.

Although his freedom of movement was impeded by affliction for many years, he was never known to be other than a smiling, earnest, and sincere worker, in every field of endeavor.

His kindness and consideration for others was as much a part of him as his very life itself.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his bereaved wife and three minor children. His life will, I am sure, be the healing balm that will inspire them to continue on in the path he cut so clear, honest, efficient, and true.

A real American has left our midst. In his memory we will be Americans—all of us.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, we lost a young man of great courage in the passing of Representative DAVID M. HALL. His diligence, integrity, and sincerity will always be a living example to all the Members of the Congress. He was devoted to his State, country and family.

A bone infection menaced him through life but, as a true Roman gladiator, he never faltered in his honest quest to serve the Republic. Like the brave man he was, Mr. HALL never flinched before the physical dangers that beset him—hundreds of surgical operations did not quench the flame of a promising political career.

He struggled throughout his life to accomplish the impossible—from a wheelchair at an early age, he managed a gas station, sold autos, was graduated from law school, and served as State senator, reaching the heights of his ambition as a Member of Congress, January 1959.

The House has lost one of its keen intellects. He was a quiet and gentle individual who, in spite of his physical trials, was kind and considerate of the feelings and interests of others. He was conscientious and devoted to his work, both in committee hearings and House sessions. He had great faith in God and man.

To his bereaved and loving wife, Sarah, and his devoted children, Sarah Anne, 10; Edith Allison, 9; and Hannah McKee, 4, I extend my heartfelt condolences and pray that our Heavenly Father give them strength to bear this great sadness, and bless his Christian soul. He gave unselfishly and courageously of himself to others to the very end.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow and sadness that I learned of the untimely passing last Friday of our friend and colleague, Hon. DAVID M. HALL, late a Representative from the 12th District of North Carolina.

Mr. HALL came to the House of Representatives as the youngest Member of the delegation from the State of North Carolina. By his ability, his sincerity, and his devotion to duty he endeared himself not only to his friends and constituents at home, but to his colleagues and associates in the House of Representatives. It was my pleasure to become acquainted with him immediately upon his election to this body, and I was privileged to know him better as time passed by.

It was an inspiration to serve with him in this body. He will be greatly missed by all of us who knew and served with him. Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Hall and their three daughters.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, DAVE HALL, our able and distinguished colleague, was a neighbor of mine. Our offices are located directly across the corridor from each other.

It is, therefore, with firsthand knowledge that I can pay this sincere tribute to one of the most courageous, conscientious and capable Members of this body with whom it has been my privilege to serve.

It is my judgment that, if DAVE had been spared by our Devine Providence, indeed in a relatively few years he would have become one of the leaders of this body.

His capacity for work without stint or thought of his own physical well-being, his courage to rise above the physical frailties which must have strained his stamina far beyond the limits imaginable for those of us who, by the grace of God, are not physically handicapped; his gentleness of disposition, always displayed even under the most trying conditions; his determination and fortitude to take a position and stay with it, regardless of pressure; and, his willingness to help any and all who solicited his cooperation, express rather inadequately the many wholesome facets of his personality and character which impressed themselves upon me as we would meet daily in the pursuit of our congressional duties.

His Nation, State, and district have lost a great public servant. We have all lost a friendly and capable colleague. I have lost a good neighbor.

To his family, I extend this expression of my sincerest condolences. Mrs. Hall and Sarah, Edith, and Hannah, you have my deepest sympathy. May God bless you in this hour of your great bereavement.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a man with a great heart and indomitable courage, our departed friend, the Honorable DAVID A. HALL.

DAVE'S entire life revealed his courage at every turn. He struggled to gain a good education, to secure a law degree, to advance in politics, and finally to make a record as an outstanding freshman Member of this body.

He was easy to get to know. I recall our first meeting when we, as freshmen do, reviewed with each other our experiences during the 1958 campaign. I marveled at some of the campaign exploits of this fine man, who worked so hard in getting out to meet the people despite the fact he was confined to a wheelchair.

Then as a colleague on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, DAVE HALL showed his true mettle by the avid manner in which he plunged into new and deep subject matter, his penetrating questioning of witnesses, and his dedication to his country in his desire to see our Nation develop a powerful missile and space program.

Finally, there was another richly human quality about DAVE HALL that none of us, his friends, will ever forget. No matter how trying must have been the physical difficulties which he suffered, I have never met or seen DAVE without experiencing the glow of enthusiasm which emanated from him. He had a hearty laugh and a wonderful sense of humor. He gave a lift to everyone he saw. He made us all feel bigger than we are.

Along with my colleagues, I will miss DAVID HALL. His passing is a great loss to the House of Representatives, to the State of North Carolina, and to the Nation.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened at the loss of DAVID HALL. Our hearts go out to his wife and daughters in their hour of grief.

Although I did not enjoy the privilege of a close friendship with DAVE HALL, I am compelled to pay tribute to this man who swam against the tide the greater part of his life and conquered adversity at every turn in the road to get himself educated, established in the practice of law, and elected by his fellow citizens to represent them in this, the greatest legislative body on the earth.

My only opportunity to observe the work of DAVE HALL was during the course of our service together on the Science and Astronautics Committee. I was impressed at the outset by his keen interest, his thorough preparation for committee meetings and hearings, and his ability to firmly grasp the intricacies of a difficult problem. He was an able and a dedicated man.

DAVE HALL'S achievements should prove a valuable lesson to all of us who have at some time in our lives thought we had a problem too difficult to surmount. We have seen, in him, what a stout heart and a desire to conquer adversity could accomplish.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learned of the death of our colleague, the Honorable DAVID HALL, of North Carolina.

During the 1 year that he was permitted to serve in the House of Representatives he spent a great deal of time on the floor, for he quickly became aware that only by such attendance could he keep abreast of legislation and learn the procedures by which the House conducts its business. It was during the long days of the last session that I came to know him and the courage and perseverance that enabled him to overcome the enormous handicaps that beset his life.

Had he lived I know that DAVID HALL would have been an outstanding Member of Congress, a splendid Representative of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and the three daughters who survive him.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I knew DAVE HALL from the days when he was a student at the University of North Carolina, which is located in my home town of Chapel Hill. Everybody who knew DAVE in his student days admired him for his courage in the face of crushing physical disabilities and for his keen and inquiring mind. After receiving his law degree in 1948, DAVE returned to his home community and engaged in the practice of law and also in farming operations, two strenuous pursuits which would tax the strength of a person in robust health.

DAVID HALL'S tenure of office here was relatively brief, but already he had made his mark and earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in this body and in the committee where he so ably served. He was a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, an appropriate assignment, it seems to me, for a young man who felt a keen interest in the opening up of a new world. He was devoted and dedicated to his committee work and to it he brought a fine and understanding intellect.

We know that since boyhood DAVE had suffered from a bone infection which necessitated his undergoing more than 200 operations. Through these ordeals he emerged with his fighting spirit still intact, exemplifying the theme of the old ballad of Sir Andrew Barton, which runs:

> I'll but lie down and bleed a while,
> And then I'll rise and fight again.

DAVE always rose and fought again, and even after this last surgical ordeal he was confident that he could continue his career and return to these Halls. Since courage was the foundation stone of DAVE'S life and career, the following quotation from Seneca seems to provide a fitting epitaph to our colleague, who never gave in to the vicissitudes of life but rose above them in a fashion that should be a lesson and inspiration to us all:

> Now has my valor borne me to the stars, and to the gods themselves.

To DAVE'S family—his wife and children, his mother, and his brother and sisters—I extend my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement and express the hope that the fine monument of DAVE'S life and works will comfort and sustain them in their hour of loss.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of the late Hon. DAVID MCKEE HALL whose recent untimely death deprived this House and our country of the services of a devoted and outstanding public servant. I felt a particularly close relationship to DAVID HALL because he and I came to Congress together as new Members at the beginning of the 1st session of the 86th Congress and were assigned together to the new Committee on Science and Astronautics. From that common bond I came to know him as a man of unusual attainments and great courage. In the work of our committee he proved himself to be a keen student, an industrious and able worker, and the possessor of a sound analytic judgment which enabled him to cut to the heart of a matter and to emerge with a reasoned decision on any of the complex problems with which we were presented.

The fortitude he had shown throughout his life from the time he was stricken with the crippling ailment which eventually resulted in his passing from us showed clearly in his all too short career as a Member of this House. He was a man of indomitable courage and strong conviction. It took such a man to surmount his great physical handicap and to become the educated statesman and wonderful husband and father that he was. Those traits were the hallmark of his short tenure as the Representative of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina. I had occasion to observe many times that even though DAVID HALL

might stand alone in his convictions on a particular issue that fact did not deter him. Once having reached such a conviction on the basis of his moral and intellectual judgments, he was able to withstand the pressures exerted by other forces and to stand firm for what he believed to be the right. Although his voice might be the only one raised to voice a "nay" on some issue before us, that "nay" was clearly heard and carried with it the assurance that he had not been distracted from his duty as he saw it.

Withal, DAVE HALL was a warmly human and a lovable man. His keen sense of humor and his engaging personality endeared him to all of us who had the good fortune to work with him and to know him as a friend. His leavening presence on our committee will be sorely missed. His unique courage will not soon be equaled in our midst. His indomitable spirit will never find a replacement among us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that even more than we mourn DAVID HALL'S passing here, his lovely wife and daughters and his many friends at home in North Carolina will share the sweet sorrow of his memory. Mrs. Moeller and I extend our hearts and our prayers to them in the sure knowledge that the overpowering love of the Almighty Father of us all will bring them the solace they need and the courage to carry on in the unwavering pattern that he set for them.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I came to know DAVID HALL early in the 86th Congress through relatives of his in my own congressional district who are personal friends.

