ties to France will result in similar relations between Paris and former French colonies.

However, our national interests and those of the new African nations will best be served by the use of international agencies serving as a worldwide clearinghouse for bilateral programs, in conducting preinvestment surveys, in providing specialized and technically trained personnel, and in fostering a regional approach.

The coordinated regional efforts of the United Nations in developing the Mekong River project in southeast Asia, and the recent success of the World Bank in dealing with the Indus Valley development suggest the possibilities.

THE VITAL CORE: PERSONNEL

This brings us to the question which in Africa may turn out to be the most decisive of all. I refer to the extraordinary dearth of administrative and technical personnel available in the new nations of Africa.

In contrast to India and the former British colonies, such Asian countries as Indonesia suffered greatly from the failure of the colonial powers to provide adequate training of administrators, engineers, and technicians for self-rule.

But how much more difficult are the prospects for the Belgian Congo, now on its precipitous way to independence, with less than 40 college graduates in the entire country? What can we say of the many areas where there are no mathematics teachers, let alone tax experts?

Africa's simple, overriding, urgent need today is trained personnel. Unless able, dedicated men and women are made available in the next decade by the tens of thousands, economic development and orderly political growth in Africa will be impossible.

Where will the teachers, engineers, technicians, and administrators be found?

Will they come largely from the two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—in a massive contest for political influence? Do the urgent demands for African development require that Africa become a new battleground in the cold-war power struggle?

Right here the United Nations and its agencies may find their most decisive role—that of recruiting a major reservoir of trained administrators and technical experts available for the use of new nations everywhere; in short, an international recruitment agency leading to an international civil service.

In the decade of the 1960's Africa will largely be ruled by black men, but to a considerable extent administered by white foreigners. That must be the case until the Africans themselves can create the new generation of leadership.

The needs vary all the way from schoolteachers to nurses, from extension workers to men of Cabinet ability who can operate ministries of agriculture, industrial development, education and public health until competent national administrators and technicians become available.

Two years ago the General Assembly approved an experimental program of technical assistance in public administration. This program, called OPEX, is operating on a very small budget, and the Secretary-General has received far more requests than he can fill.

Some such approach, greatly expanded, is, I believe, essential to the success of international economic and social development everywhere, but most particularly in Africa.

Salaries would be paid partly in the currency of the country to which the new international civil servants have been assigned, with the difference between local salaries and international salaries, together with pension allowances, made up from an international fund.

The long-term administrative requirements will ultimately, of course, be met by Africans. American and European universities can do much to hurry the day by vastly increasing their scholarship programs for Africans.

In the interval, which will last at least a generation, the one way to fill the gap without turning Africa into a cold war battlefield lies in the creation on a bold and adequate basis, of an internationalized civil service, open to men and women of all nationalities recruited by and responsible to the U.N.

The problems which Africa poses to us in the crucial 1960's are many and complex. Some are unique to that vast continent, and some are common to all underdeveloped nations.

There will remain for some time, for example, extreme sensitivity to all forms of imperialism—including what may be considered, justly or unjustly, as attempts at economic domination by the former colonial powers and their American ally.

The many-sided challenge of African development as a prerequisite of orderly political growth underscores the urgent need for a new global approach to the problems of international economic and social development.

Such a new approach can only come through effective American leadership by a new administration—Republican or Democratic—in the early months of 1961. It cannot be delayed, watered down, or sidestepped any longer.

Let me conclude, then, by restating the chief lines which I hope such leadership will follow next year and in the decade to come:

1. I hope we will approach oversea economic development with a broad creative view that takes into account the need for increased international trade; for fair, stable prices for raw materials produced in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; for new techniques to encourage responsible private investments; for the more effective use abroad of our enormous capacity to grow food; and for greatly expanded facilities to train development specialists.

2. I hope that our aid efforts will be increased in size, direction, scope, and duration to meet the needs of long-term national and regional development programs and to encourage large-scale planning.

3. I hope that we will make increased use of United Nations multilateral aid as a supervisory and coordinating umbrella for bilateral programs.

4. I hope that we will press for the formation and use of a vast corps of able and dedicated international administrators and technical experts in the form of an international civil service.

The colonial powers did things to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In recent years, however inadequately, we have been doing things for them.

In the 1960's we must learn to do things with them.

An approach both direct and through the United Nations must be flexible, imaginative, and positive.

It must be attuned to the varying needs, cultures, and political backgrounds of specific nations.

It must be rooted in an understanding of the full significance and challenge of international economic development as a vast new frontier for our Nation and its people.

Only if the new administration which takes office next January senses the opportunity and acts in these terms can we restore the partnership atmosphere of the Marshall plan and of Point 4. And only through such a relationship can we work effectively toward the ultimate abolition of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease from the face of this earth.

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1960

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Senator GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming.

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

O God of all truth, judge of all men, grant us the grace to keep our hearts with all diligence, knowing that out of them are the issues of life.

When harsh voices are strident and cruel, may we know that the wisdom of the ages is in the affirmation of the Book that reveals Thy heart—

"He that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city."

In a clamorous day filled with angry accents of unreasoning hate, give us ears to hear the voices calm and still that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a sad and mad day, give us sanity of head and heart and a glad hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

"Lord, in this hour of tumult,
Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open,
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

Not blindly nor in hatred,
Lord, let us do our part.
Keep open, O keep open,
Our eyes, our mind, our heart."

Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. MCGEE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Public Works.

The Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works.

## SOVIET PROPOSAL TO GO BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, the Soviet proposal to go before the United Nations has the trappings of a propaganda circus. There is a serious question as to whether the Soviets are looking for a method of settling disputes or a sounding board for further propaganda.

Over the years, and through two Presidents, the United States has repeatedly sought to use the United Nations as a discussion body through which the issues that really divide the world can be resolved. The record of Soviet moves to block such action is well established.

Premier Khrushchev's appeal to the United Nations might carry greater conviction if the Soviets were to demonstrate a real willingness to negotiate on such issues as armaments control, the integrity of smaller nations, and the fate of subjugated peoples.

It is obvious that we are in for a period of heightened tensions. I am confident the United States has the internal fortitude to stand up to the problems before us. I hope that somewhere along the line the Soviet Premier and those who are behind him will realize the very real dangers into which they are now plunging the whole world.

## VETO OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President has sent to the Senate a veto message on Senate bill 722. I have conferred with Senators on both sides of the aisle concerning what action the Senate may desire to take in connection with this veto message.

It is now the plan of the leadership to ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the veto message on either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, and to have the Senate decide whether the bill shall become law, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am prepared to vote today or tomorrow. But in the interest of orderly procedure, and in order that all Members of the Senate may have adequate notice, and in accordance with the desires of the authors of the bill and the States which have very special interest in the bill, I believe all Senators should be on notice that very likely the veto message will be laid before the Senate on Tuesday, after the morning hour. I cannot tell how long Senators will wish to discuss it. But this measure is of such far-reaching importance and it affects the lives of so many citizens that I have no doubt that there will be several speeches on the subject, and we shall either vote on Tuesday or, if necessary, go over until Wednesday.

But all Members should be prepared to hold themselves in readiness for a vote, on either Tuesday or Wednesday, on the question of overriding the President's veto of Senate bill 722.

## SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make, in the morning hour, a very brief statement, because I shall have to be away from the Chamber, and I understand that a little later today Senators will pay tributes to one of the great men of this century. Although I have spoken earlier in regard to the retirement of Senator O'MAHONEY, I do wish to make a brief statement at this time.

I think one of the warmest friendships I have formed during my years in the Congress has been that with the senior Senator from Wyoming, JOE O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY is one of the outstanding figures in the history of the U.S. Senate. Every person who knows him, knows him to be a man of fearless dedication to his principles and of absolute determination to represent his people as they deserve to be represented.

All of us are familiar with the outstanding record JOE O'MAHONEY has made in the service of the United States—as secretary to a Senator, as a member of the "Little Cabinet," and finally as one of the towering giants in this body. He has been a consistent opponent of monopoly; and the comprehensive study of the Nation's economic system, conducted under his direction, as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, remains a monument to him.

But behind Senator O'MAHONEY as a statesman there is JOE O'MAHONEY, the man. Basically, he is a man who embodies all of the finest qualities of his State and of the Nation which he loves so dearly. I have visited Wyoming a number of times in the last few years, Mr. President, at the invitation of this great man; and I would recommend to all the Members of the Senate and to the people of the Nation such a visit by them, because those who believe that the American spirit of adventure and of daring and of building is dead, ought to go to Wyoming and see what is happening there. There is a striving, a bustling, a hustling, a can-do feeling in Wyoming. The people of Wyoming are dedicated to progress, and they face the future with confidence. They are not discouraged by adversity, and they know how to make the best out of their resources. And this is how I like to think of JOE O'MAHONEY.

JOE O'MAHONEY has decided to retire at the end of this term. All of us can understand, and we must respect his wishes.

But a man like JOE O'MAHONEY will never really retire from the Senate, because he has put into it his courage, his imagination, his vigor, and his patriotism; and these are qualities that will endure so long as the institutions lasts.

Mr. President, one of the earliest tales I heard at my father's knee was of my ancestors' trips to Wyoming and their experiences in the cattle industry there. I am proud to say now that Texans and the sons of Wyoming have many things in common. Among them are sheep. I remember that once the Speaker said that every time he saw JOE O'MAHONEY come down the corridor, he prepared to get ready for some action in connection with the wool bill.

We look to the great Wyoming Hereford ranch for leadership in the field of some of our best bred cattle.

Mr. President, it is with a feeling of great regret that I shall see JOE O'MAHONEY leave this body, because not only do we have so many interests in common, but he is the type of public servant I should like to see every young man emulate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that the words just spoken were among the most eloquent ever uttered in this Chamber.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS ON U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1959, and a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1959, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TO PURCHASE U.S. OBLIGATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE TREASURY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman and members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR BOLIVIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia as administered by the International Cooperation Administration, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING-TYPE FUND IN THE TREASURY FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, EAST BENCH UNIT, THREE FORKS DIVISION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the East Bench unit, Three Forks division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO INTEREST RATE FORMULA OF SPECIAL OBLIGATIONS PURCHASED FOR RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 15(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, to revise the interest rate formula of special obligations purchased for the railroad retirement account, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Council of the City of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a National Youth Act with provisions for Federal grants to assist local communities in establishing expanded youth programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Bankers Association held its 73d annual convention in Topeka, Kans., last week. At this meeting several resolutions were adopted, two of which are related to legislative matters now pending in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TWO RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION 73D ANNUAL CONVENTION, TOPEKA, ON MAY 14, 1960

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Bankers Association, duly assembled in regular session, go on record as unequivocably opposing any Federal legislation which, by its terms, proposes to require a withholding tax on dividends or interest paid by corporations.

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Bankers Association, assembled in regular session, go on record as approving and recommending to the Members of the Congress all legislation designed to equalize the basis of taxation of financial institutions; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper officials in Washington who represent the State of Kansas.

## RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE HELD ON MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

*Resolved*, That the Common Council of the City of Poughkeepsie, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, duly elected to such office, hereby wish to go on record as endorsing the firm stand taken by our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, at Paris during the current summit conference in upholding the united desires of our Western allies, and we express the wish that all public bodies take a similar position in order that the Soviet people be made aware of such spontaneous action that we support our Commander in Chief in his efforts to maintain peace in the world.

HOWARD H. GIBBS,
*City Chamberlain.*

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, YONKERS, N.Y.

Whereas on April 8, 1960, Governor Rockefeller signed into law chapter 418 of the laws of 1960; and

Whereas this chapter authorizes the imposition of a tax for school purposes on general telephone services on a countywide basis; and

Whereas additional funds are urgently needed by the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers to provide more adequately for the educational program in the public schools; and

Whereas the city of Yonkers is presently within $10,326.14 of its constitutional tax limit of 2 percent, and is thereby restricted in providing additional funds for the educational program; and

Whereas the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers, in order to serve more adequately the educational needs of the more than 25,300 pupils enrolled in the Yonkers public schools, wishes to utilize the revenues from this source beginning September 1, 1960, in the event that the Federal Government does not reimpose this tax: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers, pursuant to chapter 418 of the laws of 1960, hereby requests the imposition of a local tax for school purposes on general telephone services as specified in article 24 of the tax law, a public hearing having been held on the imposition of said tax on the 5th day of May, 1960; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the said board of education hereby requests that the said tax become effective during the calendar year 1960; and be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be filed with the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, the mayor, the city manager, the members of the common council, the comptroller and city clerk of the city of Yonkers, the county clerk of Westchester County, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, and the Honorable ROBERT R. BARRY.

Resolution sponsored by:

ANITA F. WOLF,
*Member, Board of Education.*

Recommended by:

STANLEY S. WYNSTRA,
*Superintendent of Schools.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE EMPIRE STATE PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION, APRIL 28, 1960

Whereas Empire State Petroleum Association has continually maintained a position in favor of the removal of control of wellhead prices for natural gas as now exercised by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recently signified his support for legislation to bring about removal of these controls; and

Whereas there is now pending or about to be introduced before the Congress of the United States a bill that will in general accomplish this purpose: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York and to Otis H. Ellis, general counsel for the National Oil Jobbers' Council, with the urgent request that every effort be made to promote the passage of this legislation at the current session of Congress.

HARRY B. HILTS,
*Secretary.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 113. An act to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions (Rept. No. 1394);

H.R. 276. An act to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents (Rept. No. 1395);

H.R. 641. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits (Rept. No. 1396);

H.R. 7502. An act to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 1397);

H.R. 9785. An act to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 1398);

H.R. 9788. An act to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the

furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line (Rept. No. 1399);

H.R. 10703. An act to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance (Rept. No. 1400); and

H.R. 10898. An act to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children (Rept. No. 1401).

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

H.R. 9322. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool (Rept. No. 1402); and

H.R. 9881. An act to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (Rept No. 1403).

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PERMIT TAXPAYERS TO ELECT AN OVERALL LIMITATION ON THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit, and I submit a report (No. 1393) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

## COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL COUNTIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3140) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties, and I submit a report (No. 1392) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, coincident with these remarks, I am today filing a report from the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate on S. 3140, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties. This bill was cosponsored by my able colleagues, Senator CASE, of South Dakota, and Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

I am very happy to have this bill placed before the Senate for consideration through the filing of this favorable committee report. The problems of rural America—its small towns and counties—are among the most neglected.

I am sure that the people who live in the heartland of our country, in the rural areas, will be grateful that the Senate has decided to do something to help them with their problems.

We have made an effort in Congress to assist, where needed, in solving the social and economic challenges of nearly every distressed segment of American life. We recently aproved in the Senate a bill providing for a study of the problems of metropolitan areas. We have made studies for labor, for farmers, for industry, for large cities, for education, and on many other subjects. It is logical, then, that we turn our eyes toward a portion of our Nation that we desire to see survive, and that is the small town and the rural area of our Nation.

The force for good that comes from the rural towns and communities is almost immeasurable. Every group dealing with population problems comes to recognize that from the small towns comes a great ground swell of moral responsibility and strength. The support of many of our traditions and institutions comes, very often, from the training and background which people have acquired in a rural setting. Character and leadership are the real treasures of the Nation. Nowhere can they be acquired better than in a small town or rural environment. I speak of these things to indicate that a program for preservation and advancement of the small town has something more important than an economic argument to support it.

I am sure that is the reason why so many church groups, groups which deal with rural problems and rural sociology, give their support to the idea of a commission on small town problems.

For instances, most of those who have contacted me in regard to the need for establishing a commission on small town problems, indicate that they see a general breakdown in smaller towns which threatens the existence of churches and other forces for good in these areas. The economic factors which cause deterioration must be combated so that rural churches and schools will survive.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters which I have received from Mr. Willis J. Ray, of the Colorado Baptist General Convention; Mr. William H. Hillmer, executive secretary, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod; Mr. William H. Rhoades, executive secretary, American Baptist Home Mission Societies; Mr. M. Wendell Belew, director, division of missions, Southern Baptist Convention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

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

COLORADO BAPTIST
GENERAL CONVENTION,
*Denver, Colo., March 4, 1960.*

U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
*Senate Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

HONORABLE SENATOR: I have been advised that you have introduced bill S. 3140 which seeks to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns.

We assure you that we feel this study is essential. Many of our leaders in all walks of life have come from the rural communities. In fact I have read that 28 of the 33 Presidents have come from small towns or the open country.

We assure you that we will be backing you in the passage of this bill.

Our convention operates in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and western Nebraska. We have 1,500 communities and villages of less than 2,500 population, where they need help to preserve and build for the future.

Yours very truly,

WILLIS J. RAY,
*Executive Secretary-Treasurer.*

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH,
MISSOURI SYNOD,
BOARD FOR MISSIONS IN
NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA,
*St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1960.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I am in receipt of your letter of February 11 in which you bring to my attention a bill which you have introduced in the Senate calling for a Commission To Study Smalltown Problems (S. 3140). I have read the bill and your supporting speech carefully and want to say that I would most heartily endorse the action called for in your bill.

The church denomination to which I belong, namely, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, has a membership of over 2½ million. Of these, 27 percent are members of rural congregations and represent a total of 535,000. In our statistics we designate as rural those churches located in communities of 2,500 or less. If we were to use your definition of a small town as consisting of 10,000 or less then the number would be much greater.

One of the reasons why I am particularly interested in your bill is that I have had occasion to observe how closely the life and work of our churches is related to the life and problems of the community or the small town. Anything which the Government can do to help small towns look at their problems and find solutions will also directly and indirectly benefit our churches.

On the other hand, I want to say that I believe our churches also have a responsibility to the community in the small town. We have been trying to emphasize the responsibility of the churches through institutes, conferences, and literature. I am enclosing a booklet entitled "Rural Digest," which shows the approach of our church with reference to the churches located in small towns.

And so may I again heartily endorse the legislation which you are proposing.