I admired him for his philosophy of government, and for his great personal courage. Had his career in the House of Representatives not been cut short, I am sure it would have been a brilliant one.

The world is, I believe, better for DAVID HALL'S example. His State and congressional district are better because of his having lived there. I am sure that I am better because of having known him.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 434), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable DAVID M. HALL, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BARDEN, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WHITENER.

The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 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:

1743. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1744. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the operations of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1745. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1746. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the use of contractor-furnished drawings for procurement purposes by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1747. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 10th Annual Report on operations of the General Services Administration for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1748. A letter from the Managing Director, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 12th Annual Report and Financial Statement of the District of Columbia Armory Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 605, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1749. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for 1959, pursuant to chapter 1628, Acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1750. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of the balance sheet of the Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1959, filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 979); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1751. A letter from the administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1752. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1753. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of a summary of certain contracts made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations"; to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1755. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for 1959, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1756. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1757. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1758. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the General Services Administration's report on positions compensated under authority of Public Law 623, 84th Congress, during calendar year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1759. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interests in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of a public street, highway or alley, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1760. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certificates and evidences of title"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1761. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 29, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Great Lakes Harbors study-

interim report on Detroit River, Trenton Channel, Mich., requested by the resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956, June 27, 1956 and July 29, 1955, respectively (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 9, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga. This report is in response to an item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, approved July 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4786. A bill to restore to Cheyenne River Sioux tribal ownership certain land located in Dewey County, S. Dak.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MACK of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6462. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain payments for the relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8234. A bill to donate to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho approximately 11.25 acres of Federal land in Idaho County, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 10042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income-tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 10043. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10044. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10045. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10046. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10047. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10048. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise, by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10049. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to provide for prior notification and suspension of certain acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10050. A bill to authorize a study and investigation by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 10051. A bill to authorize the establishment of a national showcase of the arts and sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 10052. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 10053. A bill to provide for a payment-in-kind program for corn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 10054. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 10055. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10056. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10057. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10058. A bill authorizing bank protection and channel maintenance of the Sacramento River, Calif., in the interest of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 10059. A bill to afford additional time during which vocational rehabilitation may be afforded to those disabled veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict who have been prevented by reason of their service-connected disabilities from pursuing and completing a suitable course of rehabilitation training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 10060. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees at the naval weapons plant in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 10061. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways" as revised, codified, and enacted by Public Law 85-767, so as to provide for effective competition in the construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 10062. A bill for the relief of La Salle County, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 10063. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico (by request):

H.R. 10064. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10065. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid custom officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 10066. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the several States to enter into compacts providing for the uniform tax treatment of nonresidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10067. A bill to establish a research program in the National Arboretum to develop hardy trees and shrubs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 10068. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10069. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 10070. A bill to authorize a study and investigation by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10071. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 10072. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the U.S. Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10073. A bill to suspend certain postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H.R. 10074. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the

enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10075. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 592. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the ———— week in ———— as National Poison Prevention Week, in order to aid in bringing to the American people the dangers of accidental poisoning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 593. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution providing for a comprehensive program of research and experimentation for the purpose of investigating the growth of saltcedar and other phreatophytes, the hydrological and climatological factors influencing the use of water by such plants, and the various techniques for the eradication and control of such plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to State taxation of the income of nonresident individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 534. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 535. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H. Con. Res. 536. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 537. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 538. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 539. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 546. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Con. Res. 547. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 549. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. Con. Res. 550. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 553. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 554. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agrements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 555. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolf Edward Klawans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10077. A bill for the relief of Wong Tit Man, Chan Ying Nor, Wong Wai Kon, Wong Wai Moon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Perry King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10079. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR (by request):

H.R. 10080. A bill for the relief of Max Haleck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 10081. A bill for the relief of Jaime Abejuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

324. By Mr. DOOLEY: Resolution adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of the Civic and Business Federation, White Plains Chamber of Commerce, White Plains, N.Y. urging the President and representatives in the Congress of the United States to effect every possible economy in the Federal budget for 1960–61 and that all budgeted surplus revenues be applied exclusively to reduction of the Federal debt which now exceeds $290 billion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of H.R. 3223, "in order to perpetuate the memory of all those who while serving under the American flag in the Pacific area paid their part of the price which purchased victory in the Pacific in World War II"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

326. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to requesting that Congress take necessary measures to establish an East-West cultural center in Hawaii for the training and educating of Asian and American students"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One-Hundredth Anniversary of Rabbi Morris J. Raphall's Prayer in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting when we today commemorate the 100th anniversary of the occasion of Rabbi Morris J. Raphall's delivering the first prayer by a Jewish minister in the Halls of Congress that we pause and reflect on the deep and venerable roots of the Jewish community in American society.

This moment is an especially appropriate time because of the various acts of medieval intolerance which have lately been manifested against Jewish houses of worship.

Barbaric acts of anti-Semitism strike at not a particular isolated group, but at all of us. A democracy survives not in a society of an elite self-imposed on coteries of second-class citizens, but in a society of truly equal individuals. It is sober fact that we in the United States are still striving for that great achievement of democratic equality of which our forefathers dreamed. We are on the threshold of its realization. The struggle for full equality awaits the fateful decisions to be made within these very walls shortly.

Rabbi Raphall was an especially illustrious minister of a long and distinguished line of spiritual leaders of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of New York City.

Dr. Raphall was called in 1849 to this famous congregation in New York City from Birmingham, England, where he had become famed as the foremost exponent of the Jew to the non-Jew and had served to win for Jews the battle for equal political rights which were as yet denied them in the British Empire.

Rabbi Raphall's fame as preacher and scholar became quickly established in America too, not only among the Jewry but also among the Christian clergy so that when the invitation to open a session of the House of Representatives with a prayer came to him, he had long been acclaimed for his erudition and his oratory.

His prayer to the House of Representatives on February 1, 1860, in many respects was prophetic for a nation shortly to be torn asunder by civil war. Portions of his prayer have signifiance for our time too. He said then:

The Constitution and institutions of this Republic prove to the world, that men created in Thine image and obedient to Thy precepts are not only capable—fully capable of self-government, but that they know best how to combine civil liberty with ready obedience to the laws—religious liberty with warm zeal for religion—absolute general equality with sincere respect for individual rights.

And even more significant, he exhorted:

"Let Thy grace guide them, so that amidst the din of conflicting interests and opinions, they may each of them and all of them hold the even tenor of their way—the way of moderation and of equity—that they may speak and act and legislate for Thy glory and for the happiness of our country; so that from North and from South and from East and West, one feeling of satisfaction may attend their labors while all the people of the land joyfully repeat the words of Thy Psalmist:

"Lo! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Dr. Raphall remained the pillar of New York's Jewish community until his death on June 22, 1868, after nearly 20 years with Congregation B'nai Jeshurun.

It is good that we commemorate this occasion and in the light of this facet of history we reexamine our consciences so we might be strengthened in our resolve to be just.

Congress Should Express Its Indignation at Desecration of Places of Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was with shock and dismay that I and many other Americans have read during recent weeks of the anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic demonstrations in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world, including the United States.

The poisoned mercury of religious bigotry spreads rapidly and in many directions if left unchecked; its flow is not easy to arrest.

As if to emphasize the blasphemy of their acts, the persons who were responsible for touching off this wave a few weeks ago chose Christmas eve as the time for desecrating a synagogue in the city of Cologne in West Germany.

Mr. Speaker, those who say that anti-Semitism is dead and that the deeds of the Nazis should be passed by on the other side speak too soon. "Even when it is shameful and frightening," said Commonweal magazine recently, "history cannot be denied. That 5 million Jews were murdered by the government of a highly cultured European Christian people is a monstrous, hideous fact, for them and for the rest of the world. That nazism is quite dead becomes every day an increasingly dubious judgment; but, even if it were quite dead, it would still need to be referred to."

THE "HITLERIAN HERITAGE" OF THE ANTI-SEMITES

The January 23, 1960, issue of Ave Maria, a fine Catholic weekly published at Notre Dame, Ind., comments in similar vein:

Have we forgotten * * * the horror of Germany under Hitler, the murder of countless Jewish—and Christian—men, women, and children who were innocent of any crime? Hitler did not create anti-Jewish feeling; he merely systematically cultivated it and fanned it into a white heat of hatred which allowed him to perpetrate his crime against humanity in the name of justice. * * * When the parlor bigots today sit around and make their anti-Semitic remarks, do they not realize their Hitlerian heritage?

Mr. Speaker, because I feel so deeply the dangers of such acts of desecration of places of worship, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution by means of which the Congress of the United States can express to the world its profound sense of indignation and shock at this epidemic and can call on all peoples and all governments everywhere to work to the end that these shameful events shall not happen again.

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SHOCK AT DESECRATION OF PLACES OF WORSHIP

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas in recent days there has been a wave of desecration of places of worship and other sacred sites; and

Whereas this desecration has been spreading throughout the nations of Europe and other parts of the world; and

Whereas instances of desecration have occurred in this country recently; and

Whereas if left unchecked this wave can only result in grievous moral deterioration and denial of the true spirit of the brotherhood of man; and

Whereas the conscience of the world has been shocked by these events: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation and shock at this epidemic of desecration and calls upon all persons and governments throughout the world to exert their energies to the end that these shameful events shall not recur.

THE HIGH COST OF PREJUDICE

Mr. Speaker, we know from the turbulent history of our national experience in the United States the high cost of racial and religious prejudice.

We can see very clearly how the intolerance that burst forth with the desecration of a synagogue in Cologne soon spread to other West German communities; then to Vienna, London, Glasgow, and finally to our own country, in New York City.