Cordially yours,

WM. H. HILLMER,
*Executive Secretary.*

AMERICAN BAPTIST HOME,
MISSION SOCIETIES,
*New York, N.Y., February 25, 1960.*

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: It was thoughtful of you to enclose in your letter of February 11 a copy of S. 3140, a bill providing for a commission to study small town problems. You are, of course, correct that the American Baptist Home Mission Societies have a very real concern for and interest in the problems of communities of the character which you describe. The proposed bill and your remarks related to it have been considered by members of our staff.

We note one point which is unquestionably clear to you but which was not particularly noted in your remarks. While it is probably true that a sizable proportion of our American population lives in communities of 10,000 or less, there is some reason to question as to whether or not all of such communities are of the distinctly rural or small-town character which you describe. We are constantly aware of many small towns which are so closely involved in the life and activities of neighboring metropolitan communities and are so distinctly in the orbit of the larger communities that their problems are substantially different from the small towns which are representative of the States which have a more rural characteristic. I am sure that any considerations which a proposed commission might give would take adequate recognition of the varying characteristics of these towns of the designated size which is specified in the provisions of your bill. Whatever may be the actual facts in this area of consideration, it is true that there remains a very significant portion of our American population with the peculiar problems of the community which you describe. Clearly these are within the range of concern of our American Baptist Home Mission Societies and any conclusions or facts which might be developed by the proposed commission would be of very substantial value to us as we project our town and country program of mission work.

In our mission work within the United States we are obviously concerned also with the development of the large urban areas and in particular we have in mind the so-called strip cities or communities which are developing as the metropolitan areas of some of our great cities meet each other and develop an almost continuous urban situation in substantial areas of our country. While it is true that the growth of these great urban areas is based to some significant degree upon the rapid increase in our population, it is also true that this growth depends to some extent at least upon the problems which are involved in the smaller communities and the movement incident to the shift of population from small communities to large. It occurs to us that the solutions which you anticipate will be found for some of the problems of the small communities may well point the way to some solutions for the congested program areas in which we have equal concern.

If the commission should be established on the basis of a plan proposed in your bill, I am sure that our staff would be grateful for the opportunity to work constructively in any way that will be helpful to the communities which are intended to be benefited by this proposal.

With appreciation for your consideration in informing us of your proposal, I am,

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM H. RHOADES,
*Executive Secretary.*

---

HOME MISSION BOARD,
SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
*Atlanta, Ga., February 23, 1960.*

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
*U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: The rural church work of the Southern Baptist Convention is included in the Department of Associational Missions of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. I am delighted with the bill, S. 3140, which you have introduced in the Senate. I appreciate so very much your endeavor in this field and assure you of my support.

You may be interested to know that nearly 24,000 of our present 32,000 Southern Baptist churches are located in small towns or open country. We of the Old South appreciate a need for a study in this area.

If there is any way in which I can be of benefit, do not hesitate to let me know. I will express my interest to other Members of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

M. WENDELL BELEW,
*Secretary, Department of Associational Missions.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD copies of two articles which have appeared in church-sponsored organization publications in support of S. 3140. The first is one which appeared in the Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin of March 1960. With it, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I received from James E. Hankin, the editor of the bulletin.

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

SENATOR MUNDT PROPOSES BILL ON SMALL TOWNS

[From the Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin, March 1960]

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has drafted a proposed bill for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns. The bill is S. 2621.

The purpose of such a commission would be to make full investigations and studies of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's small-town areas.

The commission would try to determine the present and future needs of the small towns in the field of public services, including but not limited to planning, highways, water resources, schools, recreational facilities, prevention of juvenile delinquency, municipal financing, and business expansion, including ways and means to induce new businesses to small towns.

The commission would be a Hoover-type commission with 18 members all of whom would serve without salary.

For the purposes of this commission a small town would be one with 10,000 or less population.

If the reader feels that this would be a good bill for your area, you may write to Senator MUNDT, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., for a copy. If after studying the proposed bill, you find such a bill was needed, a letter to your Senator and Representative could follow.

---

METHODIST RURAL FELLOWSHIP,
*Rogersville, Tenn., February 17, 1960.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MUNDT: Thank you for the opportunity to read your bill S. 2621 and also your speech at the time the bill was introduced.

I have read both the proposed bill and your remarks. It is evident you have hit upon an area of great need in America. I have shared the proposed bill with our local newspaper editor and find that she is very much in agreement with your position.

Your letter came just at the time we were going to press with our Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin. I will clear some space and do an article on it. Around the first of March I will mail you a copy of the Bulletin.

Enclosed you will find carbons of letters to Senators KEFAUVER and GORE.

Perhaps the most helpful thing I can do is to alert our Methodist laymen and ministers of the bill in the pages of our Bulletin.

It is a joy to know of a Senator who is concerned about the problems we face in the small towns of our Nation.

If I can be of further service to you in the passage of this bill, don't hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. HANKINS,
*Bulletin Editor.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second article is from Catholic Rural Life, a publication of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. In addition, I would like to have printed in the RECORD, a letter which I received from Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., who is the acting executive director of that organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article and letter printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

A bill to establish a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

In a speech preceding formal presentation of the bill, Senator MUNDT called attention to the fact that we have many commissions created or proposed to study the problems involved in big government. These he described as the problems of our metropolitan areas, farm problems, labor problems, and the like. He then went on to point out that no agency of Government, no research department, no commission of the Congress has been charged with the responsibility of finding facts and making recommendations of value to America's small towns.

The Senator mentioned many of the problems confronting our small towns. Among them he listed the tendency of transcontinental highways to bypass small communities, the tendency of business to become more concentrated in administration and greater in size, the elimination of many railroad services and the high cost of adequate airport facilities.

Stating that the march of industrial and technical development has not always been in conflict with the advantages of living in small communities, Senator MUNDT pointed out the plus values of small-town life.

"Here," he said "families can be raised, free from the temptations, the turmoil and the disillusionments of life in the big city." He pointed out how air transportation has made it possible for people living in small towns to reach a city within a matter of minutes. Television, he said, brings to people in small towns the same public information and entertainment that are available to people in cities.

The Senator made it clear that he believes small towns are not on the way out. While some have faltered and failed, he told his colleagues, others have made real advances.

The purpose of establishing the commission, he said, is to "obtain reports and recommendations which will enable all of our smaller communities to do what some of them are doing presently: to analyze their opportunities, reappraise their advantages, create new enterprise, attract more people and capital, and move forward into eras of happier living and more prosperous economic activity."

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
*Des Moines, Iowa, February 18, 1960.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thanks very much for calling to my attention your bill S. 2621. You are quite right in judging that the purpose of this proposed legislation follows within the scope of NCRLC's interest.

Enclosed is a copy of a brief article which will appear in the March issue of our monthly magazine, Catholic Rural Life. As you will see, we are urging our NCRLC members to let you know of their support.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.,
*Acting Executive Director.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some of these letters and articles refer to S. 2621 instead of S. 3140. That is because on August 31, 1959, I introduced S. 2621; but on March 5, 1960, I replaced it with S. 3140, which is identical to my earlier bill except it has been expanded to include rural counties as well as small towns, and I was happy to add the names of Senators CASE of South Dakota, and MANSFIELD as cosponsors of S. 3140.

A question may be raised as to the need for such a commission to study the changing conditions and the problems of small rural towns. It should be immediately apparent that these small towns are totally without resources to assist themselves in this type of survey. They do not have the research facilities to undertake studies, nor the finances to underwrite them. They do not have organizations to bind them together closely, so that there can be communication on common problems and the factors leading to them. Whatever argument we can put forward to support a study of metropolitan problems can be multiplied tenfold when applied to our small towns.

Yearly, some of our smaller communities wither; at the same time, others flourish; and no one can explain why one prospers and the other does not.

It may happen that an activity not related to the community at all is the contributing factor in both instances. In some cases that activity may have Federal direction and control. We ought to know when, where, why, and how this happens.

In our big highway program, we are going to have an impact on hundreds of small towns in rural America. The transcontinental trunk lines make it easy for people to whiz by the small town. It throws the smalltown merchant into direct competition with the stores in a larger city which now becomes only minutes away with high speed cars and superhighways for the convenience of the people. This is progress, and no one wants to turn back the clock, but we should continue to review the new problems created by progress and to assess our situation so that we can preserve that which is good and that which is essential, even as we go forward to better living.

Other Federal activities which may have the capacity to contribute to the growth or to the demise of the small town is the Government's policy in selecting sites for Federal facilities. Efforts to channel more of the Government's procurement to small firms which operate in smaller communities can be a contributing factor in assisting these communities to survive.

However, Federal planning in its special activities as they relate to small towns is not the final answer. As we travel about, we witness one town that is struggling to survive. Farther on, we see another that is on the move, growing and expanding. To the casual observer, the reason why one does not grow and the other booms is not apparent, but there must be a reason. A study which such a commission as this can undertake is to try to find out what factors need to be considered, what efforts can be expected to succeed, and what pitfalls should be avoided.

Throughout history, Mr. President, the American small town has made tremendous contributions to the development of the American way of life. History is replete with examples of the small-town boy who gained national recognition and assumed national leadership. The existence of small towns has helped to contribute the necessary balances to check against the political and economic extremes and excesses in one direction or another which have plagued and destroyed other governments and countries.

The small towns of America provide the stabilizing forces. They are the bastions for producing the freedoms of Americans at home and for preserving the great institutions of private ownership and competitive enterprise which have teamed up to make America great and to keep it strong.

It follows, then, our Nation's welfare depends on the reservoir of strength which comes from our small towns and rural areas. It is only good business to keep them strong and to preserve them in the American tradition.

It is my hope that the leadership of the Senate will place S. 3140 on its legislative calendar for early action. I am confident the Senate will approve it, and that it can do much toward preserving and promoting that great American institution known as the small town of rural America.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a pleasure for me to be associated with my distinguished senior colleague in the presentation of this bill to the Senate. The place of the small town in America has never been better stated than it was in a poem by Badger Clark, our poet laureate in South Dakota, who passed away a few years ago.

I should like unanimous permission to insert that poem at this point in the RECORD.

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

SMALL TOWN
(By Badger Clark)

The circling cones of bison hide,
That made the village of the Sioux,
Rose near as high, spread near as wide,
O little western town, as you!

But small-town skylines all are great,
And small-town air is clear and sweet,
And small-town folk are friend and mate,
Not flitting shadows on the street.

No smoke of factories uprolls;
No market roars with shouted bids.
The small town's finest fruit is souls;
Its prize commodity is kids.

For while the city struts in pride,
And trumpets far its loud renown,
The men who govern, there, and guide,
Are children of the little town.

That is the small town's latent power—
Some name upon its schoolroom page,
The future hero of the hour,
The future glory of an age.

'Twas always so; 'twill always be—
Small town, the great folks' starting place,
A small-town boy in Galilee
Re-routed all the human race.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Badger Clark points out in this poem that it was from the small town of Galilee that came He who rerouted the entire human race.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for his very important contribution, as well as his cosponsorship of the proposed legislation.

I also appreciate the fine help we have had from the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in supporting this measure.

Badger Clark was indeed a great American. His poem was read around the world. I think it is most appropriate that the poem be published at the point in the RECORD suggested by my colleague.

## UNITED STATES AGAINST LOUIS SHOMER—APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES AS WITNESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], I report three original resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

From the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York there have been issued and served subpenas ad testificandum and duces tecum to Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk, of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, and Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, to appear, produce certain papers, and testify in the pending case of *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26).

There has also been issued and served from the same District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum to Peter N. Chumbris, minority counsel,

of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, and formerly associate counsel of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, in the above-mentioned case which is now pending.

The appearance of these witnesses concerns certain testimony, under oath, which was taken during the course of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, in New York, N.Y., during May and June 1955.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to these three resolutions so that the persons named may appear and testify in the scheduled trial of United States against Louis Shomer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 322) as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26) pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum and a subpena duces tecum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York and addressed to Elizabeth McGill, Chief Clerk of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing her to appear as a witness before the said Court and to bring with her certain papers in the possession and under the control of the Senate of the United States, and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate, and

Whereas said subcommittee held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31, and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on May 26 and May 31, 1955, committed perjury, in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1621, in testifying before said subcommittee at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 31, 1955: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of said Senate) can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge and for or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that documentary evidence in the possession of or under the control of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, be, and she hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpenas to attend at the trial of such case at the date and time specified in said subpenas or at an adjourned date and time and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to her, and in the giving of her testimony she be, and she hereby is, specifically authorized to testify as to matters which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

*Resolved*, That said Elizabeth McGill, be and she hereby is specifically authorized at said trial to produce and identify copies of, and testify as to the preparation, receipt, filing, transmission and whereabouts of, documents which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That in accordance with the privileges of the Senate and established Senate practice designed to prevent loss of documents and interference with Senate business, no original document in the possession or under the control of the Senate shall be removed from its place of filing or custody for production at said trial: *Provided, however*, That any original documents in the possession or under the control of the Senate, which have been deemed material and relevant by the court may be inspected and/or copied by said court or any of its agents or officers, or the proper parties to the proceedings; at their usual place of custody; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 322) was considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 323), as follows:

Whereas, in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26) pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum and a subpena duces tecum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States attorney for the southern district of New York, and addressed to Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court and to bring with him certain papers in the possession and under the control of the Senate of the United States, and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate; and

Whereas a Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of said Committee on the Judiciary, held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31 and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on May 26 and May 31, 1955, committed perjury, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621, in testifying before said subcommittee at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 26 and May 31, 1955: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate) can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge and for or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that documentary evidence in the possession of or under the control of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, be, and he hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpenas to attend at the trial of such case at the date and time specified in said subpenas or at an adjourned date and time and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to him, and in the giving of his testimony he be, and he hereby is, specifically authorized to testify as to matters which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

*Resolved*, That said Joseph A. Davis be, and he hereby is specifically authorized at said trial to produce and identify copies of, and testify as to the preparation, receipt, filing, transmission and whereabouts of, documents which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That in accordance with the privileges of the Senate and established Senate practice designed to prevent loss of documents and interference with Senate business, no original document in the possession or under the control of the Senate shall be removed from its place of filing or custody for production at said trial: *Provided, however*, That any original documents in the possession or under the control of the Senate, which have been deemed material and relevant by the court may be inspected and/or copied by said court or any of its agents or officers, or the proper parties to the proceedings, at their usual place of custody; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 323) was considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The third resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 324), as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, docket number C 153-26, a subpena ad testificandum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States attorney for the southern district of New York and addressed to Peter N. Chumbris, minority counsel of the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, and formerly associate counsel of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate; and

Whereas said Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31 and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas, said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on or about May 26 and 31, 1955, committed perjury in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1621, in testifying before said Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 26 and 31, 1955: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate), can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Peter N. Chumbris be, and he hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpena, to attend at the trial of said case at the date and time specified in said subpena or at an adjourned date and time, and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to him, and in the giving of his testimony he be, and he hereby is, specifically authorized to testify concerning matters (documentary or otherwise) which are or have been under the control of, or in the possession of, the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 324) was considered and agreed to.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3571. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3572. A bill to permit the State of Nebraska to modify the agreement heretofore entered into by it pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act so as to exclude service performed within such State by justices of the peace and constables, and to provide for social security coverage of certain justices of the peace and constables as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3573. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the further use of foreign currencies acquired thereunder for certain foreign expenses requisite to participation by foreign nations in trade fairs in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3574. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming, setting forth what the bill which I have introduced today will do in extending and amending certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

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

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, May 18, 1960.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 660, 84th Cong.) approved July 9, 1956. This bill has four principal objectives:

1. To strengthen State and interstate water pollution control programs;

2. To make more effective assistance to municipalities in the construction of necessary sewage treatment works;

3. To provide for more effective prevention and control of water pollution caused by Federal installations; and

4. To strengthen the role of the Federal Government in abating pollution of interstate waters.

To carry out these objectives, the bill would make the following changes in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act:

Extend, for an additional 5 years, the provision for Federal grants to State and interstate water pollution control agencies for administration of their programs;

Make it possible for several communities to get individual Federal grants and use these funds in the construction of a single joint sewage treatment facility;

Make all interstate navigable waters and coastal waters subject to Federal abatement enforcement authority whether or not there is a showing of interstate pollution if abatement action is requested by a State or a municipality with the concurrence of the State, and authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue final orders in enforcement actions;

Make discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings and recommendations in Federal water pollution abatement actions conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(We also propose a clarifying amendment in section 12, which preserves existing functions of other Federal agencies in the water pollution control field.)

The proposed amendments will, we believe, provide an improved statutory base for the Federal-State water pollution control and abatement program. They contain our legislative recommendations for strengthening the enforcement provisions of the act in accordance with the President's 1961 budget message and his message dated February 22, 1960, returning H.R. 3610 to the Congress without his approval.

Before explaining in greater detail the purpose and effect of these amendments, I believe it would be helpful to put them in a perspective of the development of the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the programs of water pollution control in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been engaged under this law.

BRIEF HISTORY OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

The first specific Federal water pollution control legislation was enacted in the 1890's primarily for preventing impediments to navigation. The Public Health Service Act of 1912 contained provisions authorizing investigations of water pollution related to disease. The Oil Pollution Act of 1912 was directed to control oil discharges in coastal waters causing damage to aquatic life, harbors and docks, and recreational facilities.

Comprehensive water pollution control legislation was nearly enacted by the 74th Congress in 1936. Legislation was enacted by the 75th Congress in 1938 but vetoed by the President because of technical defects. Again in 1940, the 76th Congress narrowly missed passing such legislation.

No further serious efforts were made to advance water pollution control legislation until 1947 because of World War II.

The 80th Congress enacted and on June 30, 1948, the President signed the first legislation in the history of the Federal Government which provided for a comprehensive Federal, State, and local cooperative approach with respect to water pollution control.