LEADERSHIP OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The month of February, Mr. Speaker, is the month during which the people of America celebrate Brotherhood Week. I am proud of the fact that in recognition of this week, the citizens of South Bend, Ind., as well as of other communities of the Nation, operating through

the agency of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, have taken the leadership in combating religious intolerance. I hope that, precisely because of the unhappy events that have taken place during recent weeks, every American community will this month dedicate itself to the erasing of religious hatred and ill will among Americans of different creeds.

For we all know that when one man or one house of worship or one religious faith is today made the object of attack, tomorrow another may feel the sharp lash of bigotry.

NO MAN IS AN ISLAND—ASK NOT FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

No man is an island, entire of itself—

Said John Donne—

Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or if thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of John J. O'Connor removed one of the colorful and dynamic figures who served in Congress in the early days of the New Deal. He was a man of great ability, a powerful orator and persuasive in debate. No "rubber stamp" was John. He disliked many of the Roosevelt proposals and never hesitated to express himself forcefully. He made a great contribution to the useful role of Congress by discussing fully all questions in the days when the Republicans were so weak in numbers. His independence and frankness brought down upon him the wrath of F. D. R., and he was singled out to be purged together with Senator Millard Tydings and Senator George, of Georgia. John was the only successful purge of that year and that by a very small margin.

John was chairman of the "fighting Rules Committee" of that time of which I was privileged to be a member. That fact as well as the fact that he was born in Raynham, a town in my district, brought us into close friendship. I knew well his brother Basil, a law partner of President Roosevelt, as well as the other members of his fine family. Ardent Democrats, but they always voted for me for Congress. His good mother, when over 80, hired a taxi to go to the polls to help me in one of my more exciting campaigns.

When I last saw him a year ago I realized he appeared to be not as well as he was in the old days but nothing of an alarming nature.

John J. O'Connor was an outstanding Congressman and a great American. He served his country with great ability during a tempestuous period. Those of us who knew him regret keenly his passing. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Excerpts From an Address by Senator Joseph S. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to place in the RECORD excerpts from the speech of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, made on Friday, January 29, 1960, at the Roosevelt Day luncheon of the Allegheny County Democratic Committee, Pittsburgh:

"I am confident," said Senator CLARK, "that we will elect a Democrat President and win for our party control of the State senate while we are about it. There are four reasons for this belief:

"First, we are the majority party in both Pennsylvania and the Nation. The 1958 and 1959 elections proved that.

"Second, this year we will be running against real Republicans, not a national military hero. The issue between the parties will be clearly drawn. Simply stated, it is democracy against plutocracy. The choice is clear.

"Third, our candidate for the Presidency will be running against RICHARD NIXON. The people of this country have too much commonsense to elect as their President either the old NIXON or the new NIXON.

"Fourth, Mr. NIXON must run on the Eisenhower record. In Walter Lippmann's trenchant phrase, the Eisenhower administration has put 'private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race [with international communism] because we are not allowed to run.'"

Senator CLARK deplored the emphasis given to what he called "popularity polls."

"The partisan press," he said, "is already consigning us to defeat—but elections are not won on Gallup polls in January. It is the official count at the ballot box in November which determines who wins.

"We all remember 1948. Let us also observe how close the parallel is between Mr. NIXON and Mr. Dewey."

CLARK stated that the Republican issues of "peace, prosperity, and progress" would break down under Democratic attack. "It is we, not they," he said, "who are taking the lead for peace through disarmament and a revision of the United Nations Charter.

"It is we, not they, who are advocating the governmental policies necessary to achieve lasting prosperity: an end to tight money and high interest rates, a first-class educational program, adequate aid for depressed areas, and an equitable tax system which will give us the revenues to reduce our national debt and still meet our responsibilities at home and abroad. It is we, not they, who understand the need for strong governmental action to assure progress through sustained economic growth and a rededication to the spiritual principles which made our country great."

Senator CLARK cited an editorial reprinted by the Washington Post from the New Republic which, he said, well described the Eisenhower thesis. The President's message, the editorial said, is "save now, be strong later; save now, educate later; save now, cure unemployment later; save now, reclaim our towns and cities later; save now, research later the cause and remedy for mortal disease; save now, build housing later; save now, clear the air later; save now, purge our streams later; save now, nourish later the people—and the hopes—of new nations."

"The American people," the Senator continued, "are getting ready for the coming political breakthrough. We can achieve it by sending a Democrat to the White House supported by a Democratic Congress next year. Our only danger lies in apathy and a failure to take the initiative. We must stick to our party platform, pass the bills we said we would, let the vetoes fall where they may, and carry the issues to the country. I refuse to believe that the American dream has become so faded that we will continue to shut our eyes to overcrowded schools, underpaid teachers, inadequate colleges, hospital shortages, old people without medical care, men and women working at poverty wages, polluted streams, slums in our cities, a stagnant economy and unemployment areas shifting for themselves, and all this for the purpose of providing another tax cut for the rich and well-to-do.

"Only under our party can our country redeem itself and move forward to national well-being at home, national security abroad, and that sound and idealistic world leadership to which our destiny calls us."

U.S. Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today providing for the creation of a commission to conduct a complete investigation and study, with recommendations, relating to the establishment of a U.S. Science Academy.

My bill differs, I believe, in several important respects with many of those previously introduced. I would like to point out some basic differences to the Members.

It does not provide for the establishment of an academy, but for the establishment of a Hoover-type commission, which seems to me to be the proper approach to the problem of evaluating all of the facts that would be necessary to eventually establish such an Academy.

Again, the bill conceives that the Academy would train and assist unusually qualified students, who have completed their college training, in the fields of physical science, mathematics, or engineering, and whose services would be retained by our Government for a specified number of years after graduation.

In this atomic and space age, it should be obvious that scientific progress is essential for the future welfare and security of our country, and I believe that it is important for us to have the very best brains of our youth available to the various arms of our governmental establishment. They could assist materially in progressing toward not only a more secure life for our people, but also for one containing as many human comforts as possible.

I urge the Members of this august body to study this legislation and to join with me, on a bipartisan basis, if they choose, in introducing identical bills, so that its concept will have full support.

Centenary of the First Jewish Prayer in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was 100 years ago today that the Congress of the United States first gave full and formal recognition to the Jewish religion, and to the position of the rabbi as preacher and religious teacher, by selecting a rabbi, Morris Jacob Raphall, of New York, to open a session of the House of Representatives with prayer. This 100th anniversary of the occasion is suitably observed by the invocation offered in our behalf today, but there is the happy difference that there is today nothing to surprise anyone in the presence of a Jewish rabbi in this post of honor, and nothing unusual in the event when the Members of our National Legislature bow their heads humbly as a Jewish religious leader speaks for them to the Lord and Master of us all.

Well may our hearts echo today those holy words, spoken in Hebrew and in English by Rabbi Raphall a hundred years ago and prized in Christian as in Hebrew tradition:

> The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord show His face to thee and have mercy on thee. The Lord turn His countenance to thee and give thee peace.

I am particularly gratified that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States has paused long enough today to reflect on this 100th anniversary of the first Jewish prayer offered in Congress. It is significant that we, as Members of Congress, should pay tribute to this momentous occasion because it indeed reflects that in this country we Americans have respected the rights of equality and freedom of religion since the very founding of our country.

Today's observance is particularly significant when we reflect that in many corners of the world and, unfortunately, even in some isolated areas of our own country, the evil specter of religious bigotry is again being manifested.

By paying tribute to this 100th anniversary today, we in Congress unequivocally state that the legislative branch of our Government shall never condone such bigoted conduct. I trust that the example we have set here today will be an inspiration to all men of good will and, in its own way, contribute to a halt in these outrageous attacks on religious institutions throughout the world. By this tribute today, we have again demonstrated that we recognize religious freedom and tolerance as the very cornerstone of our democracy.

I wish to add my own note of congratulations to Rabbi Israel Goldstein, who delivered this morning's opening prayer, for his inspiring words. Rabbi Goldstein is the spiritual leader of the Congregation B'Nai Jeshuran, in New York City. It is significant that Rabbi Raphall was the spiritual leader of this same synagogue 100 years ago when he opened the session of the House of Representatives with a prayer. Rabbi Goldstein's inspirational message today reconfirms the deep dedication of the Jewish people to the institutions of freedom and liberty and tolerance throughout the world.

I should also like to congratulate Dr. Abraham G. Ducker, president, Chicago's College of Jewish Studies, for calling this very significant anniversary to my attention. It was indeed through Dr. Ducker's suggestion that we have been able to arrange today's tribute to the 100th anniversary of the first invocation delivered by a rabbi in the House of Representatives.

Trade Agreement Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in support of the resolution proposed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. While it is the duty of Congress to reverse as quickly as possible some of the illogical trade policies that are directly responsible for so much unemployment in this country, the resolution will meanwhile serve notice that Congress will not tolerate further international agreements handing over domestic markets to foreign producers.

The headlong drive for free exchange of goods in international commerce has caught up with us with a vengeance. Time was when a comparatively few of us stood up here on the House floor to appeal for relief from unfair foreign competition. Now that the grave perils of the free-trade theory are beginning to divulge themselves in a multitude of industries and communities of the land, the demand for corrective measures is becoming increasingly more audible.

Those of us whose constituencies depend heavily upon coal and the railroads for a healthy economy are particularly pleased to note the growing ranks of opposition to policies that subordinate the interest of American labor and industry to diplomatic motives. For years we were practically alone in our crusade for a limitation on the imported residual oil that has created such havoc in the economy of mining regions in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

Time was when the term "selfish interest" was applied in the case of anyone who sought tariff or quota protection to give American miners and railroaders a chance to reclaim their jobs. The free trade army—commanded by leftover State Department leftwingers—insisted that everyone would ultimately benefit by opening the doors of this country to any and all alien commodities. Down and down went U.S. tariffs, setting us up for today's serious predicament that becomes more critical as the inflow of foreign products and the outgo of gold continue almost unchecked. The resolution under consideration here today can be an important means of getting us back in the proper direction. Actually, it should be welcomed by the diplomats who have been representing us at meetings of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, because this action by Congress would provide a medium of getting themselves off the hook which they assisted in setting up and which is now being used to strangle American labor and industry. Once the resolution is adopted, our generous "GATTeers" need only explain to their suave friends at the international roundtable that it is the sense of Congress that no further trade concessions be made in the next 2 years. Sorry, but our orders are to "stand pat" before we sacrifice any more industries. That is all that need be said when the boys gather at Geneva or wherever else the good fellows who trade off domestic markets without semblance of a quid pro quo plan to meet their foreign friends this year and next.

Meanwhile, back at the legislative branch, perhaps we will be able to plan for a showdown on the entire foreign trade program. Perhaps we can get an answer to the question of whether we are willing to permit our own factories and plants to shut down in order to please people elsewhere in the world. There is a possibility, too, that by now we can even convince the policymakers in the State Department of the fallacious reasoning behind the free trade doctrine. Somehow those credulous functionaries were unable to comprehend that the manufacturing facilities erected at various points around the globe at the expense of the American taxpayer would produce materials directly competitive with our own products. Now the picture becomes more vivid with the rush of American dollars into alien areas where labor and materials are cheap. When the average hourly earnings in industrial

occupations amount to more than $2 in the United States, slightly more than 60 cents in the United Kingdom, and less than 25 cents in Japan, there is no doubt about why we are being undersold all along the line. And behind the products made abroad—in addition to the reputations of leading foreign companies—are such labels as National Cash Register, Remington Rand, Hamilton, Singer, Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, General Tire & Rubber, and scores of other established brand names.

Since the end of World War II American business has invested more than $27 billion in factories, oil wells, mines, and other enterprises in foreign lands. One large manufacturer cut employment from 9,000 to less than 5,000 in a factory here after opening a similar plant in Europe. A steel processor laid off his 1,000 employees in New York State to set up shop in Japan and take advantage of cheap labor there and low tariffs here. Indeed, transferring job opportunities to Europe, South America, and Asia has become a principal export activity of the United States.

Speaking for the congressional district which I represent, I can testify that our coal, railroad, pottery, ceramics, glass, machine tools, and other industries have suffered constant oppression from imported materials. Now our steel industry has become a target of shippers from countries where labor is cheap and standards of living far below ours. Unless we take action, not a single area of the country—whether it be industrial or agricultural—will escape similar fate. Now is the time to transmit our views to the State Department. Let us give this resolution the support it needs and thus get started on the way back to a sane foreign trade program.

Cordell Hull Award Presented to Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege along with many Members of the Congress to attend the recent banquet of the Committee for a National Trade Policy at which our distinguished, able, and beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, was presented the Cordell Hull Award.

This was an occasion of particular pleasure to me because both Speaker RAYBURN and the late great Secretary of State Cordell Hull are Tennesseans. Both of these great Americans stand with our greatest sons in service to the Nation and in the love, respect, and admiration by which they are held by our citizens. Mr. RAYBURN was born in Roane County, adjoining the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and Mr. Hull was born in Pickett County, one of the fine counties of the great Fourth District of Tennessee which I represent. Judge Hull preceded me in representing the people of that area in the Congress and I indeed counted it an honor to be able to number him as one of my constituents.

Secretary of State Herter, in presenting the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to Speaker RAYBURN, said that the award is bestowed upon Speaker RAYBURN for his vision and statesmanship in furthering the internal trade policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Secretary of State.

Speaker RAYBURN in his speech of response and acceptance said that "this is a particularly appropriate time" to recall the life, deeds, and ideals of Cordell Hull in promoting two-way friendship and free flow of trade between friendly nations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the address of Secretary of State Herter, and the text of your address on this occasion.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT A DINNER HONORING THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, GIVEN BY THE COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 28, 1960

I am honored to have been selected by this outstanding and highly commendable organization, the Committee for a National Trade Policy, to present the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to your distinguished guest. The interest that your group manifests in seeking solutions to our trade problems is most sincerely welcomed by your Government.

It is particularly appropriate that tonight your gathering will honor one who has helped to solve so many problems in the field of interstate and foreign commerce, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of the great State of Texas.

When Texas was admitted as a State in 1845, there were many who regarded it as one of the most underdeveloped regions in the world, and some who thought it would always remain so. But as we all know, in the years which have intervened, Texas has done a remarkable job of belying that thought.

I say we all know this, and I can see no imminent danger that Texans will let us soon forget it.

In trade, Texas is justly famous as an exporter of oil, cotton, cattle, minerals, lumber, and pretty girls. The State imports a wide variety of consumer goods, machinery, finished textiles, and of course they still buy U.S. postage stamps from outside the State.

In 1887 Texas imported SAM RAYBURN from Tennessee, and it has had reason to be very proud of this importation ever since. The balance of payments position as between Texas and Tennessee was markedly changed as a result of this move.

No one has ever claimed that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a compilation of the world's greatest literature, but it is often fascinating reading. I have had a small job of research done in the pages of the RECORD of the 63d Congress which reveals that SAM RAYBURN delivered his first speech in the Halls of Congress on May 6, 1913. And the pages of the proceedings on that day uncover some remarkable facts which may or may not be dismissed as sheer coincidence. For on that day, although several other hotly contested issues were debated on the floor, including the question of whether women should be given the right to vote, SAM RAYBURN addressed himself to the pending tariff bill, making an eloquent plea in favor of tariff reductions. And on that same day, another Member of the House spoke on another section of the tariff bill—a section which incorporated the novel idea of a Federal tax on personal income. The Member explaining various features of this section was the Honorable Cordell Hull, Member of Congress from Tennessee. On that night of May 6, 1913, I daresay that no one could have forseeen that on the night of January 28, 1960, an award honoring the memory of Mr. Cordell Hull would be presented to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, both natives of Tennessee, both renowned in the annals of the Nation, both able statesmen, and both distinguished Democrats. And that differences of view as between the two major political parties at least on the subjects of the tariff and foreign policy have with the passage of the years become sufficiently bettered as to make seemly the presentation of this award by a Republican Secretary of State.

From my own experience as a Member of the House of Representatives, I can testify that "Mr. SAM" has developed a patient and understanding tolerance for Republicans. He has a keen eye for those situations which call for the partisan approach and those which call for the bipartisan or nonpartisan. Cordell Hull also possessed this virtue, and in his memoirs he refers to his friendship with Congressman E. J. Hill, of Connecticut. Of Congressman Hill he says:

"From 1907 forward Mr. Hill, a Republican, and I sat for hours at a time of Sundays and evenings discussing tariff, trade, and other business conditions * * * I owe much to him for the inspiration that drove me to study the interrelation of trade throughout the world."

Now I must concede that the choice of words here and the quick identification of Mr. Hill as a Republican might be taken to mean that Cordell Hull found it quite remarkable to have discovered a Republican who knew anything about world trade, but the noble sentiment is really not thereby impaired.

Returning to Mr. SAM's first speech in Congress on that memorable day in 1913, it is remarkable how early it became clear that devotion to country is his guiding star, transcending all others. Proof of this I believe is found in his initial address. If you will indulge me for a further minute, I should like to read to you a couple of brief excerpts from his message that day. He began by saying this:

"Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this great body, I, of course, feel that I should have regard for the long-established custom of the House, which in a measure demands that discussions of questions shall be left to the more mature Members * * * but I feel that as a representative of more than 200,000 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, I should be allowed to break in a measure whatever of this custom remains, and exercise my constitutional right to speak my sentiments on this floor and refuse to be relegated to that lockjawed ostracism typical of the dead past."

Now, from that day to this night, so far as I am aware, Mr. SAM has not had reason to complain of "lockjawed ostracism." Even so, he chooses to speak only when he has something to say, and then he speaks sparingly.

After making a well-reasoned plea for tariff reductions, "Mr. SAM" closed with these words:

"I came to this body a few weeks ago with childlike enthusiasm and confidence. It has

always been my ambition to live such a life that one day my fellow citizens would call me to membership in this popular branch of the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Out of their confidence and partiality they have done this. It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

These words, spoken 47 years ago, are the words of a great man. They have been followed by deeds which testify to his greatness. All Americans are ever grateful that SAM RAYBURN has served this Nation these many years. As a close friend and longtime admirer of his, I am very proud to present the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to this distinguished gentleman.

REMARKS OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN ACCEPTING THE CORDELL HULL AWARD AT A BANQUET OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY, INC., MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1960

This is a happy occasion for me.

In the first place, it is a high privilege to be presented to you by my fine friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives, Secretary of State Christian Herter, who in my judgment is a worthy successor to the man in whose memory we gather tonight.

Any citizen of this country or any other would feel deeply honored to be the recipient of the Cordell Hull Award. Coming as it does from an organization dedicated to carrying on the great work to which Cordell Hull gave the tremendous energies of his mind and body, this award symbolizes America in her finest role—that of the good neighbor.

For 42 years—a goodly portion of any man's life—my life was warmed by the close friendship, the wise counsel, and the stirring example of Cordell Hull. I never cease to be inspired when I think of that good man's love of his country, his dedication to peace in all its aspects, and his record of matchless public service.

From the days of his humble childhood in a Cumberland Mountain log cabin, Cordell Hull had only one ambition and one aspiration—to serve mankind and to help men everywhere to live together in unity.

History now records how close he came to the fulfillment of that boyhood dream.