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.) was enacted as temporary, experimental legislation which was to be reviewed after a trial period (5 years) and revised on the basis of experience. It was extended for an additional 3-year period to June 30, 1956, by Public Law 579, 82d Congress.

In 1955 President Eisenhower recommended that the Congress enact permanent comprehensive Federal water pollution control legislation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared and submitted such legislation, and after study and debate by both Houses, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which was essentially an improvement and extension on a

permanent basis of the 1948 act. In large measure, the Congress adopted the recommendations of this Department.

The basic policy of the 1948 act was declared by the Congress "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution * * *." The Congress declared the same basic policy in subsection 1(a) of the 1956 act, viz "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States in preventing and controlling water pollution * * *." This policy is underlined in subsection 1(b) which provides that "Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the water (including boundary waters) of such States."

This basic policy is reflected in the principal programs provided both in the 1948 act and the improved, permanent 1956 act and has been faithfully followed in the administration of these programs.

PROGRAMS UNDER 1948 (PUBLIC LAW 845) AND 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 660) ACTS

The principal programs under the 1948 act, together with the improvements effected by the 1956 act, and a statement of the record of accomplishments in their administration is set forth below.

*1. Collection and dissemination of information*

Public Law 845 directed the Surgeon General to prepare and publish reports of studies, research, etc., made under the act. Public Law 660 broadened this duty to cover the collection and dissemination of all information, including basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, relating to water pollution and its prevention and control.

A national water quality network was established in 1957 to determine present pollution conditions and long-term trends in water quality improvement or deterioration. Seventy-two of the projected 300 sampling stations needed to provide reasonable water quality intelligence on interstate streams have been established, and results are evaluated and published annually.

National inventories of municipal and industrial waste facilities have been published and scheduled for updating at 5-year intervals. An inventory of municipal water supplies in communities of over 25,000 population has been published and one for communities under 25,000 population is nearly completed. These are scheduled for updating at 5- and 2-year intervals respectively. These inventories show status and needs for water supply and waste treatment facilities. Contract award data are collected and published annually and serve as a measure of progress in meeting needs. Basic data are being recorded by modern machine tabulating methods to be quickly available to water resources agencies and others.

*2. Research*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for undertaking and supporting research in problems of water pollution control with emphasis on industrial waste.

Although resources were limited under Public Law 845, several research breakthroughs were made. An example is the development of the sewage oxidation pond which has proved to be an efficient but inexpensive sewage treatment method for the smaller municipalities and communities. Other examples are the development of the dissolved oxygen analyzer and the carbon filter technique. The former is the first continuous recording instrument of its kind, vitally needed in stream studies and surveillance. The latter technique has greatly helped to further our knowledge of minute quantities of new organic pollutants in water. Industrial waste guides were prepared for major industries for their use in water pollution prevention and control.

Public Law 660 broadened the authority to conduct and support research by including prevention as well as control of water pollution and by adding authority to make grants for research and training projects and demonstrations to public and private agencies including universities and other qualified institutions and to establish and maintain research fellowships.

The water supply and water pollution research program has been substantially expanded under Public Law 660. Significant progress has been made through the application of the engineering, chemistry, physics, microbiological, biological, and related sciences to the problems of water supply and pollution control. An example is a greatly enlarged arsenal of tools now available for detecting new synthetic contaminants and their pollution characteristics and effects. Another is the initiation of a major research effort to develop entirely new processes for removing much more of the pollutants from waste waters than is possible by existing methods. The success of this latter project is of utmost importance with respect to the problem of increasing pollution and the need to reuse water over and over to supply demands.

*3. Technical assistance*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for giving technical assistance to State and interstate water pollution control agencies.

The program of technical assistance to State and interstate agencies took the form of stream surveys, biological investigations, special studies of industrial wastes, solution of complex pollution problems, and the loan of engineering specialists to States to assist in water resources studies.

Public Law 660 broadened the authority for technical assistance to State and interstate agencies to include authority to provide training in technical matters, and to make grants-in-aid to public and private agencies for training and demonstration projects, and to contract with these agencies for such projects.

Technical assistance to State and interstate agencies has been widely expanded under Public Law 660, including technical training of their personnel. With the improved State programs that have been strengthened by Federal program grants, it has been possible for the Public Health Service to put more of its resources into the larger problems requiring assistance. These projects have included full-scale river studies, laboratory evaluations, special industrial waste studies, and assignment of specialized technical personnel to water pollution control agencies.

*4. Program grants*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for assistance to State and interstate water pollution control agencies in the form of grants for industrial waste studies. Under Public Law 845, the appropriation authorization was limited to $1 million per annum and funds were made available only for fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Public Law 660 recast and broadened this authority to make grants for 5 years to State and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting costs of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution prevention and control programs including cost of training personnel and administration of programs in accordance with effective, comprehensive plans, subject to review and approval by the Surgeon General. The annual appropriation authorization was increased from $1 million to $3 million.

Program grants to State and interstate agencies have served the purpose of improving and strengthening their water pollution control programs, and stimulating increased State appropriations. Since 1956 the level of State appropriations has increased from $4.2 million to $7.6 million for fiscal year 1960. Federal appropriations for this purpose were $2 million in fiscal year 1957 and have been $3 million each for fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

State and interstate agencies have increased their technical and supporting staffs by nearly 50 percent. They have been able to initiate or expand pollution surveys, research, basic data collection, and more aggressive enforcement of State laws. Grants have made possible the purchase of major items of field and laboratory equipment needed to support the expanding programs.

*5. Construction grants*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 to make loans to States and municipalities to help finance the construction of sewage treatment plants.

In one respect Public Law 660 went beyond the recommendations of the administration by providing for Federal grants to localities to pay part of the cost of constructing municipal sewage treatment works. This construction grants program supplanted the loan program in the 1948 act for which no funds had ever been appropriated by the Congress.

As of March 31, 1960, a total of 2,082 Federal grant offers to municipalities have been made in support of projects costing an estimated $1.016 billion. The Federal grant offers totaled $175 million contrasted with local commitments of $841 million, showing a local-to-Federal dollar participation ratio of 4.8 to 1.

*6. Comprehensive planning*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 for the development of comprehensive plans for water pollution control by major water drainage basins in cooperation with State and interstate agencies, municipalities and industries.

Under Public Law 845 the Public Health Service published 71 water pollution control program reports on river basins that were cooperatively prepared with the appropriate State agencies. These reports covered all of the major drainage basins of the country and are serving as the framework for the development of comprehensive water pollution control plans.

Under Public Law 660 the Public Health Service has expanded its initiation of major special project activities and initiated the development of comprehensive water pollution control plans. An expansion of these important activities had been recommended strongly by committees advisory to the Public Health Service and by supporters of water pollution control.

At present 24 special projects are under way and these studies cover such problems as land management practices affecting water quality, the effect of water resource projects and other construction on water quality and use, insecticide hazards, water evaporation control, radioactive pollution, development of master regional plans for water supply and waste disposal, and many others.

In addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has agreed with the Department of the Army to cooperate in the administration of the Water Supply Act of 1958 by determining municipal and industrial water supply requirements over the next 50 years and the economic value thereof in connection with authorized Corps of Engineer construction projects. Ten requests for such determinations have been complied with and work in connection with 46 other construction projects is proceeding.

*7. Interstate compacts*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 to promote

interstate cooperation in water pollution control through encouragement of interstate compacts.

Technical assistance has been given in the development, negotiation, and consideration by the Congress of seven interstate compacts, as follows:

Water Pollution Compacts

Klamath River Basin compact—California and Oregon. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–222, August 30, 1957.

Tennessee River Basin compact—States eligible: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. States which have enacted the compact: Tennessee, Mississippi, and Kentucky. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–734, August 28, 1958.

Columbia interstate compact—States eligible: Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Still in process of negotiation. Latest proposal is to emphasize water pollution control.

Water Resources Compacts With Minor Provisions on Water Pollution Control

Bear River compact—Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–348, March 17, 1958.

Wabash Valley compact—Indiana and Illinois. Congressional approval, Public Law 86–375, September 23, 1959.

Northeastern water and related land resources compact—States eligible: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. States which have enacted the compact: Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. Bills for congressional approval introduced in this session.

Great Lakes Basin compact—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. New York and Ohio have not yet enacted the compact. Bills for congressional approval pending in this session.

*8. Improvement of State laws*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 to encourage the enactment of better State laws governing water pollution control.

In 1949 the Public Health Service developed a suggested model water pollution control law in cooperation with the Council of State Governments and with State and interstate water pollution authorities which was published in 1950. Its purpose was to encourage uniform State water pollution control legislation. While Public Law 845 was in effect, 28 States passed new legislation or modified existing statutes; 7 more States have taken such action since Public Law 660 was enacted.

*9. Research and training facility*

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for the construction of facilities for research and study of water pollution and training of personnel for water pollution control work.

The Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center was completed and placed in operation in 1953. It is the largest and finest research facility of its kind in the world.

*10. Advisory board*

A water pollution control advisory board was established within the Public Health Service by Public Law 845 to review its policies and programs under the act and to make recommendations to the Surgeon General. The board has held seven meetings since being reconstituted under Public Law 660 and has made many substantive recommendations to the Surgeon General and a report to the President in 1958. Its next meeting is scheduled to be held at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

Measures Against Pollution of Interstate Waters

In addition to the principal programs discussed above, both Public Law 845 and Public Law 660 established a role for the Federal Government to take action to abate pollution of interstate waters.

The enforcement provisions of Public Law 845 were considered to be so weak as to be ineffective, and opinion corroborated in the statement of the House Appropriations Committee in 1955 when funds for enforcement activities were denied. Indeed, only one enforcement action was undertaken under Public Law 845 when, on the basis of surveys, findings and reports, and informal requests for assistance from the State water pollution control agencies of Arkansas and Louisiana, the Surgeon General initiated enforcement action in the Corney River Basin involving these two States. Although this case was successfully completed under the provisions of Public Law 845 in 1957, this result was doubtless somewhat induced by the enactment of the new enforcement provisions of Public Law 660.

In Public Law 660 the provisions dealing with the Federal enforcement role were revised to make more effective the Federal role in abating interstate pollution. An accelerated interstate enforcement program was initiated under Public Law 660. Enforcement actions have been taken in 11 interstate pollution situations, 7 on the Surgeon General's initiative and 4 at the request of 1 or more States, and these required 11 formal conferences and 2 public hearings. These actions were taken to abate pollution in 4,000 miles of interstate streams. It is estimated that the remedial measures agreed upon at the conferences and required by findings of the public hearings will include the construction of at least $500 million worth of waste treatment facilities.

Detailed Statement of Legislative Recommendations

Now, after more than 3 years of operating experience under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, we have certain suggestions and modifications which would further improve the program.

To strengthen State and interstate water pollution control programs

Section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act authorizes appropriation of sums up to $3 million annually, for a period of 5 years, for grants to State or interstate water pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. Authority for appropriation of these grant funds expires on June 30, 1961.

As we have stated earlier, in the almost 4 years these Federal grants have been in operation they have stimulated and encouraged significant progress in State and interstate water pollution control programs. Among the effects of these grants on State programs have been increased appropriations, technical and supporting staff, water quality monitoring activities (including some radiological surveillance now performed by about half the States), stepped-up enforcement, and expanded research.

Despite this progress, the current State and interstate expenditure rate of $10.6 million (inclusive of Federal grant funds) must be increased in order to make a significant impact on the Nation's pollution problem in the next decade. Lack of current data on the condition of waters in most of the States, information on industrial wastes, and new control techniques, as well as the qualified personnel to carry them out, remain serious problems.

Continued Federal financial support of State and interstate water pollution control programs is essential to consolidate and build upon the gains stimulated by the first 5 years of the grant program. Withdrawal of this support would be detrimental to the cooperative Federal, State and interstate water pollution control effort; assurance, at this time, of continued support after June 30, 1961, would facilitate State planning for effective control programs. We therefore recommend amendment of section 5(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend for another 5 years the appropriation authority for State and interstate agency program grants.

To make more effective assistance to municipalities in the construction of necessary sewage treatment works

In order to facilitate multimunicipal projects, we recommend an amendment to section 6 (which authorizes grants to a State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary sewage treatment works), to apply the present ceiling of 30 percent of the estimated cost of a project, or $250,000, separately in the case of a project serving more than one municipality, to each municipality's share of such project (as determined by the Surgeon General on a reasonable and equitable basis).

We also suggest amendment of subsection (c) of section 6 to permit reallocation of construction grant funds that are not obligated for the construction of approved projects within 18 months. The proposal is that these funds would then be reallotted to States which were in a position to go forward (during the 6 months that the grant funds remained available) with projects that had been approved by the State water pollution control agency. Such reallocation authority would improve the construction grant program by assuring use of the full amount appropriated for this purpose each year.

To provide for more effective prevention and control of water pollution caused by Federal installations

Section 9 of the present act gives congressional recognition to the importance of cooperation on the part of Federal installations in preventing or controlling pollution of waters into which such installations discharge polluting matter. In order to emphasize congressional endorsement of the policy that the Federal Government should participate fully and responsibility in cases where the enforcement provisions of the Federal act are invoked, it is recommended that section 9 of the act be amended to provide that summaries of conferences prepared pursuant to section 8(c)(3) shall include references to discharges from Federal installations, that notices of hearings pursuant to section 8(e) shall be sent to Federal agencies having jurisdiction over any property involved, and that findings and recommendations of the hearing board shall also include references to discharges from Federal property which are contributing to pollution found by the boards.

To strengthen the role of the Federal Government in abating pollution of interstate waters

We have carried out the enforcement provisions authorized by section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in a vigorous manner and are happy to report that the results of this Federal-State water pollution control activity have been gratifying. Many complex problems of long duration have proved amenable to solution by the enforcement procedure provided by the Federal act. Based on experience with this procedure, we recommend strengthening these enforcement provisions.

The enforcement procedures outlined in section 8 of the act provide a mechanism for bringing into play the combined strengths of State water pollution control

agencies, interstate agencies, and the Federal Government. In harmony with the policy declaration of the act, this Federal-State cooperative enforcement program is characterized by its use of conferences and public hearings to achieve full investigation and a thorough understanding by all interested agencies of the nature and extent of pollution problems and the remedial action required. Ample opportunity for action by State control agencies is provided for at appropriate stages of these procedures.

These procedures are now authorized only for cases of pollution which are damaging to health or welfare of persons in a State other than a State of origin, and they can be set in motion either by the Surgeon General, on his own initiative, or by a request addressed to the Surgeon General by a State Governor, or a State water pollution control agency.

Our first recommendation for the amendment of section 8 would make these procedures available also whenever there is pollution affecting legitimate uses of the waters of any navigable interstate stream, whether or not there is interstate pollution. Federal jurisdiction in this kind of pollution situation, however, would be exercised only upon request by the State (or, as explained below, a municipality) and then only when the interference with legitimate uses is judged to be of sufficient significance to require the initiation of enforcement procedures. Such an extension of Federal authority could serve to improve serious pollution situations which are also of great national importance although not endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates. Inclusion of navigable interstate waters within the scope of the water pollution enforcement procedures is consistent with constitutional authority over these waterways.

Our second recommendation for improving enforcement procedures is to provide a mechanism for the initiation of such procedures by a municipality adversely affected by pollution. This avenue for remedial action should, however, we believe, be limited to situations in which the Governor or State water pollution control agency has concurred in the municipality's request to the Surgeon General. Statutory recognition of the vital interests of municipalities in pollution abatement problems—and of the propriety of their setting in motion all the normal Federal-State enforcement procedures—would encourage active participation by municipal government agencies without detracting from the responsibilities of State pollution control agencies. Accordingly, with that qualification of State concurrence, we recommend inclusion of the governing bodies of municipalities in section 8(c), which specifies the agencies which may request action by the Surgeon General.

In addition, we recommend clarifying and strengthening the Secretary's role in the enforcement process by providing that the findings and recommendations of the hearing boards (after the public hearing now authorized by section 8) shall be the Secretary's findings and recommendations except to the extent modified by him and by providing for issuance of an order (instead of a notice) by him for abatement of any pollution found to exist. To afford adequate protection for the parties in interest, provision is made for appeal from the order to be taken within 60 days to the U.S. Court of Appeals; the court's review would be on the record and these provisions of the draft bill are consistent with the judicial review provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Jurisdiction of civil actions brought by the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, to enforce any order issued by the Secretary or by a U.S. Court of Appeals would be vested in the U.S. district courts.

Finally, the draft bill would amend the definition of "interstate waters" in section 11(e) of the present act so as to include all waters which flow across or form a part of State boundaries. Coastal waters would be specifically included within the definition.

The draft bill would also amend section 12 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to mention specifically the Atomic Energy Commission as one of the Federal agencies whose functions with respect to water pollution would not be superseded or limited by the act.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

In compliance with Public Law 801, 84th Congress, there is enclosed a statement of cost estimates and personnel requirements which would be entailed by enactment of the proposed legislation.

Bureau of Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
*Secretary.*

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3575. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate any discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3576. A bill for the relief of Imre Tokodi, Piroska Tokodi, and Eva Tokodi; and

S. 3577. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Clemente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

### PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIRS AND EXPOSITIONS

Mr. JAVITS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) concerning increased participation in international trade fairs and expositions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

## RESOLUTIONS

### UNITED STATES V. LOUIS SHOMER—APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES AS WITNESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD, for Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported three original resolutions, which were considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 322. Resolution to authorize Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk of the Juvenile Delinquent Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify and produce certain records in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer;*

S. Res. 323. Resolution to authorize Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify and produce certain records in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer;* and

S. Res. 324. Resolution to authorize Peter N. Chumbris, minority clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer.*

### EXPOSITIONS FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I know Members of the Senate are anxious to pay tribute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation which would provide for a sharp increase in the number of trade fairs held in the United States and for much greater U.S. participation in foreign-trade exhibits, as part of a new program called expositions for peace. The number of trade fairs in which the United States would take part during the next 18 months under the bill could be expanded from about 50, as presently planned, to at least 80, while the number of foreign nations—about 25—expected to participate in three or four major U.S. fairs would be doubled, so that 50 foreign countries would exhibit in large and small fairs across the United States.

The reciprocal nature of the fairs would be advanced by permitting counterpart funds to be used to defray some of the costs incurred outside the United States by foreign governments in connection with their participation in trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs and exhibits staged in this country.

The introduction of the proposed legislation comes during the week which President Eisenhower has proclaimed World Trade Week, immediately after the successful conclusion of the World Trade Fair at New York City's Coliseum, which had some 3,000 exhibits displaying goods from 65 foreign countries.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3573) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the further use of foreign currencies acquired thereunder for certain foreign expenses requisite to participation by foreign nations in trade fairs in the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since 1954, when President Eisenhower launched U.S. participation in foreign trade fairs, U.S. exhibits have scored some notable successes—most recently in New Delhi at the agricultural fair which the President visited. There has been a significant strengthening of cultural and economic ties between us and the people of the host nation, while displays of U.S. goods have testified to our dedication to peaceful pursuits and higher standards of living for peoples in less developed areas.

We have already crossed the threshold into a new era in world trade, when U.S. businessmen must pioneer new outlets for their goods abroad, develop new products to attract oversea customers and actively support world trade in the United States and abroad which can help us to retain our status as the great common marketplace for the free world.

The key to the vast expansion of trade opportunities so necessary to sustain economic growth in industrialized and less developed nations is a new program of expositions for peace, dependent upon the legislation I am proposing today. The resolution has four main objectives: First, to step up U.S. participation and encourage individuals and businesses to take part in the various types of fairs and expositions provided for in the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 and in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; second, to increase the number of U.S. trade fairs and expositions and encourage foreign exhibitors to arrange displays on a reciprocal basis, by making available to them technical, administrative, and financial assistance in part financed by counterpart funds; third, to encourage much more extensive participation in these fairs by U.S. labor-management, consumers, investors, and farmers; fourth, to use U.S.-owned foreign currencies resulting from mutual security and agricultural trade development programs to promote more expositions for peace at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) concerning increased participation in international trade fairs and expositions, submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas increased trade among nations is the key to sustained economic growth both for the industrialized and the less developed countries;

Whereas the export trade of the United States represents a vital and necessary part of our economy and increased exports are vital for the elimination of the international balance of payments deficit which the United States is presently experiencing;

Whereas international trade fairs have contributed greatly to the economic, and cultural ties among nations, have made the peoples of the world better acquainted with each others' productive capacity and economic capabilities and have strengthened communications and understanding among them;

Whereas exhibitions at trade fairs abroad, supported in part by the Government of the United States, have helped greatly to project our true image to foreign peoples, proven important forces in the promotion of understanding, and contributed substantially to the growth of trade between the United States and foreign nations; and

Whereas there is substantial room for the expansion of these efforts for the increased promotion of U.S. products abroad and the products of friendly foreign nations here, and for U.S. participation in foreign trade fairs and the establishment of foreign trade fairs in this country, for the promotion of peace and economic well-being for all the peoples of the world; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, that it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President of the United States, acting through the Departments of State and Commerce and through such other agencies as he may deem appropriate, should provide for increased participation by the United States and by U.S. individuals and businesses in international trade fairs and expositions abroad, including trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs, expositions, and exhibits, participation in which is provided for in the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, as amended, and in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Congress);

(2) encouragement be given to the increased establishment of trade fairs, expositions, and exhibits in the United States by foreign governments, businesses, and other foreign exhibitors on a reciprocal basis, by making available to them technical, administrative, and financial assistance through our missions abroad and through the appropriate use of any U.S. owned foreign currencies counterpart funds which may be available for such purposes;

(3) U.S. business (including labor-management, consumers, investors, and farmers) both for the promotion of its own economic well-being and for the further dissemination of the benefits of the free enterprise system, should participate in an increased extent in such international fairs, expositions, and exhibits; and

(4) the development of such international trade fairs and expositions and exhibits, both in the United States and abroad, should receive support through the use of U.S. owned foreign currency funds to the greatest extent compatible with other requirements for such currencies so that these funds, resulting from mutual security and agricultural trade development programs, may result in continually increased trade opportunities and thus continually increased economic well-being for all the nations of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment I am introducing is to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and would authorize the use of some of the hundreds of millions of dollars in counterpart funds now held in 60 countries to help defray costs requisite to participation in the fairs by foreign nations and other foreign exhibitors.

The balance of payments deficit of $7 billion run up by the United States in the past 2 years came as an unexpected shock to many American businesses accustomed to discounting their foreign competitors. Their reaction was quick, and so far this year U.S. exports are running ahead of our sales abroad in early 1959—but so are U.S. imports. We do not have a monopoly on ingenuity, new production methods, or attractive consumer items, but neither do our competitors monopolize initiative and good salesmanship.

If under the expositions for peace program, the United States participated in some 80 to 90 international fairs in the next 18 months instead of in some 50 exhibits as now planned, the increased promotion and sales of U.S. products abroad notwithstanding the increased sales here of goods from friendly foreign nations would furnish much needed assurance that our imbalance in international payments will be reduced.

A primary U.S. foreign policy objective is to prevent the spread of communism into the free world's less developed areas, and it is their young industries which often have a very hard time selling in foreign markets. The Soviet bloc is competing actively in trade fairs, having participated in 433 exhibits in more than 50 countries of the free world between 1957 and 1959, with the emphasis on expansion. From 123 fairs in 40 countries 3 years ago, the bloc went to 133 fairs in the same number of countries in 1958 and to 177 fairs in 51 countries last year.

It is very important to us that the citizens of the less developed areas of the free world utilize the machinery of the private enterprise system to develop their economies so they can provide decent living standards for the average individual and family. What better showcase can we find for the products of the U.S. private enterprise system than in international trade fairs on both sides of the Iron Curtain? And what better showcase can we provide the less developed nations than the display of their products in the United States, partially financed through the use of counterpart funds? Businessmen from every State and almost every nation can come to buy, to sell, to see new goods, to get new merchandising ideas, and to form new associations as these expositions spur foreign trade and foster international peace and good will.

Mr. President, I conclude upon this note: We have all been deeply moved by the situation in Paris and the breakup of the Summit Conference. I, for one, feel we are going to do two things now. First, we shall strengthen the United Nations and make it the forum for world negotiation which must now ensue. Second, we shall integrate the free world in a far more active and vigorous way than we have before.

I consider this effort in respect to trade fairs, Mr. President, to be a very important aspect to our program; a very important aspect of our new export drive, signaled by President Eisenhower; a very important aspect in regard to redressing our imbalance of international payments. A demonstration of U.S. progress, I believe, is the only thing which will convince the Communist leadership of the Kremlin of the fact that the vital, dynamic, and successful character of the free world system makes it the superior system, and that if the Communists do not negotiate with us in an honest and sincere way what will happen is that their system rather than ours will go by the board.

---

## DEFINITION OF TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] be added as an additional cosponsor at the next printing of the bill (S. 2201) to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities," introduced by me (for myself and Mr. GRUENING) on June 17, 1959.

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

## PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON EASTPORT HARBOR, MAINE (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 6, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Eastport Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted December 6, 1950.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will return today from the summit conference to a united Nation. I wish to pay tribute to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have contributed to this unity, for it means strength for our country.

I wish to join with millions of Americans everywhere in commending President Eisenhower for his steadfastness and his devotion to truth and principle. His leadership is appreciated by freemen everywhere.

To my mind the summit conference proved four things:

First. That it is far better for a conference to reach no agreement than to reach an agreement that is wrong in principle and that would jeopardize the future of our Republic.

Second. That the American people are alert as well as united; that they will back to the limit a Government that stands for principle.

Third. That Khrushchev is now known to the whole world for what he is—the ruthless leader of a godless ideology.

Fourth. These recent events have also proven that communism has not changed.

Father James Keller, the founder of the Christophers, in his valuable book, "Three Minutes a Day," carries this bit of history that should never be forgotten:

"War is inevitable" were the strong words used by Dimitri Manuilsky, when he addressed the students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1930.

His dire forecast continued:

Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years.

In order to win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record.

"There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries—stupid and decadent—will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends.

"As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

Father Keller went on to say:

This terrifying statement merits much thought, prayer, and action. Do something constructive to strengthen every weakness and thus prevent catastrophe.

## VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the U.S. News & World Report for May 16 is an excellent interview with the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON, on how he has discharged the expanded and expanding duties of his office in the administration of President Eisenhower.

I think it may be said in all truth that never in the long history of our country has a Vice President been given the multitudinous responsibilities which Vice President NIXON has been given these last 7 and more years.

I would wish to add that never has a Vice President more diligently or more honorably discharged those duties. Never has one more faithfully served the President with whom he has held office as Vice President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the interview with Vice President NIXON be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NIXON'S OWN STORY OF 7 YEARS IN THE VICE-PRESIDENCY—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW ON HOW A VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE FIRST TIME IN HISTORY SERVES AS THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY

(Here, from the Vice President himself, are the inside facts on the country's No. 2 job, and the change that has taken place in that job during the Eisenhower administration. The extent to which a Vice President today participates in executive work has never before been revealed. What it all means, now and for future Vice Presidents, is disclosed in impromptu answers to questions in this exclusive interview.)

Question. Mr. Vice President, are you the first among American Vice Presidents to play a major role in the day-to-day operations of Government?

Answer. It is the first time a Vice President has had these responsibilities in this magnitude. In the previous administration, Vice President Barkley was a member of the National Security Council by law, as I am, and I understand he was also invited to attend Cabinet meetings.

In administrations before that, there were occasions when the Vice President was invited to attend Cabinet meetings as well as other gatherings, as the President then in office saw fit.

President Eisenhower has made it a rule of his administration that the Vice President shall attend all Cabinet meetings, all Security Council meetings and all meetings of the legislative leaders. In fact, he also includes any other meetings at the White House which might affect overall policy.

Question. What has been the President's reason for this?

Answer. I think the reason was perhaps best stated by him when I met him for the first time after he had approved my selection as Vice President. I remember in 1952 going from the Stock Yards Inn at Chicago, near the convention hall, to the Blackstone Hotel, where I talked with General Eisenhower. He said he had submitted a list of names to his close advisers and they recommended that I be selected as the vice-presidential nominee. He said that he approved of their decision and paid me the courtesy of asking if I would accept the nomination if it were offered. I indicated that I would.

Mr. Eisenhower then said that he wanted me to know that he did not want the Vice President in his administration to be merely a figurehead, handling protocol matters and, as he said, "pounding the gavel in the Senate." He said he felt it was vitally important, based on his experience in command of military enterprises in years past, that a deputy, who might at any time go into the top position, should always be completely informed on existing policies. He said, therefore, that he wanted to be sure that I participated in the meetings where policy was developed during the course of his administration, and that I would have assignments which would prepare me for the possibility that I might have to assume the highest office.

Question. Was the President concerned about continuity of policy in case anything should happen to him?

Answer. I think this was perhaps the primary reason. For example, I remember in this same conversation—and, incidentally, this shows that he is a student of political history in this country—he indicated that Mr. Truman was not informed on many of the basic and important decisions which had been made by President Roosevelt and which Mr. Truman had to execute on assuming office. Mr. Eisenhower said be believed it vitally important that this should never occur again.

So I would say his first reason was to see that, if the Vice President should have to assume the office of the Presidency, he would be prepared to do so.

I think he had a second reason, too. In the same conversation, he said that the Vice President, who is the only man in the Government elected by all the people other than the President, simply should not be wasted in a purely ceremonial position.

In other words, Mr. Eisenhower has always felt that it is important to make use of the talents of people within his official family to the greatest extent possible.

Question. Broadly speaking, what percent of your time is spent in executive work?

Answer. I would say at least 90 percent—and while the Senate is not in session, of course, 100 percent.

Question. Does your day end at any particular time? Are there sometimes night sessions at the White House, too?

Answer. Yes. If you were to include the evenings, I spend 95 percent of my time on executive assignments.

Let me put it in terms of hours: I would say that, on the average, the amount of time I spend presiding over the Senate is a half hour to an hour a day—that is, out of a 14-hour day.

I should add that I have other functions which keep me at the Capitol. I have meetings with legislative leaders, with Senators and Congressmen, and with various people who are interested in legislation.

These functions are related both to my legislative and executive duties. But as for presiding over the Senate itself, the only constitutional duty the Vice President has, I should say that perhaps no more than at the maximum 10 percent, and usually around 5 percent, of a Vice President's time is spent in that fashion.

Question. Do you have time to do this executive work?

Answer. I certainly have. As a matter of fact, I would say the Vice Presidency, if it did not include executive assignments, would be the dullest office that I can conceive of.

Question. When you talk about doing executive work, what do you mean?

Answer. Well, perhaps we could separate it in terms, first, of meetings. On the average, I have three formal meetings a week at the

White House: These are the Cabinet meeting, the National Security Council meeting, and the meeting with the legislative leaders. These meetings usually take approximately 2 hours. While they do not take place every week, when Congress is in session they are held more often than not.

As a matter of fact, I had my office do a tabulation of the meetings that I have attended since January 1953 as recorded in my daily calendar. I have attended 173 meetings that the President has had with legislative leaders, and presided over 2 of those. I have attended 217 meetings of the National Security Council and presided over 26 of those. I have attended 163 meetings of the Cabinet and presided over 19 Cabinet meetings.

Now, in addition to such meetings, there are occasions when I see the President alone, and other occasions when I attend informal meetings in his office with selected Cabinet members or other associates within the administration. In addition, I, of course, have meetings with Cabinet officers and other Government officials on specific legislation that may be under consideration at a particular time.

Question. Would you say that the bulk of your executive work is attending meetings?

Answer. I would say the rule in Government is about the same as it is in business or any other kind of activity. For every hour that you attend a meeting, you spend at least 2 hours preparing for it or executing the decisions made at a meeting.

For example, the meetings of the National Security Council require studying the intelligence reports before the meetings are held, and also consulting with various members of the Security Council with regard to decisions that are pending and with regard to carrying out decisions that are made.

Question. Do you have access to highly classified material?

Answer. Virtually all the material before the Security Council is confidential or secret in classification. For example, every morning my assistant for National Security Council affairs, Brigadier General Cushman, puts on my desk the intelligence reports from the day before from all over the world. I read these reports every day, whether there is a Security Council meeting planned or not. And I read an additional, more comprehensive, report on the mornings that the Security Council meetings are actually held.

Question. Do these reports give you a picture, so to speak, day after day and week after week of what is happening?

Answer. I get a picture not only of what is happening around the world, but, in addition to that, every morning I receive an up-to-date summary report of all actions being taken by various Government agencies affecting domestic affairs—for example, from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce—from every one of the Government agencies in which decisions have been made.

By reading these reports, and by reading the classified reports on international affairs, I am thereby able to talk with Members of the Congress with whom I may meet during the day or members of the press with whom I might have appointments, with some degree of knowledge as to what the facts are affecting a particular question.

STUDYING WORLD PROBLEMS

Question. Have you been given an insight into current developments in the world?

Answer. Yes. There is no question about that. For example, during the recent Korean crisis I received daily reports as the crisis developed.

This is true of all the various problems around the world. To the extent that intelligence information is available, I am able to keep abreast of world developments on a broad basis.

Question. How does what you have learned day by day differ from what comes out in the press either concurrently or later on?

Answer. The difference necessarily is that what comes out in the press contains no classified information. The reports that I read, for example, go into such classified matters as an ambassador's appraisal of the motives and the personal backgrounds of the various world leaders.

Such opinions could never be made public, of course, because, if they were critical, that would immediately make an ambassador persona non grata.

It is this kind of reporting that is extremely valuable in giving the President, or me, or anybody else who has access to such information, the kind of background that enables us to comment with balance and judgment on world affairs. You must know of the forces behind the action that we might be taking, or that another government might be taking, in a particular case.

Question. Would you say that your experience has given you an understanding of this country's relationships with other governments?

Answer. I think there is no question about that, and I think it is vitally important that the Vice President in future administrations be given the same opportunity that I have had in this respect.

Question. How about domestic problems? How do you become informed on them?

Answer. Well, this is very easy to explain. All that I do is simply call a Cabinet officer on the telephone, if he has jurisdiction over the matter, and either discuss it with him by telephone or go to his office or have him come to mine to discuss it. In some instances, I have one of the members of my staff get the information directly from him.

I should add that, in addition to these formal meetings to which I referred earlier, informal meetings of this type are far greater in number, of course, and consume more time than all the formal meetings put together.

Question. How many countries have you visited as Vice President?

Answer. A total of 54 in all.

Question. Were those visits usually related to some objective in foreign policy?

Answer. In some cases, yes. In other cases, the President felt that the trip would be helpful in establishing better communication between the leaders of those countries and the American Government.

For example, the first trip I took abroad to Asia, in 1953, covered 20 countries in Asia and southeast Asia. It lasted 70 days, and it proved to be very helpful in obtaining for the President direct information from the leaders of those countries with regard to their attitudes toward our policies, their criticisms—where they did have criticisms—of our personnel or of programs that we might be following.

After that trip and after each other trip that I have taken abroad, I have made recommendations to the President. Some went to him alone, others went to the State Department, with the President being informed and approving, and some were made in reports that I gave to the National Security Council. These recommendations have dealt with a number of issues.

In some instances, in the case of the State Department, I have dealt specifically with the problem of personnel. After my visit to Africa, for example, I came back convinced that we were not assigning enough high-quality personnel to the African area. I believe that the most important and explosive area, as far as the outcome of the world struggle is concerned in the next 10 years, will be Africa. There, 26 nations will be independent by about 1970.

At the time I visited Africa in 1957, it was, with some exceptions, a low-priority area in terms of the general quality of personnel assigned there. When I came back, I said that it was time we began to recognize that, while the African posts were difficult in many instances and would have to be classified as hardship posts, we should be sending our best people there. We should not be sending less-experienced people who, after service there, are promoted to easier and presumably more important posts in Europe.