Not long before his death he is supposed to have told a friend that out of his long adventurous career he was proudest of four things.

First, that he had helped in the shaping of the United Nations. His role in this effort was so great that Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to him as "the Father of the United Nations."

Second, he had initiated the policy of nonpartisanship in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Third, he had put into practice the good neighbor policy in cooperation with the other American nations.

And fourth, he had headed up the drive toward a more liberal trade policy through the reciprocal trade program.

Any one of these accomplishments would be the mark of a distinguished career in American politics, but here are four mighty undertakings.

He might easily have mentioned many other things out of his busy and fruitful lifetime.

From humble beginnings he rose to a member of the Tennessee Legislature, a Tennessee circuit judge, a captain in the Spanish-American War, and he served 24 years in the Congress of the United States—22 years in the House of Representatives and 2 years in the Senate. After that he served nearly 12 years as Secretary of State under Franklin Roosevelt, the longest time one man ever held that high office. In an office once occupied by such towering figures as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Daniel Webster, John Marshall, John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, John Hay, and Charles Evans Hughes, he established himself as one of the truly great Secretaries of State.

This modest man might have recalled that he had the high honor of leading the American delegation to the London Monetary and Economic Conference, to four Inter-American Conferences, and to the Moscow Conference in 1943. He was much too humble to have mentioned that public opinion polls year after year found him to be the most popular member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet.

Many people now have forgotten that from 1921 to 1924 in the period of greatest Republican ascendancy in this century, Cordell Hull as chairman of the Democratic National Committee helped to rebuild a defeated and discouraged Democratic Party giving not alone of his energy but also lending substantial amounts of his own money as well.

It was altogether fitting that the world paid homage to this man of peace in 1945 when he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

I want to reminisce a few moments about Cordell Hull, the human being. He was one of the first close friends I made after I came to Congress on March 4, 1913, the day Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States.

I lived in the old Cochran Hotel as did many other Members of Congress including Cordell Hull. Each night after supper most of these men would pull their chairs together at the end of the big old lobby and for several hours they would explore together in serious candor the great issues of the hour. As a freshman Congressman I listened with rapt attention, and I have often thought that this was the best school of political science I ever attended.

Perhaps because we both had been born in Tennessee or perhaps because we held very similar views on political issues, Cordell Hull and myself became warm personal friends. As the junior member of that partnership, I was the great gainer profiting from his experience and wisdom.

When the Underwood tariff bill was taken up by the House of Representatives in 1913, it included the first constitutional income tax. Cordell Hull was the author of this tax plan. During that debate, I made my maiden speech in Congress in support of the bill. This tax plan has been the cornerstone of our fiscal policy from that day to this.

Before World War I, Cordell Hull became convinced that "unhampered trade dovetailed with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers, and unfair economic competition with war * * * I reasoned that, if we could get a freer flow of trade—freer in the sense of fewer discriminations and obstructions—so that one country would not be deadly jealous of another and the living standards of all countries might rise, thereby eliminating the economic dissatisfaction that breeds war, we might have a reasonable chance for lasting peace."

He also opposed high tariffs because "I believe (they) meant a higher cost of living for American citizens. They assisted in building trusts and monopolies. By cutting down the sales by other countries to us, they also cut down the purchases by other countries from us."

Cordell held the doctrine that other countries could not continue to buy from us unless they could continue to sell to us. He knew that other people could build walls against our products as easily as we could build walls against theirs, and that they had done so with a vengeance in times past.

In his memoirs he told the story of how a simple incident in the Tennessee mountains impressed the importance of trade upon his youthful mind.

"When I was a boy on the farm in Tennessee," he recalled, "we had two neighbors—I'll call them Jenkins and Jones—who were enemies of each other. For many years there had been bad feeling between them—I don't know why—and when they met on the road or in town or at church, they stared at each other coldly and didn't speak.

"Then one of Jenkins' mules went lame in the spring just when Jenkins needed him most for plowing. At the same time Jones ran short of corn for his hogs. Now it so happened that Jones was through with his own plowing and had a mule to spare, and Jenkins had a bin filled with corn. A friendly third party brought the two men together, and Jones let Jenkins use his mule in exchange for corn for the hogs.

"As a result, it wasn't long before the two old enemies were the best of friends. A commonsense trade and ordinary neighborliness had made them aware of their economic need for each other and brought them peace."

He carried this faith in liberal trade into action throughout the rest of his life.

Someone once said that "the only monument in life that Cordell Hull ever wanted was a deep nick in a tariff wall."

Cordell Hull had an almost religious belief in what came to be known as the good neighbor policy. He believed that we could not look for closer cooperation throughout the world unless we first showed that cooperation could work in the Western Hemisphere.

Friendship, he knew, is a two-way street. To have friends, we must be a friend. Patiently, tirelessly through the years Cordell Hull labored with great success to make one free neighborly community of all the American nations. Out of this concept of the good neighbor policy grew our point 4 program and eventually our continuing determination to help the underdeveloped nations of the world to a better way of life.

I loved and followed Cordell Hull as a statesman, but my fondest memories concern his qualities as a human being. I don't think he ever knew what it was to be afraid. When he believed something to be right and true, he never ceased to battle for it. He had a deep yearning to make the path a little smoother and the burden a little lighter for all people wherever they lived. He never sought credit for anything that he accomplished. The only reward he wanted was the accomplishment of his purposes. In his personal life as well as in his political philosophy he embodied the concept of the good neighbor.

He had that rare combination of gentle humility and rugged strength which were also Lincoln's qualities.

I think this is a particularly appropriate time for us to remember Cordell Hull and the great political ideals for which he stood.

In a time when our relations with our sister American Republics are troubled, when our own Vice President is insulted in a neighboring country, when American property is being expropriated almost daily, it might pay us to try to envision how Cordell Hull would have treated this situation.

The same is true of the increasingly competitive trade situation in the world. As nations recover from the devastation of war and competition for markets becomes fiercer, we hear new demands from every side for higher trade barriers. Now let us think—how would Cordell Hull have met this situation?

In closing, let me say again how deeply touched I am by this honor which you have paid me in the memory of one of the giants whom I was privileged to call my friend.

In the beautiful library which I have built in my home town as a gift to all the people, I have many treasured mementos. The Cordell Hull Award which you have so kindly given me tonight will have an honored place among them and will rest there forever for people to see.

It might have been of Cordell Hull that the poet Shelley wrote, " 'Til the future dares forget the past, his fate and fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

And I think one may fairly say of him as once was said of Thomas Jefferson: "The honors which other men had given him were unimportant; the opportunities he had given to other men to become free were all that really counted."

On Mount Rushmore—the Faces of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower Will Be Eternal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of adding figures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower to the present memorial. It is my hope that this bill will pave the way for including likenesses of these two Presidents alongside those of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

It would be fitting to have the figures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower added to the panorama of other great past leaders. President Franklin D. Roosevelt stirred this Nation to cast out fear from our hearts and initiated programs which lifted our Nation from the depression and gave encouragement and strength to the youth of our country, our farmers, our workers, and all economic groups. Later he inspired the free peoples of the world to rise up and resist the spread of ruthless tyranny and tear asunder the chains of slavery imposed upon free peoples by totalitarian regimes. President Dwight D. Eisenhower led forces of the United States and our allies to military victory. He has been an inspirational figure throughout the world and carries the confidence of foreign nations and the American people by his fatherly image and trustworthiness. Each man played his part in making America fully aware of its world responsibilities and its obligations to men of good will in the task of building world peace and security.

I am delighted that my colleague and friend, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, of New York, is also introducing this bill. On the Senate side, this measure has bipartisan support in the person of my good friends, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York. A moving force behind the drafting of this measure has been the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, whose officers are as follows: Honorary advisory board; Hon. Nina Rao Cameron. Hon. George B. B. DeLuca, Hon. Ross J. Di Lorenzo, Hon. Athony Di Paola, Hon. Frank A. Emma, Hon. Enzo Gaspari, Hon. Lawrence E. Gerosa, Hon. Angelo R. Parisi, Hon. Charles Polleti, Hon. Paul P. Rao, Jr., Hon. Vincent P. Rao, Hon. Ben Scafidi, Hon. Joseph P. Vaccarella; president, Jack Ingegnieros; vice presidents, Miss Sarina D'Amato, Prof. Bartolomeo Liscio, Frank Valenti; treasurer, Mrs. Antoinette Loscuito; executive secretary, J. P. Sommer; publicity, Miss Terry Milburn.

No matter what the Republicans may think of Franklin D. Roosevelt or what the Democrats think of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, informed and impartial men of good will can agree that they have played vital roles in the story of our Nation. They deserve to be considered for their works and place in history, apart from any partisan considerations. It is in this spirit that I offer this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial is a unique, magnificent and heart-warming aspect of our national life enshrining as it does Presidents who have meant much to the progress and heritage of America. I hope this bill will make possible the addition of these two towering figures to this sculpturing marvel.

Vandalism to Houses of Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who express shock and horror at the recent outbreak of vandalism to houses of worship and anti-Semitic feeling.

This is evidence of religious intolerance and is shocking to every thinking person, who, I feel certain, must be indignant over these shameful acts.

I sincerely hope that our citizenry has been sufficiently alerted to the serious problem of combating bigotry and will continue to be ready to join in the fight against it.

Group Insurance Protection for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by my distinguished colleague from Kansas Senator FRANK CARLSON and appearing in the February issue of the Journal of American Insurance be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My colleagues will recall the dynamic and effective leadership that Senator CARLSON provided in the enactment of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Act. He has consistently championed such legislation during his 9 years in the Senate.

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

HEALTH BOON FOR UNCLE SAM'S STAFF
(By Senator FRANK CARLSON)

A new era of security-assured independence will open for 2,300,000 Federal Government employees and their families this year in the anniversary month of Independence Day.