I feel that the recommendations I made on Africa did have a very salutary effect. Today the State Department and other agencies have not only upgraded the importance of our African posts, but, in addition, we have an African desk in the Department—something we did not have until the year 1958.

Question. You've gone all around the world—have you been to every continent?

Answer. I've been to every continent—to Africa, to Asia, to South America, and, of course, to the Soviet Union and Europe.

After I visited Austria to investigate the Hungarian-refugee situation, I was able to make some recommendations with regard to bringing Hungarian refugees into this country on a more liberal basis than we had been following.

When I was in Central America in 1955, I saw that the Inter-American Highway was being built in a disgracefully inefficient way. Because of the way Congress was dribbling out the funds, it would not be completed for 25 years and, by that time, the parts of the road built first would already be practically useless because of the need for repairs. I made recommendations at that point that we should step up the allocation of funds to the highway to complete it in 3 to 4 years at the most, because in the end this would not only be more economical but it would also open the way for communications among and between the Central American countries and the United States. My recommendation was approved.

Had the trip not been taken, this probably would not have been done. So here is an indication of what a Vice President, or any other visitor from the official family, can accomplish.

Question. How many miles would you say you have traveled outside the United States while you have been Vice President?

Answer. Approximately 160,000 miles.

Question. Is that a record for a public official?

Answer. No, I would say that Secretary Dulles had a considerable bulge on me in travel abroad. And I might say he was a very remarkable man to be able to travel as he did and withstand it as well as he did. I am considerably younger than he was, and, despite the fact that my travel was not nearly as extensive, I sometimes wondered after I finished my trips how he was able to travel even farther and without showing any physical strain.

HOW TRIPS WERE PLANNED

Question. How can you, as Vice President, act as an emissary of the President abroad and not come in conflict with responsibilities of the Secretary of State?

Answer. This question is extremely important, and I would like to emphasize that I have taken no trips abroad which have not been approved by the Secretary of State. They were all approved by Secretary Dulles, and then, after his death, by Secretary Herter.

A Vice President, or any other Government official, cannot be useful in such trips unless he works in close cooperation with the Secretary of State. It would be very detrimental to U.S. foreign policy to have a Vice President go in and, in effect, undercut the Secretary of State in his primary responsibility for U.S. foreign policy. I have had no difficulty in this respect, because my relation with the Secretaries of State, both Mr. Dulles and Mr. Herter, has been not

only friendly but one of complete cooperation. They welcomed these trips that I have taken, and, as a matter of fact, in every instance they joined with the President in urging me to go.

Question. When you visited a country, was your position as Vice President regarded as higher than that of any Cabinet officer?

Answer. I cannot say that the position of Vice President was regarded as of greater importance. I will say, however, that the receptions that Mrs. Nixon and I have received abroad have been—with the exception of Venezuela's—extremely friendly. In effect, we have been accorded the same hospitality and the same respect that would have been accorded the President had he made the trip.

These countries all considered me the direct representative of the President and, in addition, the second-ranking elected official in the Nation. This meant that I had direct access to all the top officials of the governments, and the conversations I had were just as complete and frank, I believe, as would have been the case had the President himself been there.

VISITING WORLD LEADERS

Question. How many individual dignitaries have you talked with in the various countries?

Answer. I believe I have had extended discussions with some 35 presidents, 9 prime ministers, 5 kings, 2 emperors, and the Shah of Iran.

Question. Were officials in some countries complimented that an official as high ranking as the Nation's Vice President was sent to visit them?

Answer. That's exactly the point. The receptions were not just for me as an individual, but they were more for (1) the people of the United States, (2) for the President whom I represented, and (3) for the office which I held.

For example, when we visited Japan in 1953, there were more than a half million people on the streets of Tokyo when we came from the airport. This was repeated when we were in Manila for the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines. President Magsaysay and I spoke together on that occasion, and the crowd in the great public square, where such meetings are held, was estimated at three-quarters of a million.

The most moving experience was when we came to Poland after our visit to Russia, and when, without any notice by the Government of the route we were going to take into the city—because they were making no effort to get out a crowd—over a quarter of a million people crowded the streets to welcome us.

I emphasize that these welcomes from the people were for the reasons that I mentioned above, and not personal in character.

But they do show that any Vice President of the United States who goes abroad representing the President can have a great impact upon the people of these countries and also will inevitably be received by the leaders of those countries in a way which will enable him to get information which can be very helpful in the development of foreign policy.

Question. In your trips abroad you could be called a special ambassador. How would you describe your role at home—that of an Assistant President or an Executive Vice President?

Answer. It's very difficult to classify the work by either of those terms. Let me put it this way: A Vice President of the United States can be only as effective as the President wants him to be. In other words, a Vice President has, except for his power to break a tie vote in the Senate, no power of his own.

I think perhaps the best way to classify the work of the Vice President domestically is that he serves as the deputy of the President and as the representative of the President. His position differs, however, from those of the members of the President's White House staff in this very important respect: The Vice President is an elected official of the Government. He has a position of political influence and political power that the appointed members of the White House staff lack completely and that members of the Cabinet generally do not have.

This means, therefore, that when the President gives the Vice President an assignment, the Vice President, with the President behind him, can exert more influence and can be more effective than a member of the White House staff or even a member of the Cabinet.

I go back to the settlement of the steel strike, for illustration. I am convinced, in this instance, the fact that I was Vice President and the fact that I was representing the President were decisive factors in enabling me to be the catalytic agent to bring the two parties together so that they would discuss this matter and eventually reach a settlement.

Had I simply been somebody from private life whom the President might have assigned to this responsibility, or somebody from his White House staff, I don't believe that the parties could have been brought together.

The fact that I was speaking for the President and the fact that I had the added official prestige of being Vice President in my own right formed a combination which was necessary in this instance, and probably decisive in bringing about the settlement.

Question. In the parliamentary system of government, is there some Cabinet member without portfolio who might fill the role you have come to fill?

Answer. We've often discussed such matters with members of foreign governments when I have visited other countries, but there are very few who have vice presidents, to begin with, and, second, in other forms of government there simply aren't offices that are similar to the Vice-Presidency. I suppose the closest parallel you find is a prime minister and a deputy prime minister in a parliamentary system. But the office of vice president is somewhat unique. Far more countries get along without vice presidents than have them.

MEETINGS AT CAMP DAVID

Question. Did you attend all the meetings at Camp David that President Eisenhower had with Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Chancellor Adenauer?

Answer. I have not attended all of them. I have attended several. Some of these meetings are more social in character, and the President very properly does not invite others. However, he has been most considerate in seeing that I am in attendance when important issues are discussed, so that I might be able either to contribute to the discussion or obtain information it would be necessary for me to have in carrying out any duties which might fall upon me in the future.

I would like to add, too, that, in those cases where I do not attend such meetings, the President always makes available to me his memoranda of conversations dealing with other than purely personal matters.

In other words, even though I do not attend such meetings, I am always familiar with decisions that are made and discussions that take place. Then, when I meet these leaders—as I do when I have a dinner for them, or when they call on me at my office, or when I call on them—I am able to speak with knowledge of all the conversations they have had with the President.

Question. Do you get in on budget making and fiscal affairs under this policy of having the Vice President play an executive role in addition to the limited role common in the past?

Answer. Well, let me say first that my participation in the development of such policies has naturally increased as I have gained experience in office. For example, in each of the last 3 years when the budget was under consideration, I have consulted with the Director of the Budget and with the various departments on the budgets that they were submitting. During and after these consultations, I have had an opportunity to make recommendations in Cabinet meetings or, in some instances, directly to the President himself with regard to my views on the budget.

At the President's direction, moreover, in the past 3 years various Cabinet officers have brought their key budget decisions to me for any suggestions or recommendations that I might have.

Question. Is the same thing true in other fields? Where do you fit in when labor problems are involved?

Answer. In this instance, the Secretary of Labor consults with me to see what my views might be on legislation before he recommends it to Congress. The same, incidentally, is true of the other Cabinet officers when they face major issues which may involve congressional action.

Question. When farm policies are up for consideration, have you been kept informed?

Answer. I have not spent as much time on agricultural policy as on labor, defense, foreign affairs and overall budget policies. On the other hand, I have had the opportunity, as far as agriculture is concerned, to participate in the discussions on agricultural policy which have taken place in the legislative leaders' meetings. Because agricultural policy affects such a broad segment of the country, decisions with regard to agriculture are generally considered in the legislative leaders' meetings before they become final.

Question. Have you had to deal with any of these programs that relate to exploring outer space?

Answer. In the field of outer space I have a close association with Dr. Glennan [Dr. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration] and with members of his staff. I see him approximately once a month, and more often during the period when the budget is being made. For example, this year I felt very strongly that there should be more unified direction of our outer-space programs than had been the case previously, and also that there should be a stepped-up program for the development of large boosters.

In my conversation with Dr. Glennan, and also when these matters were discussed at meetings of the National Security Council over which the President presided, I strongly supported decisions which the President made in this area.

ACTION ON STEEL STRIKE

Question. How did you get in on the steel strike settlement?

Answer. The President has no rigid rules as to what matters I will take responsibility for. In the case of the steel strike, he was, as you know, starting on a trip abroad. He indicated prior to that trip, on a national television broadcast, that he believed it was vital that the strike be settled while he was gone.

In view of that exhortation, and in view of private conversations in his office at which the Secretary of Labor and I were present, I considered that it was our responsibility while he was gone to explore every possible avenue for finding a basis for settlement which would meet the criteria which he had laid down.

While the President was gone, we started the series of meetings with the leaders of the union and the leaders of the steel industry. These meetings culminated shortly after the President's return in a recommendation for settling the strike—a settlement recommendation which the President approved.

Question. Has President Eisenhower called on you for a wide range of tasks?

Answer. Well, of course, I am Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth and, as is generally known, I serve as Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. This Committee meets every month and has as its responsibility the making of recommendations to contracting agencies for their enforcement of the clause in all Government contracts that there shall be no discrimination in employment where an individual or a corporation has a Government contract. This is an assignment which the President gave me shortly after the administration came into office in 1953.

The President has also given me some specific assignments in the national-security area. For example, I was responsible for the development of public support for our mutual security program, for an intensive study which was made within the administration on the economic aspects of the cold war, and for other matters of this type.

Question. What role do you play in Cabinet meetings, for example? You are not a Department head. Do you have a chance to speak up?

Answer. Yes, I have always had the opportunity to express myself, not only at Cabinet meetings but at the other meetings over which the President presides. Usually it is his custom once a matter is presented at any one of these meetings, to ask the various people around the table for their comments and suggestions.

In fact, the President always invites all of us who participate in such meetings to indicate our views before he, the President, reaches a decision.

Question. Who makes the decisions in meetings? Are they committee decisions?

Answer. I think one of the essential rules for any orderly government is that there can be only one man who makes the final decisions. I, for one, have never believed in government by committee, because what happens then is that the decisions made represent the least common denominator of what everybody will agree to, and this means leadership at its lowest level, rather than at its highest level.

Now, I know that there have been those who have suggested that the President believes in government by committee, that he does not make decisions or overrule members of his official family on issues. Nothing could be further from the truth. The President is a very patient man. He always invites full and free discussion. He tries to bring about agreement among all of the members of his Cabinet and Security Council when important decisions are being made.

But, in the final analysis, the President recognizes that the Cabinet and Security Council are advisory to him only.

The President, during the 7 years that I have been with him, has never put a matter to the vote of the Cabinet, the Security Council or the legislative leaders. I believe he is absolutely correct in following this practice because, in the final analysis, he, the President, should make the big decisions rather than pass the buck, in effect, to his advisers. I don't mean that he isn't affected by what we all say, but he himself, after he hears what we all say, announces the decision.

Of course, there have been instances in which the view adopted by the President has been the view held by others in his official family than myself.

But I would say that the number of cases in which this has happened has been very small compared to the number of cases in which I have shared the views that the President has eventually approved.

Question. If an accident happened and you were required to take over the Presidency, would there be much of a gap in your familiarity with the duties to be performed?

Answer. As far as information is concerned, there would be no gap—no significant gap whatever.

Question. How about familiarity with the problems of the Government itself on pending matters?

Answer. I would say there would be very few pending matters in Government with which I would not be familiar. I do not mean that I am aware of all the conversations the President has with his Cabinet officers, but it would take a relatively small amount of time for me to get up to date on all the matters under discussion and consideration by the President.

Question. Examining this problem impersonally and looking ahead many, many years, do you think that the system which has been instituted by President Eisenhower, whereby the Vice President has been kept informed daily of what's going on in the Government, could have an effect eventually on the efficiency and effectiveness of our governmental system?

Answer. I most certainly do. While I speak as a not-unbiased observer, I would still say that, when President Eisenhower's administration is judged, it will receive high marks in several areas. From a long-range standpoint, one of its most important achievements—one of the President's most significant achievements—has been upgrading the office of the Vice-Presidency.

As a result of what President Eisenhower has done, I believe neither political party in the future will ever again look upon the Vice-Presidency as simply an office to be used for purposes of balancing a ticket geographically or religiously or politically. I think that in the future both political parties will recognize, first, that a vice-presidential candidate must always be qualified and prepared to serve as President.

In addition to that, his views must be close enough to those of the President so that he will feel completely confident in using the Vice President to the utmost in foreign policy and domestic assignments.

In the future, building on the precedents that the President has established in this administration, even greater use can be made of the Vice President. I think that, as a legislative troubleshooter at home, as a coordinator and executor of administration policies, and as a representative in the foreign policy area, the Vice President can serve the President immensely in the years ahead.

In the foreign-policy area particularly, this is not only constructive but I believe absolutely essential. The burdens of international affairs upon the President have become increasingly great as more nations have acquired their independence and as U.S. responsibilities in the world have increased.

In the future, the Vice President can assist the President by visiting countries that the President is unable to work into his schedule and by carrying out specific foreign-policy assignments which the President and the Secretary of State find that his particular office qualifies him to execute.

GAINING PUBLIC SUPPORT

Question. If this formula of the Vice-Presidency is continued in the future, irrespective of party, would you expect a Vice President to become a logical choice or at least be given serious consideration as a possible nominee for the Presidency in future years?

Answer. Without referring to my own situation, I would say that one of the reasons Vice Presidents have been buried politically in times past is because they simply have not had enough important things to do. If the Vice President does have assignments of importance, he inevitably will be in the public eye and will develop political support in his own right. For that reason, I would say that, if future Presidents use their Vice Presidents as President Eisenhower has used me, we can expect future Vice Presidents to be among those who are most seriously considered as presidential candidates.

Question. Do you think that the Vice President of the future who serves as deputy to the President is likely to have an advantage over other candidates who might be in the running for the party's nomination?

Answer. Again, I may have a prejudiced view in this respect, but it seems inevitable that one who is familiar with all aspects of the major problems confronting the Nation has a head start on others who have to learn the issues pretty much from the ground up.

While the fact that an individual has served for a certain number of years as Vice President and has had the opportunity to obtain information on the working of the Government, both at home and abroad, does not in itself qualify him for the Presidency, it undoubtedly gives him an invaluable opportunity to learn, to test his capabilities, and to prove himself in the eyes of the people.

Question. Again, looking at this thing impersonally and assuming that your own political party had been out of power and a new President were elected, what do you think are the handicaps and disadvantages to the country in the fact that 2½ months must elapse between the time of an election and the inauguration of a new President and his opportunities to become familiar with the intricacies of the Government itself?

Answer. Well, of course, looking back on our own administration, we ran into exactly that situation in 1953. There obviously has to be a period of time in which a new administration must learn the ropes, in effect, with regard to the intricacies of foreign and domestic policies. This, of course, is not an insurmountable problem if there is genuine cooperation between the incoming and outgoing administrations. The American people in many instances have seen fit to take the inevitable temporary inefficiency which is involved in such a changeover rather than to continue in power an administration in which they have lost confidence. But, when an administration has a good record and when there is no real disagreement with its policies, there is probably a natural tendency upon the part of the people to think twice before they throw that administration out of office and replace it with one that will have to pick the new personnel and build the machinery which is needed for operating the biggest business in the world.

REPORTS TO EISENHOWER

Question. Have you seen the President alone—absolutely alone with nobody else present—very often in the last 7 years?

Answer. Prior to my trips abroad I always have extended conversations with the President so that he can give me his views on the countries I am visiting. When I return I always see him alone before reporting to the National Security Council. When the President returns from his trips, he calls me into the office and gives me an evaluation of the foreign leaders that he has met and of the problems which he ran into.

I have not had and do not have regular private meetings with the President. There are some weeks that I will not meet him alone at all, since I see him three times a week at our regular meetings. There are other times when an issue, such as the steel strike, is up during which I may have four

or five conferences with him—either individually or by telephone—during 1 day. I don't have a record of the complete number of the conferences, but this gives an idea of the type of conversations I have.

Question. Do you talk to the President on the telephone from day to day?

Answer. I always follow the practice, unless he has asked me to call, of not talking to him on the telephone unless he calls me. The only exception that I have made in this respect was during the course of the steel strike when I had to keep him posted daily on developments. He calls me on the telephone, but I would say that telephone conversations are the exception rather than the rule. Usually they occur when he is out of Washington. Since my office is only minutes away from the White House, it is usually more convenient, when he wants to see me, for him simply to have his secretary call. Then I go down to the White House to see him.

AN OPPOSITION ISSUE

Question. Do you believe that the Constitution imposes on you a requirement to spend all your time in presiding over the Senate when it is in session?

Answer. I know there are some who believe that is the case. Indeed, some Members of the Senate in the opposition party may want to make an issue of the fact that I have not presided over the Senate for as many hours as did some of my predecessors.

I, of course, welcome this complaint, because I think people generally throughout the country recognize that the responsibilities I have undertaken are infinitely more important and more in the interest of serving the American people than simply sitting in front of the Senate.

Question. Has the Senate recognized this by providing under its rules for a President pro tempore who is a Member of the Senate itself?

Answer. The President pro tempore is supposed to preside in the Vice President's absence. I might add also that, according to senatorial practice, any Senator can preside over the Senate.

The only thing that the Vice President can do—and must do—that the President pro tempore or another presiding officer cannot do is to break a tie. That is why the only limitation I have as President of the Senate is that I must always be on hand in Washington when there is a possibility of a tie vote.

In the 7 years I have been Vice President, I have broken eight ties. While this is an average of a little more than one a year, it still indicates the importance of being present when the division of the Senate is as close as it is.

Question. Have you ever missed any votes when there was a tie that could be broken on anything important?

Answer. No; I haven't. I think there was one occasion when I was not present on a tie vote, but my unavoidable absence caused no problem because the same issue came up the next day. It was brought up when I was present and able to decide upon it.

CRUCIAL VOTES IN CONGRESS

Question. Have there been some occasions when the opposition party would have preferred you to be absent on some of those ties, too?

Answer. That is certainly true because the eight tie votes in which I did participate were on important issues. You may remember that I broke the 47–47 tie on whether or not the Senate would approve a massive Federal-aid-to-education bill which would have made teachers' salaries a Federal responsibility. My breaking of the tie on that vote was considered a significant step, and I did not take it hastily.

Question. Don't you usually know in advance when some important issue is going to come up that might result in a tie?

Answer. Exactly. This is another reason why the possibility of a tie vote should not keep the Vice President from taking other assignments. The work of the Senate is generally so planned that you do not have votes called on the spur of the moment. Generally speaking, votes in the Senate are taken at specified times, particularly on critical issues.

Question. Is most of the work that you do for the executive branch in Washington itself, rather than out of town?

Answer. Yes; except when a trip abroad is involved. However, good-will trips are generally scheduled for congressional recesses or for periods when we do not expect any legislation. Otherwise, I am in Washington. I may be at the White House, for example, and I might point out that, at the White House, I am exactly 7 minutes—I know exactly how long it takes—from the Senate floor. So, if a vote should occur while I am at the White House, I am always able to get there in time to vote.

Question. In this rather intimate official relationship with the President for the last 7 years, it is presumed you have gotten to know each other pretty well. How would you describe your personal relations with the President?

Answer. Why, I would say that, thanks to him, those relations have been friendly, and certainly very memorable as far as I am concerned. I have been able to see how he reacts in handling difficult problems—problems like Lebanon, and Quemoy and Matsu, for example. There is nothing that quite takes the place of witnessing firsthand the making of great decisions.

WHEN A CRISIS ARISES

Question. Would you say that in crises Mr. Eisenhower is any different from what he is in the normal routine of everyday work?

Answer. I think everyone is different in a crisis. In the case of the President, what impresses me the most is his complete objectivity and impersonal approach to a crisis. You can describe it as coolness in a crisis, but simply saying that he is cool in a crisis does not adequately describe his attitude. In fact, those who have seen him, as I have, when he has made important decisions, get the impression that here is a man who is carefully weighing all the pros and cons of a particular course of action, without thinking at all about the effect that such action may have on his personal popularity—thinking only of what he believes is in the best interests of the country. And, most important, by watching him in these moments of crisis I was impressed by the fact that the hotter the discussion became, the cooler he became. This is probably one of the greatest lessons that I have learned while working under the President and with him during the past 7 years.

There is one other thing I might say in this connection which I think is important: Once he makes a decision, it is made. He does not continue to worry about it and to second-guess it. This, I think, also is important in leadership.

Question. What is your feeling as you watch the President? Is the Presidency itself something toward which there is a sense of awe and perhaps of great reverence?

Answer. Strangely enough, as you were stating that question the words "awe" and "reverence" were exactly the ones that came into my mind. Whenever I see the President making a tough decision I recognize how easy, by comparison, my responsibilities are. Another thing that is very impressive about the President is that, no matter how much he may have on his mind, he seldom gives the impression of carrying the world on his shoulders. He has the ability to keep a relaxed mind when he makes the important decisions. Some men, when they have tough decisions, inevitably tense up right in front of your eyes. I have seldom seen the President give that impression, if ever.

## THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LINDBERGH'S SOLO FLIGHT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC OCEAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 33 years ago tomorrow the world was electrified by a singular act of courage which stirred the imagination of mankind and signified the entrance into a new era. I refer to the first flight across the Atlantic Ocean by Charles A. Lindbergh.

Since that hour of triumph, Colonel Lindbergh has passed through many fiery trials. He has been visited alike by success and disappointment, by tragedy and achievement.

Last Sunday's issue of This Week magazine supplement featured a brief but moving article by Lindbergh, a statement reflecting the insight and experience of an unusual life. It is an eloquent plea for a rejection of the materialistic philosophy by the free world and for subordination of politics and science to the aims of a philosophy based on eternal moral truths.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

CHALLENGE

(By Charles A. Lindbergh)

I grew up as a disciple of science. I know its fascination. I have felt the godlike power man derives from his machines—the strength of a thousand horses at one's fingertips; the conquest of distance through mercurial speed; the immortal viewpoint of the higher air. I have sensed the harmony of muscle, mind, and mechanism which gives the illusion of life to substance until levers move with thought as hand or foot, until the rhythm of an engine is geared to the beat of one's own heart, and wing in turning flight seems an extension of one's own body.

Now, I have lived to experience the early results of scientific materialism. I have watched men turn into human cogs in the factories they believed would enrich their lives. I have watched pride of workmanship leave and human character decline as efficiency of production lines increased. I have seen the lifesaving miracles of medicine perverted toward the murderous ends of biological warfare. I have seen the science I worshiped, and the aircraft I loved, destroying the civilization I expected them to serve, and which I thought as permanent as earth itself. In memory, the vision of my mailplane boring northward over moonlit clouds is now mingled with the streaks of tracers from my fighter, flaming comets of warplanes, and bombs falling irretrievably through air.

We still have the possibility, here in America, of building a civilization based on man, where the importance of an enterprise is judged less by its financial profits than by the kind of community it creates; where the measure of a man is his own character, not his power or his wealth. If we have sufficient desire, we can still build a civilization whose leadership rests on the respect and confidence it instills in others, and whose standard of life is the quality of life itself.

But time is short. Looking at the destruction already wrought, at the materialism growing on every side, at the increasing bitterness and unrest throughout the world, at

the tremendous power of our latest weapons, a realist might well conclude that many of us now living will see the start of another war, one which will end in more dark ages.

There is no materialistic solution, no political formula, which alone can save us.

Our salvation, and our only salvation, lies in controlling the arm of Western science by the mind of a Western philosophy guided by the eternal truths of God. It lies in the balanced qualities of spirit, mind, and body of our people.

## TALE OF TWO CITIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter entitled, "The Tale of Two Cities," which appeared this morning on the editorial page of the Washington Post.

Written by Carl Levin, chairman of the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square, the letter points out the need for adequate facilities in Washington for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Levin and his committee and hope that the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds will report favorably on this project following hearings scheduled for Monday.

I want to commend Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the subcommittee, and Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Public Works Committee, for their efforts in scheduling hearings on this most worthy project.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Levin's letter be printed in The RECORD.

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

TALE OF TWO CITIES

Your May 11 editorial, "Tale of Two Cities," brought out pointedly the sad incongruity of the relative facilities for the presentation of the arts in New York City and in our Nation's Capital.

The newly formed Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, however, hopes that our effort will be neither "too little" nor "too late."

Though it is true that we undertook our effort late—for the west side of Lafayette Square apparently already is lost—we are convinced that there is still time to save the quiet dignity and utility offered by the old buildings facing on the east side of the White House park.

As you pointed out so well in your editorial, New York City has rallied to save and is saving Carnegie Hall. Simultaneously, it is proceeding to build the Lincoln Center, all of this in addition to numerous other facilities such as the City Center where the New York City Ballet and other such groups are able to offer their art in appropriate and adequate surroundings.

By contrast, Washington, probably alone among the great capitals of the world, has no existing adequate facility for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

The Belasco Theater, originally known as the Lafayette Square Opera House, can be restored to its former beauty, elegance, and utility, and it would certainly seem that a country which has spent tens of millions of dollars restoring foreign opera houses and other public buildings abroad could afford the small expenditure required to put the old Lafayette Square Opera House back into a proper and usable condition.

It may even be that in the immediate future we will have a President who will take pride in, and derive great pleasure from, being able to take a state guest across the park to a lovely opera house for an evening of ballet or opera or for a recital by some great American artist.

Not long ago, a group which wished to exhibit the work of student artists of a foreign country had to take their exhibit to a little public library on upper Connecticut Avenue, because Washington lacked a building in which such exhibits could be held.

The American Art League, one of the numerous groups combining their efforts within the organism of the Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, has pointed out that either the old Dolly Madison House or the Benjamin Tayloe House would serve ideally for exactly such purposes.

With organizations representing millions of citizens—national organizations such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Music Clubs, and the American National Theater and Academy, and such local entities as the D.C. Recreation Department, the Children's Theater of Washington, the Washington Ballet Guild and others—pleading for sympathetic understanding of the wisdom of saving the buildings and the atmosphere of Lafayette Square, we of the citizens committee feel that in coordinating and sparking these efforts we at least are not bringing "too little" effort to bear.

We have been heartened by a promise of public hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee and by pledges of assistance from many enlightened Members of Congress. However, this is a problem on which much additional support is needed and your readers are urged to assist where they think they can help.

CARL LEVIN,
*Chairman, Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square.*

## ACTIVITIES OF CYRUS EATON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, among this morning's bulletins from Paris was the story that Cyrus Eaton, a well-known American apologist for world communism, flew to Paris last night and held a conference with Khrushchev at the airport before the departure of the Kremlin dictator.

This is the latest of many incidents in which Mr. Eaton has meddled in the conduct of American foreign policy through personal meetings with officials of foreign governments. Mr. Eaton is only one of a growing number of private citizens who are making a fad out of Mecca-like pilgrimages to the Kremlin, constituting themselves as messengers from the United States to Khrushchev and from Khrushchev to the United States, and, in general, involving themselves in the worldwide propaganda operation of the Communist movement.

For the benefit of Eaton and others, I quote the key provision of the Logan Act which was passed in 1799.

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Cyrus Eaton is a materialistic, meddlesome, evil old man, who has been a useful tool of the Communist movement. He has made a habit of exchanging visits and gifts with Communist leaders. He has made a practice of criticizing the United States in Russia and praising Russia in the United States.

He is the object of continuing Communist accolades and awards, the latest being the Lenin Peace Prize.

It is in his statements that the best picture of Eaton himself emerges. I wish to quote for the RECORD what Mr. Eaton has said about the United States of America. On one occasion he said:

The scientist is conscious that the FBI is breathing down the back of his neck all the time, scaring him * * * we have even praised the FBI for violating the rights of free men. But if you were to take the police forces of the cities and of the countries and of the State and the governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such extensive spy organization as we have in this country today.

He accused Secretary Dulles, the Pentagon generals, and American politicians in general of "relentlessly driving us to war." He has said that American officials do not represent the American people—this is interesting—whereas in the Soviet Union the Government speaks in the name of all the people. He has said: "There is more spirit of war in the United States than in any other country in the world and it's dangerous."

He has publicly urged Canada to "completely disassociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs." If he has said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in this public meeting, then he has violated the express provision of the Logan Act and should be prosecuted.

So I direct the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Mr. Eaton has done.

Mr. Eaton has publicly praised Khrushchev's integrity, his popularity, his ability, his sense of humor, his honesty and his desire for peace. He described the completely phony disarmament plan Khrushchev announced to the United Nations as the "most statesmanlike utterance in my lifetime."

During questioning before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., he said that Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world; that Dr. Zhivago was suppressed because the fanatical young people of the Soviet Union cannot bear any criticism of their beloved government; that the Russian massacre of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon."

This is a man in the United States who is comparing what we did in Lebanon to the butchery of the Hungarian patriots by Khrushchev.

I say again that I urge the Attorney General to keep a special eye on Mr. Eaton and whenever he violates the letter of the Logan Act, as he has so frequently violated its spirit, the Government of the United States should move

promptly against him and against all others who unlawfully interfere with the conduct of American foreign policy.

I hope the Attorney General will carry out his duty. It is time we put an end to such activity in this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that he has brought to our attention a very pertinent and important factor in present-day American politics in its broadest sense. I think the Senator has done a service today by the very vigorous remarks he has made.

The strange aberrations of this man Eaton are not understandable to most of us. This incident serves only to illustrate how far the tolerance of the American people goes in the field of freedom of speech. We have tolerated the ununderstandable conduct and ununderstandable statements of this man simply because this is America, and we respect the right of free speech. However, as the Senator has pointed out, there is a limit, so far as the public good is concerned and so far as the public weal is concerned. There is a limit to so-called freedom. When freedom becomes license we have always recognized that it must be curbed. It must be curbed sensibly and unemotionally.

I congratulate the Senator on his statement. I think this is a matter to which we should pay more attention in the future than we have in the past. The peculiar mental gyrations of this man Eaton, who apparently has great affection for the Communist system and apparently has great admiration for the autocracy and dictatorshop or Russia, are not understandable. We should pay more attention to his utterances, because he happens to be a man of wealth, which fact enables him to indulge in publicity of this kind. It can do nothing, and has done nothing, but bring about very unfortunate difficulties for the United States.

One might go a little farther. Although I am not particularly charmed with this kind of an attitude, one might say, as has been said a few times in the past, when people do not seem to like the United States, want to tear down what we have done, and seem to love other systems, "Why do you not go there to live? Why do you not join the system for which you seem to have such great admiration, and simply abandon the citizenship which you do not seem to appreciate and the privileges which you do not seem to appreciate?"

I congratulate the Senator.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I point out that this latest performance by Eaton is particularly objectionable. His flight, apparently hurriedly, to Paris last night to greet Khrushchev at the airport, after the terrible incident in Paris yesterday, when Khrushchev called the President of the United States a thief and said all these dreadful things about our country and our President, is to me unconscionable. It is unforgivable that an American citizen would fly to Paris and confer with Khrushchev in the most cordial manner, as reported this morning. We do not know what was said. What he did was particularly offensive.

As the Senator has said, I am not at all taking the position that anyone should be denied his right to criticize his Government or any of us. I am simply pointing out to the Attorney General that there is a statute on the law books which forbids private citizens from entering into conversations or correspondence with the heads of other states concerning matters about the U.S. Government and its relations with other governments. That is the law of the land. I believe this man is violating the law. Some others may have been doing so as well. I think the Attorney General ought to prosecute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not, by the slightest suggestion, mean to indicate that I deny the right of an individual to criticize his government or to criticize me or anybody else.

Mr. DODD. Neither do I.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is an American privilege. I only wished to point out a moment ago that when free criticism reaches the point of injury to the general body politic of this country it is time we look into it very carefully.

I suggest also that although I, of course, am not a physician and have no medical competence, I have read about what has taken place, and a question is raised as to a matter of psychological quirk which might be investigated to some profit, so far as this man is concerned. There are evidently certain delusions of grandeur which are not well-founded on the record. It might be well to examine them a little more.

I congratulate the Senator again.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I agree with what he says and I emphatically agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. His statement was something which should have been said on the floor of the Senate. What he has said is right and appropriate, and I commend him for it.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

## SPY PLANE INCIDENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I discussed with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the fact that I was going to speak on the subject on which I am about to address the Senate, and he very kindly agreed that he would be present in the Senate today to discuss the matter with me.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in a statement took issue with Vice President NIXON, who disclosed in a speech in Buffalo that at the very time Mr. Khrushchev was making a speech before the United Nations, agents of our country arrested two Russian spies in this country, one of whom at least, I believe, was a member of the Russian mission to this country.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] took issue with the Vice President on his disclosure of that fact yesterday. In turn, I wish to take issue with the junior Senator from Tennessee.

In most fields of national defense, especially in the field of atomic energy tests and activities of that kind, the junior Senator from Tennessee and I are in very substantial agreement. I admire his zeal and his devotion to the problems involved in international affairs. However, I am sorry that in this instance I must disagree with him very definitely.

Since the U–2 incident was first publicly disclosed I had felt it was high time that we of the United States spread upon the record the days, the dates, and the names of those concerned with Communist espionage in this country over the past years. If we will lay that record before the people, in my judgment, we will find that no country in modern times has engaged in such a vast network of espionage, which has extended on occasions even into the U.S. Government itself. I believe it is high time that those activities should be documented publicly. I was earnestly hopeful that they might have been documented in Paris.

So far as the U–2 incident is concerned, there is no question that the Russians knew all along, and for a substantial period of time, that these overflights were occurring. It so happened that this particular incident occurred a short time prior to the conference which was supposed to be held this week in Paris, of which Mr. Khrushchev and the high command took advantage to torpedo the conference. If it had not been for the public knowledge of the U–2 incident, there is no doubt Mr. Khrushchev and his group would have found some other excuse to scuttle the conference.

To return to the criticism of Mr. NIXON by the Senator from Tennessee, I believe it is time that some statements were made, not alone concerning the 2 spies who were captured, but concerning the whole list of those who have spied in this country on behalf of Russia.

We talk much about overflights across Russia. To me there is little difference between a man walking along the ground and gathering information, a man riding in a train and gathering information, a man riding in a commercial airplane and gathering information, and a man flying at 50,000 feet and gathering information. The Russians have been gathering information in this country brazenly. We know that. We have had documentation of their activities.

But what the United States did in the interest of peace was to refrain from bringing these matters before the world, in the hope that a conference in Geneva could be operated on a basis of as much harmony as possible. Therefore I am quite sure that our purpose in refraining from bringing these activities before the Geneva Conference was to avoid contributing additional tensions. However, since the Russians have brought these occurrences before the world, I think we should likewise bring before the world the information which we have. I dis-

agree with the Senator from Tennessee in his criticism. I quote from this morning's issue of the New York Times. The Senator from Tennessee will correct me if this is a misquotation:

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. NIXON was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robber-treason technique," Mr. GORE said.