On July 1 they'll come, for the first time, under the protection of a new, Government-wide group health insurance program, comparable to those already serving some 90 million workers in U.S. private industry and their dependents. This will be made possible by the Federal Employee Health Benefits Act, passed by the 86th Congress just before adjournment last summer.

Heretofore, the employees and their families, about 4½ million people in all, have had to arrange their own health plans, and many have been carrying inadequate coverage. But with the participation of such a large group, they now should be able to get broader coverage for their money. And, certainly the biggest boon to most of them, the Government will assume half the cost of their insurance.

While the Government will share the cost, just as many private employers are doing nowadays, it is notable that it did not seek to set up a big new bureaucratic branch to run its own health insurance program. In fact, such a possibility was never even considered—a tribute, I think, to the job private enterprise has done in providing health insurance benefits to 123 million Americans who are covered today.

This program is expected to cost about $214 million a year. Thus, the cost to the taxpayers will be about $107 million annually. Of this, no more than 1 percent will go for administrative expenses—again, because private insurers will be running the program.

All Federal employees are eligible to participate—public health workers, post office employees, Congressmen and their staffs, the employees of every government department, agency, bureau, and office in Washington, in

all 50 States, in U.S. territories, and workers stationed overseas. It has been estimated that 75 to 90 percent of them will sign up.

They'll have a choice of the following plans:

(1) A regular cash indemnity policy with an insurance company. It will reimburse the employee for hospital and medical costs incurred. The insurance carrier, chosen by the Civil Service Commission in December from about a dozen of the Nation's largest, will be Aetna Life Insurance Co. Aetna will reinsure with all other qualified companies wishing to participate:

(2) A service-type plan, such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield. It generally makes a settlement with the hospital or doctor directly.

(3) An existing group health insurance program operated by one of the national government employee organizations, such as the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, or by the agency for which the employee works. Such plans have been set up by the FBI, Central Intelligence Agency, and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, for example. Some of these plans have been in operation for a number of years, providing hospital and medical coverage for thousands of employees at cost.

(4) Comprehensive group-practice prepayment plans, such as those offered by Group Health Association in Washington, the Kaiser Foundation on the West Coast, or the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, or individual-practice prepayment plans. Many thousands of Federal employees also are covered by these programs.

In every case, the principal effect of the new law will be that the Government will now pay half of each employee's insurance premiums. If an employee has been paying $10 a month for his coverage, for example, he now will have to pay only half that. Since half of our Federal employees make less than $4,800 a year, and some half a million earn less than $4,000, it's clear what a help this will be to them.

It may be that rather than continuing his present coverage at half the cost, the employee will choose to increase his protection, perhaps paying $15 a month for it. He'll improve his $10 coverage by a third, yet pay only $7.50. And many employees now facing the terrible risks of illness without any insurance at all will be able to buy group coverage at a price they can afford.

Naturally we had to set limits on the amount the Government will match under the new law. For instance, for a single employee the Government will pay $1.25 to $1.75 per pay period (biweekly). For an employee plus his family, the Government's share can range between $3 and $4.50 biweekly. That's for a policy under the cash indemnity or service benefit plans. The employee is free to choose the level of coverage he wants, and the Government, within these limits, will match his payments.

For members of employee group plans or prepayment programs with set subscription charges, the Government will pay up to $2.50 a pay period for a single person and $6 for a family as its half.

LAW TOOK YEARS OF EFFORT, COMPROMISE

The employee's half will be deducted from his paycheck. His half actually may be more than half his total premium if he chooses to buy more extensive coverage than the maximums prescribed in the new law.

It took many years of effort to achieve the passage of this legislation. Since 1947 Federal employee health insurance bills had been considered by the Congress, but they got nowhere because the groups involved could never agree on the provisions. Finally, though, agreement was reached among the employees, the administration, the insurance industry, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, the American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, and the various employee group health plans. Our subcommittee, headed by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER of Oregon, held extensive hearings last April, and in July the Senate passed the bill 81 to 4. The House then held its hearings, made some changes in the bill, and approved it 383 to 4. A conference committee ironed out the differences between the two versions, and the final bill, cut down somewhat from the original in costs, was signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 28.

Some of us in Congress and the administration tried to cut the costs still further, thinking of our already gigantic national debt and the effect of new spending on the Federal budget. We thought $80 million as the Government's share of this plan would have bought some good benefits. But with some groups asking for $145 million and more, there had to be some compromising. The administration also fought for years to hold the Government's share to one-third of the total cost, while the employees' organizations thought the United States should pay two-thirds. So the final 50–50 cost sharing was a compromise too.

PLAN COMPARABLE TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY'S

No one connected with the bill would even pretend it is perfect, or that it will work without some complaints and adjustments. But in view of the deep-rooted disagreements over a Federal employee health insurance plan during the past 12 years, I think all parties are pretty well satisfied that this is a good, workable law. At least the Government—the Nation's largest employer—has recognized its obligation to its employees, and is now offering them a health plan every bit as generous as they'd find in most private industries.

With medical and hospital costs what they are nowadays, few families feel they can be without a health plan of some sort. Along with the retirement program, the group life insurance plan adopted 4 years ago and generous sick leave provisions, this health insurance program is probably the greatest "fringe benefit" our civil servants could get. Some 27 percent of the Government's $13 billion annual payroll item already has been for fringe benefits. Financing half of this new health plan will boost those figures still higher. Nevertheless, if the Government is to compete with private business for competent, high-caliber employees, it cannot lag so far behind industry in the insurance protection it offers. This unfortunately has been true for some years. Now this new law goes far toward alleviating that situation.

This legislation does not include retired Government employees and their dependents. However, bills are being considered this session which would provide them with a health plan, too.

RESERVES NEEDED TO AVOID RATE INCREASES

There is another omission in the new law that I think will have to be watched: It does not require the accumulation of a sufficient reserve to cover the future rises that must be expected in hospital and medical costs. To keep boosting the rates for this program to cover these rising costs would be unfair both to employees and to the taxpayers who pay the Government's share. Yet that is exactly what will have to happen, if past experience is any indication.

The people taking Blue Cross in New York City, for example, had their rates boosted by a third in 1952, another 22 percent in 1958, and a whopping 26½ percent last year. Needless to say, there are a lot of unhappy Blue Cross subscribers in New York City. Other plans weren't all that bad off; nevertheless, rates have been rising constantly, and the experts say we can expect hospital costs alone to go up at least 5 to 10 percent for the next 8 or 10 years. It takes a good reserve to cover increases like that without having to ask the policyholders for higher premiums every year. Yet this law requires setting aside of 3 percent of the premiums at the most for reserves. So when these cost increases come, as they will, the only solution will be to raise the insurance premiums or cut down on benefits. Either way, our Federal employees are going to get hurt.

It is my hope that once the plan begins operating and we see how it is working out, we can hold new hearings and, if necessary, amend the present bill to fit the needs. For the time being, though, we have a program we can be proud of, and our Government employees will rest a lot easier come July 1, knowing they are protected by health benefits as generous and reasonable as they'd find anywhere. Adequate insurance means peace of mind, and it's time our Federal Government workers got their fair share of both.

Federal Aid to States for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, It appears that the President has abandoned the whole concept of Federal aid to States for construction of primary and secondary schools.

Can he have lost sight of the fact that we are short 140,000 classrooms needed to house our bulging school population, now some 2½ million children in excess of school capacity? Some experts even set this classroom shortage at being 500,000 classrooms short. These 140,000 classrooms would constitute a building one room wide across the United States from Atlantic to Pacific. With the tremendous population expansion anticipated during the next few years, the shortage will grow and feed upon itself with each passing year.

In order to forcibly remind the President of his orphaned and abandoned administration proposal for Federal aid to States for school construction, I am reintroducing the administration's 4-year program of Federal aid to States, introduced on January 27, 1957, as H.R. 3976 and H.R. 3986. I regard this bill as grossly inadequate to meet the need, unfair to large and prosperous States, unsuited to its purpose, and insufficient to meet the crying need of this country. This is the first, and I hope the last, time I introduce a piece of legislation with which I am not in sympathy.

I favor proposals offered by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Michigan, the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, and the bill sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, the Honorable JAMES MURRAY, and my colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable LEE METCALF, known as the Murray-Metcalf bill. These bills offer significant advance in the field of

education and would enable this country to meet its school needs in an age where education is everything to business, science, the community, to the individual, and to the United States in its competition with an atheistic, communistic dictatorship whose purpose is to rule the world by conquest, or if possible by economic and technological competition.

Inadequate though this legislation is, I introduce it with a challenge to the President of the United States and to the members of his party to at least support their own measure for school construction during this Congress. I remind the President and his partisans that 2 years ago Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that there were over 2.5 million children in excess of normal capacity of existing buildings and that the need for Federal assistance is not theory, but demonstrated fact since it cannot now be said realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need for school construction. The school needs of this country are too great, too many children are on half days, in overcrowded classrooms taught by overworked teachers, for inaction on any level of Government. Certainly the words of the President himself are conclusive of the need.

Unless something is done shortly about school construction the United States will be in danger which will exceed anything which we have met in the past, including the missile lag, the sputniks and Russian acquisition of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. The danger will be an educational lag resulting in the loss of scientific and technological lead in the world to Russia. If the present situation continues Russia and even China not too long hence will surpass the United States in scientists, technicians, and in invention and scientific effort in all fields. The point may be reached ultimately where the United States will be weakened financially and economically, so deficient in production of new scientific thoughts and new weapons as to cease to be a factor in world politics. When this has come to pass the United States will not even be a secondary power; America will simply be a thrall to Russian communism. Inadequate though this legislation is, it is the least which can be done by the Congress, and I challenge the President and the party to support their own program reminding them of their words of 2 years ago.