Mr. President, in all sincerity and in all friendship for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and in the light of our long and cordial association, I still say I believe he was unduly brutal and unduly harsh on the Vice President of the United States, who probably did as much as any other man in this country to point up the espionage ring which existed a few years ago in our country. I do not believe he merits criticism for revealing that activity.

The Vice President needs no defense for his own defense of the integrity of the American system. I believe he needs no defense for pointing out after the fact—and he pointed out only two instances of the scores which can be documented—that we refrained as a country from stirring up international tensions by making a big issue out of the spy incident in this country, so that we might have some basis of harmony on which to approach the discussions of peace and the discussions of international tensions.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is unduly harsh in his criticism, and I feel that he is unjustified in saying that, because the Vice President of the United States in his speech at Buffalo yesterday disclosed only two instances as an illustration, the Vice President should be charged with making cheap politics out of an issue of this kind.

As I said a moment ago, I regret every disagreement which I have with my friend from Tennessee, for in the majority of cases we find ourselves in substantial agreement on questions of international interest. But I do feel that this whole article is unwarranted, and I believe the attack by the Senator from Tennessee was unwarranted and unjustified. I do not believe that American public will accept it as a justifiable attack, under all the circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article from this morning's issue of the New York Times, written by Russell Baker, referring to this incident.

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

GORE CRITICIZES NIXON ON SUMMIT—CALLS TALK ON SOVIET SPIES A CAMPAIGN MOVE—FOUR TOP DEMOCRATS PRESS UNITY

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Senator ALBERT GORE shattered the domestic political calm over the collapse of the summit meeting with an attack today on Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S response to the Paris crisis.

It was the first open political clash to come out of the summit breakdown and it came while Democratic leaders for the third consecutive day were making extraordinary efforts to maintain a unified national front behind President Eisenhower.

Senator GORE, a Tennessee Democrat, did not criticize the President, or raise a question on events leading to the summit collapse, but he delivered a cutting denunciation of Mr. NIXON'S reaction to the news from Paris.

The Gore attack was provoked by the Vice President's speech in Buffalo today, in which Mr. NIXON gave hitherto secret reports of Soviet spies spotted in Springfield, Mass., during Premier Khrushchev's tour of this country last fall. Mr. NIXON in his speech also challenged the Democrats to investigate the President's refusal to apologize to Mr. Khrushchev in Paris.

While Democrats were "withholding criticism and pleading for unity," Senator GORE said, "Mr. NIXON is talking of how to be hard on communism, and how to deal with Communists, and giving forth about the arrest of Russian spies. Maybe the old NIXON is going to be nominated after all instead of the new."

Why, he asked, was new spy information being made public "in a campaign speech, only after the get-along-with-Khrushchev treadmill has come to a crashing halt?"

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. NIXON was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on both Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robber-treason technique," Mr. GORE said.

Other developments here in the wake of the Paris breakdown included these:

Disclosure that four leaders of the Democratic Party had cabled the President yesterday urging him "to convey to Premier Khrushchev the views of the opposition party in your country that he reconsider his suggestion for postponement of the summit conference until after the national elections in this country."

The message was signed by Sam Rayburn of Texas, Speaker of the House; Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, Democratic Senate leader; Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956, and J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A spokesman for the Republican National Committee said that sentiment was building to arrange a big homecoming demonstration in Washington for President Eisenhower when he returns from Europe Friday afternoon.

Congressional leaders quietly dispelled speculation that a special investigation of the administration's presummit maneuvers would be countenanced at the Capitol this year.

PROSPECTS FOR CONGRESS

The prospect was that questions about presummit maneuvers and reassessment of the national position in the wake of a new tough line from Moscow would be dealt with piecemeal in routine committee proceedings.

The renewal of the Democratic leadership's call for unity was based on fears that any deep division within the United States at this time might weaken its international position while new Soviet intentions were still uncertain.

Another factor was the disgust many Democratic leaders feel for the prospect of making grave international policy a partisan spectacle in this election year. Many of these same Democrats still resent Republican political exploitation of Korean war issues and do not want a Democratic reprisal.

One other factor is the expectation that President Eisenhower will receive a wave of public sympathy in reaction to Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris. At the moment, the Democrats are disposed to wait for the dust to settle before arguing background issues.

The Democratic leadership's message to the President was worked out at the Capitol Monday while Mr. Stevenson was there to testify on the use of television in political campaigns.

"We feel that total failure of the [summit] conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the world," it said.

"All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race and ever better relations between our countries. We ask you as the leader of this nation to see that these views are conveyed to Mr. Khrushchev."

Aside from its value as a demonstration to the Russians of the U.S. internal unity, the message was designed to destroy the idea that Mr. Khrushchev might get a better bargain by waiting for a new President to be elected. The Soviet Premier proposed postponing summit conferences until after the national election in the United States. Both parties are sensitive and angry about this Soviet interference in domestic politics.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the generous references of my friend and distinguished colleague, the able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. As he has done, I, too, wish to pay tribute to the warm friendship which he and I enjoy serving together, as we do, on two committees and having found ourselves upon many occasions not only personally agreeable to each other, which relation, I say to my friend, I have enjoyed thoroughly, but also many times we have had an affinity of views upon questions affecting our national security.

The Senator has just said there are many more cases which are being suppressed. Are they, too, to be fed out piecemeal for campaign oratory?

The essential question I raised yesterday was that of secrecy. Why has this information so long been withheld from the American people? If there are scores more, I call upon the Government of the United States to give this information to the American people. Secrecy in Government has gone entirely too far. I do not wish to refer to incidents prior to or involved in the regrettable tragedy of the Paris Conference. As other Members of the Senate have said, there will be a proper time to discuss our individual feelings of humiliation and that of our country. The proper time has already occurred to express resentment, which every American must have felt, at the insults heaped upon the President of the United States. I expressed my resentment on the floor of the Senate.

I do not wish now to make reference to other sentiments and views which I have withheld and will withhold until the proper time.

However, I am not sure that a suppression of the news involving Russian espionage in our country has contributed to peace. If there are scores of additional incidents, I call upon the Government to release the information to the American people.

I read from a dispatch from United Press International, of today:

The Vice President, who made the disclosure during a political swing through upstate New York—

I asked two questions yesterday. Why had this information been kept secret

from the American people since last September? When did these other score or more occur? Has that information been suppressed, too, for 6 or 8 or 10 months, or longer?

The second question I asked was, Why is it now made public in a political speech after the debacle in Paris? I interpret this as an effort to convert the tragedy in Paris to political advantage.

My friend the distinguished Senator from Iowa says that in that judgment I am harsh. I do not wish to reach harsh judgments, or to render brutal verdicts. I submit to the Senate the record and ask each Senator to determine for himself whether the cause of peace has been served by the suppression from the people of the United States, by secrecy, of information involving espionage attempts reaching into scores of incidents, as we are told; whether such secrecy is proper and in the public interest.

Each Senator may determine for himself whether this was a political use of information which heretofore had been denied the American people, but which on yesterday was used, according to the news dispatch, on a political swing through upstate New York.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. GORE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to the Senator's contention that this is information which has been kept secret, I certainly join him in saying that we should now make these cases public, that they should be documented and should be told to the world.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator goes further, I am glad that he joins me in that expression. Will he also join me in the suggestion or request that the Government of the United States, through its established agencies having jurisdiction, make this information public rather than making it public piecemeal through political speeches?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I was just approaching. It has been made public. It has been made public repeatedly over the years. I call the Senator's attention to the insertion in the RECORD of yesterday made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], at page 10548 of the RERORD, where there appears a list of 65 Russian spy cases, naming names, naming incidents which have occurred in the United States since 1946, which have had full publicity and which are known. I shall not repeat the names now; they are all printed in the RECORD beginning at page 10548. To supplement that information, there is listed a very substantial number of foreign cases in which Russian spies have been convicted, and sentenced in most cases—activities in Switzerland, West Germany, Greece, Japan. I shall not take the time to delineate all of them, but they are in the RECORD. These are all cases that have been made public, but the last two the Senator refers to were apparently the most recent ones that had occurred.

The American public and the world should know these things. They should know that the Russians have been the masters of espionage in the world, and have probably exceeded all other countries in the world in espionage. I think it is high time we let that fact be known. I did not think we should stir up this situation prior to the great attempt at the summit to achieve a peaceful solution of the tensions of the world. I thought it wise not to bring up these irritants beforehand.

However, now that Mr. Khrushchev has found this "fish out of water"; now that he has disclosed what the intentions of the Russians are, and that he has no intention of seeking a solution of world tensions on any realistic basis, I think the time has come for us to tell the world exactly and to emphasize exactly what the Russians have been doing in the field of espionage, and thus lay the activities of most of the other countries in the shade.

However, that list was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and is now available for all to see.

Mr. GORE. I again shall decline to refer to the assumptions upon which the U.S. approach to the summit conference was rationalized. At the proper time, I shall address the Senate upon that and related subjects. I do not regard today as the proper time to do that.

I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Iowa if the list to which he refers, which appears in the RECORD, as I understand, and is available only this morning, and therefore was not printed before the disclosures in the upstate New York political swing yesterday, includes the two instances in September, to which the Vice President referred.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A cursory reading of the list indicates that they do not appear. I cannot find them in the list at the moment. The list comprises one column on page 10548, three columns on page 10549, and one and three-quarters columns on page 10550. So upon a quick examination, I cannot say whether the two cases are included. However, it is my impression that the list does not include those two cases.

Mr. GORE. One question seems to remain between us. The Senator from Iowa has joined with me in a request and a suggestion that a full disclosure of Soviet espionage efforts be made public. Would the Senator also join with me in asking that such information be released by the departments and agencies of the Government having jurisdiction over such matters, and of whom, I feel certain, the representatives of the free press will soon make inquiry, rather than to have it fed to the public piecemeal in a political campaign for political advantage and use?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I must say to the Senator from Tennessee that I would not necessarily support a full disclosure of all espionage cases in this country, for the very reason that the American self-interest and security might not warrant such a disclosure. In certain cases, if knowledge of espionage activities were disclosed at the present time, it might give information to the enemy, to the detriment of the United States. There are some cases which cannot be disclosed at the time they are discovered, and should not be disclosed. They should be kept very secret, simply because of the techniques which are used. The espionage effort in which the Russians are engaged is a very clever game.

Generally speaking, I believe the number of cases which can be disclosed without harm to the national security and without harm to our friends should be documented, so as to counter the Soviet espionage activities. I think such cases should be disclosed. It does not make any difference to me how they are disclosed, but I think the circumstances of them should be available to the public.

I had hoped, for instance, that if the conference took place, and Mr. Khrushchev began to make much of the so-called U–2 incident, the President would have with him a list of Soviet espionage cases to throw right back in Khrushchev's face. But the conference did not take place. I do not know whether what I have suggested would have been done. However, I had hoped we would be prepared to do that.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator, in replying to my question, instead of answering it, has raised two more questions.

Shall the Vice President, in a political campaign, determine what shall be secret and what shall not be secret? The Senator from Iowa says it does not make much difference to him as to how such information is released. I say that is a matter of propriety and importance. It is one of the two principal issues I raised. The other was secrecy. The Senator from Iowa has said that in some cases the interests of this country might well be served by disclosure. If so, I am willing to have the proper authorities make that determination.

However, I wonder if the Senator would agree that any information which can be disclosed in a political speech, to be specific, should, in an orderly way, be made available to the American people and the free press by the agencies of Government having proper jurisdiction?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see no reason why any information along that line, the release of which would not be detrimental to the activities of the United States, should not be disclosed to everybody or should not be made available to everybody.

Mr. GORE. Shall it remain classified until a candidate for political office decides that it may be fortuitous to release such information?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I do not believe in the system of classification by convenience, and I never have. I do not think what the Senator says is necessarily so. Nevertheless, I think it is high time that the Government disclose to the American people what is taking place. So far as I know, the only persons who can disclose it are the officials who know about it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Iowa has used some rather strong language. It is not the most pleasant experience

that one can have in this body to have one of his esteemed colleagues and friends say that he has reached a brutal judgment. I thought I reached an entirely justified judgment. I thought I raised proper questions. I think the record bears me out.

I ask the Senator again, specifically and pointedly, since he has joined with me in a request that such information as will not be injurious to the national interest be disclosed to the public, will he also join with me in the request that the agencies concerned reach such a determination and disclose the information to the public, rather than reserve it until a candidate for political office, in an upstate swing in New York, or in a political swing in some other State, decides it is fortuitous to release it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not joined with the Senator from Tennessee in any particular request. I have merely stated that I think the spying activities of the Kremlin which are taking place in this country and elsewhere should be documented and disclosed to this country and to the rest of the world, except in those cases where it would be a disservice to our own national security or the national security of our allies to disclose individual incidents.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Iowa does not wish to join with me in that request, I join with him in what he has said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I welcome the Senator's statement. So far as my accusing the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal is concerned, I did not intend to accuse the Senator of being brutal. I think the phrase I used was that I thought he was unduly harsh in his criticism. I take it there is a little difference in the connotations of "brutality" and "harshness."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think "harsh" is a little less brutal than "brutal."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification with appreciation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would never accuse the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal, because he is not a brutal man. It is not his instinct to be brutal.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, I think the Senator from Tennessee on occasion, perhaps, can put himself in a position where I think he is undoubtedly harsh, and without doubt I can put myself in a position where the Senator from Tennessee may think I am unduly harsh. I think there is a difference; and I do not wish to have the RECORD indicate that I am accusing the Senator from Tennessee of brutality, because that is furthest from my thought.

Mr. GORE. I may have been accused of worse, I may say.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, those of us who have been in politics for some years have been accused of a great many things, and we get used to that.

But so far as concerns disclosing something in a political campaign, let me say that political campaigns are for the purpose of discussing the issues. I take it the Senator from Tennessee is raising the objection because of the fact the Vice President disclosed the incident referred to in connection with a speech on what might be considered to have been a political occasion. I see no reason why he should not have disclosed it. I do not know that it was classified information beforehand. It may have been; I have no knowledge about that.

But I repeat that I think the world should know with some detail of the activities of the Kremlin. And regardless of what may be considered the wise way to issue such information, I think it should be put out. I think it should be laid down for all to see; and then I think it would answer, or should answer, the questions asked by a number of well-meaning people in this country.

I have received letters from several persons who have had the effrontery to say that we should apologize to the Russians—although most of the letters I have received have expressed just the opposite view. But when the few who favor the making of an apology realize what we have done by way of gathering necessary information to protect the security of this country, as against what the Russians are planning to do over there, from a military standpoint, and when they consider what our country has done by way of gathering such information and what the Russians have done in this country for years and years and years, I think such persons will change their opinion as to the desirability and the necessity of our securing information as to what the enemy is plotting against us.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not press my friend further.

I shall close by recalling that as soon as I heard the report that the Russian dictator had demanded an ignoble apology by the President of the United States, I rose on the floor of the Senate and expressed resentment, and said the American people could be confident that the President of the United States, the embodiment of America's pride and hopes for peace, would respond as a gentleman of honor.

---

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON AT JAMESTOWN, VA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, Mrs. Talmadge and I had the privilege of joining the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in attending the impressive ceremonies held at Jamestown Island, Va., commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine, which honors the founder of the first Protestant church in America. The combined services were sponsored by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, with the cooperation of the Bruton Parish Church, the College of William and Mary, the Colonial National Historical Park, Colonial Williamsburg, and the Jamestown Foundation.

The principal address of the occasion was delivered by the respected junior Senator from Virginia, and was an eloquent and stirring tribute to the unwavering faith in God and stanch adherence to the tenets of freedom of our Founding Fathers. It was an inspiring experience; and I came away with the firm conviction that it would be beneficial, indeed, if every man and woman in public life in America could visit and see for themselves this historic site from which have sprung the institutions of liberty which have given us on this continent the greatest and freest Nation in the history of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the remarks of the junior Senator from Virginia on that occasion be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

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

### FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the 353d anniversary of the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown, Va., May 15, 1960)

On this 353d anniversary of the landing of English settlers at Jamestown, I welcome the privilege of joining with distinguished church leaders in paying tribute to the memory of Robert Hunt, the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement who served in that capacity until his death in July of 1608. The fact that those first settlers had a deep and abiding faith in the teachings of the Bible is not as well known as the faith of those who settled at Plymouth 13 years later. The latter had come to a new land in search of religious freedom, whereas the Virginia settlers had come in search of gold. But members of the church of England had made a substantial contribution to the London Co. which financed the Jamestown settlement on the condition that it could send with the first settlers a chaplain and the further condition that the Christian religion would be brought to the savages of the North American Continent. Evidently, therefore, the first chaplain, Robert Hunt, was chosen by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his work was highly praised by Capt. John Smith who said that he was "an honest, religious and courageous divine." Smith also said of the first religious services at Jamestown: "We had daily common prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two sermons, and every 3 months the holy communion, till our minister died: but our prayers daily, with an homily on Sundays, we continued 2 or 3 years after, till more preachers came: and surely God did most mercifully hear us."

At the untimely death of their rector, at about 40 years of age, the colonists not only paid tribute to the religious and social work that he had done among them but to his readiness to defend the settlement, upon any alarm as quickly as any man and of his constant encouragement to the men at Jamestown to persist in their attempt to plant a successful colony. Again, when the first session of the assembly met in 1619 (incidentally, the first elected governing body ever to serve in this country) the first order of business was a prayer by Reverend Buck, then the minister at Jamestown. That action was noted in the records of the assembly in the following terms: "But for as much as men's affairs do little prosper where God's service is neglected; all the Burgesses took their places in the choir, till a prayer was said by Mr. Buck, the minister, that it

would please God to guide us and sanctify all our proceedings to his own glory, and the good of this plantation."