The bill would provide $325 million for 4 fiscal years for grants to the States and municipalities. The Federal share on a project would be not less than one-third nor more than two-thirds varying in accordance with the States relative income per child of school age.

It authorizes appropriations of $750 million for a 4-year program to enable the Federal Government to purchase obligations of local school districts issued to finance public, elementary, and secondary school construction where bonds could not be marketed at reasonable rates of interest by the State or municipality.

It provides $150 million for a 4-year program for Federal advances to State school financing agencies for deposit in reserve funds to be used to back up issues of obligations for public, elementary, and secondary school construction purposes.

Lastly, the bill provides for miscellaneous grants of $20 million over 4 years to enable States to meet their administrative expenses for construction or development programs to increase school construction and promote greater efficiency in planning and financing such construction.

I am extremely critical of this legislation because the matching requirements place an unfair and undue burden on prosperous States like New York, Connecticut, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana. The provision for Federal purchase of State and local obligations is a pathetic effort to meet the real needs of the States which will create a bonanza for investment bankers to broker bonds from municipalities and States to the Federal Government with a large rakeoff, when the whole matter could be handled more cheaply and with less money dribbled off in sundry administrative costs through direct Federal grants. Moreover, many communities are already bonded to the limits of their financial ability to carry debt and still others have reached their statutory debt limit. To these, this provision will be an insult.

This is not an effort to put the administration or the Republican Party on the spot. America, the administration, and both political parties are on the spot and failure to act vigorously at this time may result in a situation of irreparable harm to the United States before we are aware of it.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following Newsletter of January 30, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The 1961 Federal Budget is 1,030 pages, weight 4 pounds, 4 ounces, and filled with detailed expenditure figures for every branch of Government. Estimated expenditures are $79.8 billion, estimated receipts, $84 billion. The budget does not, however, cover all Federal moneys. The cash flow or cash budget (including trust funds of all kinds) is estimated at $94 billion expenditures and $102 billion receipts. The $4.2 billion debt repayment suggested by the President is recognition of the need in more prosperous times of reducing the debt, instead of constant deficit financing no matter what the shape of our economy. The latter course is the road to ruin. Here's an example of budget language:

"The budget presents a balanced program which recognizes the priorities appropriate within an aggregate of Federal expenditures that we can soundly support. I believe the American people have made their wishes clear: The Federal Government should conduct its financial affairs with a high sense of responsibility, vigorously meeting the Nation's needs and opportunities within its proper sphere while at the same time exercising a prudent discipline in matters of borrowing and spending, and in incurring liabilities for the future."

What does it mean? It is clear to me. Yet this is the kind of language that each person can bend to his own interpretation or need. Here is language more specific:

"In times of prosperity, such as we anticipate in the coming year, sound fiscal and economic policy requires a budget surplus to help counteract inflationary pressures, to ease conditions in capital and credit markets, and to increase the supply of savings available for the productive investment so essential to continued growth. * * * If expenditures are held to the levels I am proposing for 1961 and reasonable restraint is exercised in the future, higher revenues in later years will give the next administration and the next Congress the choice they should rightly have in deciding between reductions in the public debt and lightening of the tax burden, or both. Soundly conceived tax revisions can then be approached on a comprehensive and orderly basis, rather than by haphazard, piecemeal changes, and can be accomplished within a setting of economic and fiscal stability."

Now that says it. All we have to do as people and Congressmen is to believe it and practice it, not just pay lipservice. Election year forensics unfortunately may "muddy up the water" of such commonsense. For my part, I shall support these budget statements of the President, perhaps even repeating them later should I encounter differences of viewpoint—whether differing with a Democrat-led Congress or Republican administration.

The President's economic report expanded the elementary economic bases underlying the administration's analysis of the Federal role in our national economy. The President said, "A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic growth. * * * It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth."

I am convinced that many Members of Congress do not believe the statement above; rather, they believe that Federal law is the panacea and cure for all economic problems. In fact, though I agree with most of the President's economic message, it demonstrates to me (contrary to the language quoted) that too heavy reliance is placed on the "Full Employment Act of 1946" which places far too much responsibility in the Federal Government for providing jobs under the guise of providing the "proper climate" for business success and growth. It is not the role of Federal Government to provide jobs any more than it is to feed, clothe, house, and provide other basic necessities for our people; nor can government do these things without the tyranny of a regimented and controlled economy. Herein lies the difference between a free society and socialism.

The announced retirement from Congress of GRAHAM BARDEN, able and respected North Carolinian, serves to point up the dilemma confronting the less liberal element remaining in the Democrat Party. Of the really vital issues which may divide our people, none are more important than those which must be thrashed out before con-

gressional committees concerned with the courts, education, labor and public works. With Mr. BARDEN's retirement, in any Democrat-controlled Congress, the House committees handling legislation in these areas will all be controlled by New York City Democrats of distinctly liberal persuasion. Charles Buckley, enthusiastically endorsed by the ADA, rules the Public Works Committee whose activities involve such a whopping proportion of government expenditures each year. EMANUEL CELLER presides over the important Judiciary Committee, and now with BARDEN's departure, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL can expect to be elevated to the chairmanship of the key Committee on Education and Labor.

A Charter of Independence for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the diligent senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has developed and presented a challenging program which he has entitled, "A Charter of Independence for Senior Citizens."

Our able colleague, whose record of interest and accomplishment in the field of social legislation and public service dates back a quarter of a century to the days when we were privileged to serve together in the U.S. House of Representatives, has set forth his eloquent and sincere views concerning the needs of our older citizens in a speech delivered at the West Virginia Institute on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Aging, January 25, 1960, at Institute, W. Va.

Senator RANDOLPH, as a Representative, was active and forthright in his support of the great social security program at the time of its enactment. He has consistently worked for its improvement and for many other movements and programs intended to provide aid and comfort for the blind and other handicapped persons.

During the last session he was a leader in this body in the passage of the Youth Conservation Corps measure which embraces certain features of the popular CCC program which we both supported with vigor during the early period of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal era. It was my privilege, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to have appointed the senior Senator from West Virginia to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings and prepared the majority report on the Youth Conservation Corps bill.

Knowing of our colleague's abiding interest in and sterling qualifications to perform real service in connection with studies of problems of our senior citizens, as well as our youth, I likewise was privileged to appoint him to membership on the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Senator RANDOLPH, as a member of the latter subcommittee, devoted his time to hearings during the latter part of 1959 across the country and presided over those hearings held by the subcommittee for West Virginia at Charleston. His speech before the West Virginia Institute on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Aging is particularly appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

A CHARTER OF INDEPENDENCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Ray Power, fellow West Virginians, and guests, the questions which you are confronting during this conference are aspects of one of the fundamental problems of modern American civilization. It is a problem which no society in history has ever before faced in such magnitude.

During the recent recess of Congress, I participated, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, in hearings conducted in representative cities throughout the Nation. Our subcommittee held hearings in Washington, Boston, Pittsburgh, Miami, San Francisco, Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Charleston, W. Va. I took part in all but those held in Pittsburgh and Michigan, and I presided over those in our State.

We received the scholarly and scientific testimony of the experts, and we received the often heart-wrenching and pathos-laden reports from the elderly folk themselves. This evening I share with you some of the findings of our subcommittee and some of my own observations drawn from these hearings.

But, first, let me sketch in the briefest detail the national scope of what my friend and colleague, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, has called the quiet revolution.

APPROXIMATELY 16 MILLION CITIZENS OVER 65 YEARS OLD

Perhaps these figures are well known to many of you, but we cannot emphasize them too frequently. In 1900 there were only 3 million Americans aged 65 or over, contrasted with approximately 16 million today, 5 million of whom are 75 or over. These 16 million, within the next decade, will swell to 20 million, of whom 7 million will be 75 or over. These figures received a dramatic expression in our Washington hearings when it was stated that of all the persons who have ever reached the age of 65, 25 percent are alive today.

In terms of West Virginia statistics, the total population of the State in 1957 was 1,962,000. Of that total, 164,000 persons were age 65 years or more, and this number constituted 8.3 percent of the West Virginia population.

Between 1950 and 1957, the number of persons 65 years and over increased by 18.7 percent, with only two other States, Mississippi and Arkansas, having experienced the same type of change.

Then, too, in West Virginia persons 45 and over amount to 28 percent of the population. I am told that each month the public employment offices in West Virginia receive an average of 1,200 new applications from older jobseekers.

During the last fiscal year, approximately 15,000 new applications were received from workers over 45 years old, and during that same year 3,710 of them were placed in nonagricultural positions, including almost 2,000 in service jobs—the bulk of them in private households.

Experts on census evaluations point out that in one important way West Virginia's population pattern differs from the normal of the country. Ours is a State predominantly rural. The latest available official census (1950) reveals that 65.4 percent of West Virginia's population was rural, and this is the fifth highest agrarian population—percentagewise—among all the States.

LIFE EXPECTANCY IS INCREASING FOR AMERICANS

A man of 65 may today expect to live another 13 years; a woman of 65 now has a life expectancy of 15½ years, with the average age at death being about 70. But, by the year 2000, it is estimated that the average will be 82; and it was not uncommon during our hearings for experts to testify that with continued progress in medical science, by the end of this century many people may expect to live to be 125.

These are but the bare outlines of the revolution—and this is not too strong a term—taking place in our population pattern. It is a revolution for which we have been inadequately prepared—psychologically, socially, economically, and medically. Although in some of the States genuine advances have been made in the fields of low-rental housing, employment counseling, and medical care, our national treatment of the problems of the aged as a whole has been marked by callous indifference and neglect. While we glorify in our claims of being the richest nation on earth and having achieved the highest standard of living in history, we allow millions of our senior citizens who have contributed so much to our national achievements now to suffer personal isolation and poverty, degraded housing conditions, and pitifully inadequate nutritional standards and medical care.

This condition is essentially the product of a default in our national attitudes and a failure to develop national planning in the light of new knowledge and new perspectives.

First, with reference to our national attitudes: As a comparatively young nation, with a history first of an expanding physical frontier and then expanding technological and economic frontiers, we have customarily placed the accent on youth and vigor and action. We have not, as a culture, given the veneration to age and wisdom and contemplation that these qualities have received in many other more traditional societies.

URBAN SOCIETY ACCENTUATES PROBLEM OF OUR AGED

Also, until the 20th century we were largely a nation of farmers and small townsmen, and the comparatively few elderly people in our society offered little welfare or maintenance problem. Normally, each family took care of its own, and on the farm and in the small town there was a role to be occupied and work to be done by the elderly. But in the urban life of today—in the project house or the three-room efficiency apartment—there is often no place for the elderly.

Thus, as a nation we have looked the other way while millions of our senior citizens have been forced upon the "tundra of neglect"—to use the graphic phrase of Gen. John F. McMahon, commander in chief of the Volunteers of America.

A second basic inadequacy in our perspective of the elderly is the arbitrary assumption that old age begins at 65—and after that the person is ready to be placed upon the shelf. The arts of modern medicine have long since invalidated this assumption in its general application, and for disproof in particular instances we need only look at the the creative work of such leaders as our two living ex-Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman; elder statesman Bernard Baruch; world personalities Winston Churchill, Conrad Adenauer, and Eleanor Roosevelt;

and great poets Carl Sandburg and Robert Frost—as well as that of some of the vital and active oldsters among my own colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

I am most happy to note the presence tonight of Dr. A. A. Shawkey. He will be "90 years young" next August. Dr. Shawkey has been an active and prominent physician during a fruitful lifetime of service.

Thus, among our 16 million senior citizens today, there is a precious store of skills and abilities, experience and wisdom, which we allow to atrophy through mere neglect and indifference. Not only do we thereby squander a critical national resource, but we also violate the cardinal principle of our own society—that is, the right of each person to a life of dignity and self-respect.

THREE-FIFTHS OF THOSE 65 RECEIVE LESS THAN $1,000

Now, to return to some of the findings of the Senate hearings: according to expert testimony presented to our subcommittee, three-fifth of the persons over 65 received an income of less than $1,000 in 1958, with half of the elderly couples receiving less than $2,000 and about 1½ million widows receiving average social security benefits of $56 a month.

Yet the last budget designed for an elderly couple by the Social Security Administration—and priced at 1950 costs—ranges between $1,600 in New Orleans and a little over $1,900 in Milwaukee. Considering that the general consumer price index has risen approximately 22 percent since that time and medical costs almost 50 percent, it is little wonder that Commissioner William C. Mitchell of the Social Security Administration declared: "* * * The cost of maintaining a healthful, self-respecting mode of living * * * is likely to be more than a sizable proportion of our senior citizens can afford."

The picture was sketched for us in more vivid terms during our hearings by the testimony of scores of elderly people who reported from their own experiences. Too frequently the term "golden years" is surrounded by bitter irony. The composite picture of our senior citizens, rather than being one of the elderly couple living in modest but graceful retirement, is all too often that of lonely men and women, marking off the days in rented rooms, in isolation from the mainstream of community life, eating in cheap cafeterias, and living in anixety under the constant spectre of a major illness which will wipe out whatever savings they may have.

As Dr. Margaret Mead observed during our Boston hearings, in some respects we treat our aged worse than the Eskimos, since they at least allowed the old people themselves to choose death if they had become a burden upon their children and grandchildren.

Throughout our hearings the most crucial area of concern, and the recurrent theme in the testimony of the elderly witnesses was that of health care. For old people spend more on health services than do the young, and this comes at a time when income has been sharply reduced. And I need hardly emphasize to you ladies and gentlemen that physical rehabilitation is the first step toward vocational rehabilitation.

In this respect I was particularly impressed by the testimony of Dr. Jack R. Ewalt, director of the Massachusetts Mental Health Center. Dr. Ewalt cited the National Health Survey which indicates that of the people aged 65 or over covered by the survey, 78 percent had some chronic illness. But, Dr. Ewalt points out, when one examines the figures on chronic illness more closely, one finds that in spite of chronic disorders only 14 percent of the older patients were unable to carry on major activity. Thirty-five percent were in no way limited in activity, an additional 8 percent not limited in any major activity, while 20 percent were in truth limited in the amount and kind of major activity they could carry on. Eighteen percent of the older people could not get around alone.

"Thus, at least 80 percent of older people insofar as their general physical and mental health is concerned, can carry on some type of useful activity."

OLDER FOLK ARE CAPABLE OF USEFUL EFFORT

This then should be the minimum goal of rehabilitation at every level of governmental activity—to assure that at least this 80 percent has the opportunity for independence and the self-respect of engaging in some constructive and useful activity.

It was pointed out also by Dr. Ewalt and other medical experts that many of the mental disorders associated with senility are more an expression of social, psychological, and economic pressures upon a person with lowered brain reserve than they are due to any change in the structure of the brain itself. Therefore, with adequate assessment and rehabilitative programs, many of the aged now simply vegetating in our institutions could be helped to rejoin the active currents of community life.

In addition, there are approximately 450,000 aged in institutions which are loosely classified as nursing homes. Yet, a study indicated that 60 percent of the homes have no registered professional nurse, and one-third have neither a registered nurse nor a licensed practical nurse. Many, if not the majority, of the patients would not need to be institutionalized if we had adequate low-rental housing planned specifically for the aged.

But to achieve our goals—to give every man and woman the will and the opportunity to use what is usable—to assure our senior citizens the right to spend their remaining years in pride and dignity rather than pity and degradation—we must take inventory now. This is not a casual situation which we may face in the luxury of our leisure, for millions of those most directly affected will not be here 5 or 10 years from now. And increasing numbers in the near future will be facing the same problems.

FOUR POINTS ARE STRESSED FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

To meet these problems, I have developed a charter of independence for senior citizens.

First, to assure such independence, hospital and medical insurance must be placed within the reach of the nonindigent aged; and social security and old-age assistance payments must be raised to a realistic level which will make possible a decent minimum standard of living.

Second, we can no longer postpone the creation and expansion of health centers dedicated to providing up-to-date restorative services for the aged who are chronically ill. Nor can we delay further the upgrading of the quality of care in nursing homes for those aged persons who definitely cannot be rehabilitated.

Third, my experience during the past several months as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging has convinced me that there are literally hundreds of thousands of older citizens who really do not belong in the institutions in which they now live. The establishment of extensive home medical care and homemaker services for such men and women is called for, as another step toward the independence of our senior Americans.

Fourth, because independence requires decent living arrangements and opportunities for meaningful activities, the elderly have every right to a greatly expanded program of low-rental housing, the establishment of community centers, and the provision of such services as counseling and adult education.

Certainly these are the minimal goals which must be realized by concerted and coordinated efforts at the local, State, and Federal levels. Needless to say, the realization of these goals will not be achieved without considerable financial outlay. But as the richest Nation in the world we cannot afford to do less.

It is worth remarking, that during recent years we have been consistently decreasing the proportion of our national income being devoted to all welfare purposes, including the aged. As Dr. Seymour Harris of the department of economics of Harvard University pointed out, "* * * despite a rise of gross national product of $124 billion in the last 6 years: that is, from 1950–51 to 1956–57, the rise in welfare expenditures by the Federal Government, exclusive of insurance was only $1.5 billion, or a little more than 1 percent." And as Dr. Harris later remarked, "The Federal Government now seems to have a horror of getting into debt, but no horror at all of getting everybody else into debt. The net result, therefore, is that State and local governments which have much more serious financial problems than Federal Government are asked by the President, for example, in his budget address of 1960, to assume a larger part of the burden of * * * taking care of the old."

NOT IN AGREEMENT WITH NARROW CONSUMER CONCEPT

This record is perfectly consistent with the aims of this administration as expressed by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers last year when he stated "As I understand an economy its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is, I suggest a shockingly gross and materialistic conception of our national destiny. If this is truly the aim—merely to produce and consume things—if this is the aim of the Nation which produced Jefferson and Lincoln, then we are already truly lost.

But I will not accept this low estimate of American aspirations. I believe our national destiny is more than this. I believe it is to continue to maintain and extend the ideals of human dignity, self-respect, and self-fulfillment for every individual. As these values bear upon the theme of this conference, I conclude by quoting an injunction left us by one with a somewhat higher vision of life than that of the bookkeepers of this administration.

In the words of John Galsworthy: "Restoration is at least as much a matter of spirit as of body, and must have as its central truth, body and spirit are inextricably conjoined. To heal the one without the other is impossible. If a man's mind, courage, and interest be enlisted in the cause of his own salvation, healing goes on apace; the sufferer is remade; if not, no mere surgical wonders, no careful nursing, will avail to make a man of him again. Therefore, I would say, from the moment he enters the hospital, look after his mind and his will; give him food; nourish him in subtle ways; increase that nourishment as his strength increases. Give him interest in his future. Light a star for him to fix his eyes on, so that when he steps out of the hospital, you shall not have to begin to train one who, for months, perhaps years, has been living mindless and will-less, the life of a half-dead creature.

"A niche of usefulness and self-respect exists for every man, however handicapped, but that niche must be found for him. To carry the process of restoration to a point short of this is to leave the cathedral without a spire. To restore him, and with him the future of our countries, that is the sacred work."