In the Senate of the United States we have an organization known as the Breakfast Group, which meets each Wednesday morning at 8:30 for breakfast and then for a 30-minute discussion of some religious topic for which some member is designated each week as the leader. I am proud of the fact that four members of that Breakfast Group have accompanied me to Williamsburg and Jamestown not only to join in our tribute to the memory of the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement but also to indicate their appreciation of the significance in the subsequent development of the most powerful nation in the world, of the religious faith that was translated into George Mason's Bill of Rights, into Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, and into the Philadelphia Constitution of 1787, all of which are based upon the teachings of the Bible.

Needless to say, all members of our Senate group share the sentiments concerning this historic area of the Old Dominion expressed by Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument when he said: "We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it, nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended."

Last night we were privileged to see a moving picture made for use during the Jamestown celebration of 1957 which, among other things, depicted the debate in the House of Burgesses concerning the oppression of the sister colony of Massachusetts by the British Crown and the adoption on May 24, 1774, of the following resolution:

"This House, being deeply impressed with apprehension of the great dangers, to be derived to British America, from the hostile invasion of the city of Boston, in our sister colony of Massachusetts Bay, whose commerce and harbor are, on the first day of June next, to be stopped by an armed force, deem it highly necessary that the said first day of June be set apart, by the members of this House, as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, devoutly to implore the divine interposition, for averting the heavy calamity which threatens destruction to our civil rights, and the evils of civil war; to give us one heart and one mind firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to American rights; and that the minds of His Majesty and his Parliament may be inspired from above with wisdom, moderation, and justice, to remove from the loyal people of America all cause of danger, from a continued pursuit of measures, pregnant with their ruin.

"*Ordered*, therefore, that the Members of this House do attend in their places, at the hour of 10 in the forenoon, on the said 1st day of June next, in order to proceed with the Speaker, and the mace, to the church in this city, for the purposes aforesaid; and that the Reverend Mr. Price be appointed to read prayers, and the Reverend Mr. Gwatkin, to preach a sermon, suitable to the occasion."

George Washington, who helped to frame that resolution of 1774 knelt in the snows of Valley Forge to ask the help of God to carry on an unequal military struggle for independence and it was Washington who was presiding over the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in the summer of 1787 when his friend, Benjamin Franklin said: "In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Again, in 1789, Washington said in his inaugural address: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

All Members of the Congress, and I assume that laymen generally, are aware of the fact that the Soviet Union possesses intercontinental missiles capable of reaching any part of our Nation in the course of some 25 or 30 minutes after being fired, that the hydrogen warhead of those missiles has a destructive force for a radius of 10 miles or more, that the fallout from such a missile will poison the exposed food and water supplies for a radius of several hundred miles and that we have no adequate nor satisfactory defense against a missile attack of that character. And since we can fire a nuclear weapon from a submerged submarine, it is only reasonable to assume that the Soviet Union has the same capability. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in the event of an all-out nuclear war, our casualties in the first few days of such a conflict would be tabulated in terms of millions.

It is, therefore, with the hope of staying the hand of a possible aggressor that in recent years we have been devoting more than one-half of the total tax revenue of our Government for the operation and development of our Defense Establishment.

In our visit today to this historic area whose contribution to the birth of our Nation should never be forgotten, we should be acutely conscious of the fact that we are as much in need for God's help as were the 3 million relatively poor and untrained colonists in their struggle for freedom against the then strongest military power in the world. The recent destruction in Russia of a CIA observation plane indicates how easily a cold war could suddenly turn into a shooting war. It illustrates the urgent need for a program of international disarmament, while at the same time casting a grave shadow over prospects for a successful summit conference in Paris.

By our presence here where our experiment in representative democracy started, where our concept of personal liberty under God was proclaimed to the world, the Members of our Senate Breakfast Group desire to indicate our deep concern over the fact that at a time when our beloved Nation is threatened from without by a deadly foe she also is threatened by destruction from within by spiritual indifference and moral deterioration.

The conflict of deepest concern is not might against superior might. The major issue which faces us today is this: Will America accept the moral challenge of this hour, as she has accepted the military challenge of past years, or will she allow this glorious opportunity to slip from her grasp forever?

This, my friends, is the world leadership to which we are called: to stand before the nations of the entire world and say with young David: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I came to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts."

In stemming the tide of the anti-God ideology of communism—the unseen forces of a mighty God are on our side, and we can go confidently forward in the power of His might when we take Him at His word as He says: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, so that I may comment on the same matter?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had the honor and the privilege of attending the ceremonies commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America, and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine on Sunday, May 15, at Jamestown Island.

As has already been mentioned, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered an outstanding address on our heritage as a nation and our obligation to preserve it.

It was 353 years ago on May 13 that three small ships, the *Discovery*, the *Godspeed*, and the *Susan Constant*, dropped anchor at an island in Virginia, which the settlers immediately named Jamestown.

The little settlement at Jamestown passed through many crises; and I am confident that the story is familiar to everyone who has read our early history.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Library, has said:

> No other spot in either hemisphere carries so much significance as Jamestown.

On this occasion we were again commemorating the fact that the landing with not only the beginning of a new nation, but it was also the beginning of religious worship in our Nation.

It should be remembered that the settlers who landed at Jamestown were in many instances very religious people. The first thing they did when they landed on the sandy soil of Point Comfort was to erect a cross. And when they reached Jamestown Island, they took some of the sails from the ship and made a tent-chapel in which they thanked God for a safe voyage. The pastor of the colony was a remarkable man by the name of Robert Hunt.

In 1907, the dioceses of Virginia, southern Virginia, and West Virginia dedicated a memorial to the Reverend Robert Hunt, in the form of a handsome bronze relief tablet. It was at that spot that our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, delivered his stirring address.

This monument and the restoration of Williamsburg are not only memorials; they are also reminders to every American citizen of the sacrifices our forefathers endured in order to establish a true Republic based on the rights of the individual.

The Nation is indebted to the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for his foresight and his dedication in preserving these historical landmarks for all generations. It was his aim to recreate a shrine where great events of colonial history might be visualized in their proper setting, and where a revival of crafts, music, and literature would not only comprise major activities of the city of Williamsburg, but also would bring to the 20th century an appreciation of the important cultural gifts it has received from colonial times.

In this age, we of this generation must again rededicate ourselves to the principles of those who have gone before. We must, as the settlers of old, again give thanks to divine providence for the many blessings that have befallen this Nation, and at the same time pray for divine guidance in order that this heritage may be preserved for future generations.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on last Sunday, May 15, it was my privilege to attend the ceremonies at Jamestown Island, commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine. We met there to pay honor to these and other early settlers who founded our great Nation, and to rededicate ourselves to their basic principles in meeting the problems of today.

The speaker for this occasion was well chosen indeed, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He did a masterful job, just as always, in paying tribute to those patriotic and spiritual leaders who settled and founded this Nation. His interesting and inspiring message held the audience of more than 1,000 people in rapt attention.

Mr. President, I also wish to mention briefly the fine contribution Colonial Williamsburg is making in enlightening our people of our early history, and in inspiring the members of this generation to adhere more closely to those principles on which our Nation was founded. While we were at Williamsburg, the flags were at half-mast, in memory of that great benefactor who made Colonial Williamsburg possible, the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to whom this and all future generations owe a great debt. The administration of Colonial Williamsburg is most ably directed by its president, Mr. Carlisle H. Humelsine.

Again, I congratulate the junior Senator from Virginia on his masterful address, which is worthy of the careful reading and study of each Member of the Congress. I am happy it is being placed in the RECORD, thereby being made available to all citizens of our Nation.

## THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week I made a lengthy statement to the Senate on the fallacy of the test ban. Among other things, I warned that if the Kremlin were to beat us to a major technological breakthrough, we might shortly find ourselves confronted with a choice between surrender and annihilation. One of the possible breakthroughs which I mentioned was the development of a neutron bomb.

Commenting on my statement, Newsweek Periscope for this week said:

THE DODD BOMB A DUD

Senator THOMAS J. DODD's demands for information on the neutron bomb—a weapon that supposedly kills by radiation alone without blast or heat—will be ignored. Reason: There is no such device. Scientists explained that they know no way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. (A reactor would do it, but bombers don't drop reactors on the enemy.)

I have the greatest respect for Newsweek. In general, I think its reporting reflects a careful regard for the truth. In this case, however, I feel that Newsweek could not have read my statement too carefully and that they were, in addition, the victims of calculated misinformation from pro-test-ban sources.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement in respect to the neutron bomb be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would, in short, operate as a kind of death ray.

I have heard that, in the light of present theoretical knowledge, the neutron bomb is no more questionable than the hydrogen bomb was 6 months before it was demonstrated that one could be built. Although there have been a few fragmentary references to the neutron bomb in the press, I was told, when I tried to obtain more information, that the matter was classified. When I pressed my physicist friend further, he threw up his hands in despair and said: "You must forgive me, I have never heard of a neutron."

I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

The current issue of Foreign Affairs contains a remarkable article on the question of the test ban by Dr. Freeman J. Dyson. Dr. Dyson quotes a paragraph from a report by the prominent Soviet physicist, L. L. Artsimovitch entitled "Research on Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions in the U.S.S.R.," printed in December 1958. Let me read this paragraph very slowly:

"It may also be possible to realize a pulsed thermonuclear reaction under conditions in which the high temperature is produced by a charge of conventional explosive (such as TNT or something more powerful) which surrounds a capsule containing heavy hydrogen. Without dwelling on the experimental details, we may note that conditions have been found under which the generation of neutrons in hydrogen reactions has been established reliably and reproducibly. In experiments carried out in 1952, there is no doubt that we have observed neutrons which are formed as a result of the heating of matter to extremely high temperatures."

From this, it is apparent that the Russians were experimenting with fission-free hydrogen devices as far back as 1952 and that, as a corollary of this, they have for years had some understanding of the possibilities of the neutron bomb.

Once upon a time there was no hydrogen bomb. But there were a few scientists, a tiny but brave minority, who said it could be made and who urged that we embark on a crash program of development, lest the Kremlin beat us to it. At that time we had a President, Harry Truman, who gave the facts to the people. Had he not done so, had he not enjoyed the public support that only comes from understanding, the production of the H bomb might have been deferred beyond that fateful day in 1953 when the Soviets exploded their own first H bomb.

I believe President Eisenhower owes a similar duty to the American people in the case of the neutron bomb. The President should tell the people what the scientists told him. Not to do so would be a dereliction that can only lead to the most dangerous kind of speculation.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Newsweek article said there is no such device as a neutron bomb. I never said that there was. I simply said that there were many scientists who were convinced it could be made. The Newsweek article implies I said that scientists know of a way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. I said no such thing. I said that there was no theoretical reason why a neutron bomb could not be produced, and I implied that there were quite a few scientists who considered the project practicable. I said that if such a bomb were produced, a burst of neutrons would be the primary, but not the exclusive manner in which it released its energy.

For the record at this point, I want to say that I checked all of the facts in my statement carefully, not with one expert or even two experts, but in most cases with either three or four experts in the field. I am convinced that my facts were accurate.

For the record, too, I would like to point out that there have been references to the possibility of producing a neutron bomb in a number of scholarly publications. For example, the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. F. J. Dyson, in the article in Foreign Affairs which I have quoted, said:

There seems to be no law of nature forbidding the construction of fission-free bombs. The question remains whether this theoretical possibility is likely soon to be realized.

There are some very able physicists who believe that the neutron bomb—which would be a fission-free bomb—is

in the cards for the next few years. There are other physicists who believe that it may be a very long time away.

There were many scientists who said the A-bomb could not be built. There were many more, including Dr. Hans Bethe, the President's chief adviser on the test ban, who said the H-bomb could not be built. I have seen it stated that our ICBM program was delayed for 2 years because Dr. Vannevar Bush held the project was impractical. In general, it would be fair to say that the pessimists have been proved wrong and the optimists have been proved right.

Personally, I see the greatest resemblance between the situation that obtains today on the question of the neutron bomb and the situation that obtained in the immediate postwar period, on the question of developing the hydrogen bomb. At that time, there were many scientists who were so horrified by Hiroshima that they were emotionally opposed to the development of even more terrible weapons of destruction. Sometimes they would say the H-bomb could not be made. At other times they would say that, even if it could be made, it should not be made.

There was no willful sabotage. On the other hand, the human mind being what it is, I am convinced that those scientists who were emotionally opposed to the creation of an H-bomb, were disposed, by virtue of this opposition, to be pessimistic and defeatist. Since they felt it should not be done, they argued that it could not be done. In fact, they actually believed it could not be done because, as I see it, their terror and their sense of guilt robbed them of their capacity for scientific as well as political judgment.

Where would we be today if it had not been for the handful of brave and persistent scientists who took the stand that, precisely because the H-bomb was so horrible, the free world could not permit the Kremlin to beat it to it?

Once again we are confronted with a situation in which a minority of scientists take the stand that radically new types of nuclear weapons probably will be built, and, if they are built, we must build them first. On the other hand, there are those who have grave misgivings about any qualitative or quantitative expansion in the field of nuclear weaponry, and who, not very surprisingly, question the feasibility of any major breakthrough. In the present critical situation, whose words shall we take? The word of those scientists who say "we should not" and "we cannot," or the word of those who say "we must" and "we can"? I think this question is most effectively answered by recent history.

## ARMED FORCES DAY: DEDICATION OF U.S. POWER FOR PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 21, the Nation—as proclaimed by President Eisenhower—will observe Armed Forces Day. In 1960 the overall theme for the observances is "Power for Peace."

Across the Nation, special activities will be undertaken to promote greater public understanding of the need of power for peace. The programs will include:

Paying tribute to men and women of our armed services for their contribution to our security;

Stressing the civilian-military teamwork that, historically, has preserved our freedom;

Displaying the land, sea, air and space weapons and equipment to illustrate the scope of our power for peace;

Creating greater understanding of the need for such defenses as a deterrent to aggression; and

Rededicating ourselves to the traditional U.S. policy of utilizing such Armed Forces—mighty and powerful—only for defense, halting aggression, or for promoting stability in areas threatened by outside forces.

Mr. President, last night for 2½ hours Mr. Khrushchev had the television stations of this country opened for his abuse, for his tirade. I could not help thinking, Will there be reciprocity in that respect for the President of the United States and the people who want to speak on the subject, to tell the people of the Kremlin the true story.

Khrushchev, we know, sort of "let the cat out of the bag." He said that when he was at Camp David he was going to ask the President about the trips such as the flight of the U–2, but he did not, for the President was so kindly then. Khrushchev has known for years that in order to protect our own country and to protect the West we have been seeking to get the facts of life in relation to the Kremlin and what it is doing. We have seen the threats. We have seen countries taken over; for instance, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Baltic States, and part of Finland. The world knows that, but it has a tendency to fall asleep.

In a crisis-weary world, all of us yearn for the time—yet somewhere in the unforeseeable future—when we can beat our swords into plowshares and turn a vast volume of resources, manpower and brainpower to programs that will benefit—not threaten to destroy—mankind.

The turn of world events at the Paris meeting, however, provides us more evidence of the need for maintaining a strong defense, coordinated with our allies, as a matter of self-interest and security.

The tantrums of Premier Khrushchev—pounding the table, spewing insults, shouting threats and "flexing his missiles"—regrettably recalls images of tirades and tyrants of the past. The world, I believe, would rather forget such bad memories.

In the face of such emotional outbursts—created by "cooked up" rather than real factors—the thermometer readings of the global temperature—or perhaps, more accurately, "temper"—regrettably are "shooting up." As a world leader, however, we need—as President Eisenhower so nobly demonstrated in Paris—to be calm and cool, making reasoned evaluations (a) of the impact of Mr. Khrushchev's antics and (b) insofar as possible, an assessment of what it really means as a greater threat to world peace.

The Armed Forces Day observances, I believe, offer a real opportunity not to illustrate counter "rocket-rattling" but rather a rededication to peace; at the same time, the defense displays themselves, I believe, will be ample worry to any enemy that—if attacked—we are ready, willing and able to defend ourselves, and world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, several Armed Forces Day statements on its purposes and objectives.

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

### ARMED FORCES DAY STATEMENTS

Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of Treasury: "On this Armed Forces Day, all Americans join in paying tribute to the men and women of our armed services who are making such a vital contribution to the strength and security of our country. The preservation of our free way of life depends in large measure upon their faithful and efficient performance of duty. However, the responsibility for keeping America strong rests not only upon our Military Establishment, but also upon the dedicated efforts of all our citizens to maintain a vigorous and progressive economy. Let us all go forward, therefore, in the common effort to build an America capable of playing its full part in the maintenance of world peace."

Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army: "The U.S. Army proudly joins in the observance of Armed Forces Day. Designated for public celebration throughout the Nation, it is a fitting reminder of the civilian-military teamwork that has played—and will continue to play—such an essential part in the preservation of our way of life."

W. B. Franke, Secretary of the Navy: "The Armed Forces Day slogan, 'Power for Peace,' means not only the military might of the United States but the power of 178 million Americans—aware of their responsibilities—working daily within the framework of our Constitution to maintain freedom and bring about a lasting world peace. We of the Navy—which steadfastly upholds the cause of freedom and peace—invite our fellow Americans to visit with us on Armed Forces Day 1960."

Dudley C. Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force: "Armed Forces Day gives all Americans an opportunity to join in grateful tribute to the men and women of our military services. We acknowledge that their strength is our best hope of peace and our assurance of survival. On this day the Air Force salutes its sister services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Also, the Air Force opens its bases to the public and is glad to welcome its many friends so that they may become better acquainted with the Air Force and the part it plays in the defense of our country and our allies."

Gen. N. F. Twining, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: "To an important extent the effectiveness of the Armed Forces is dependent upon the intelligent support of the American people. The observance of Armed Forces Day is one of the traditional opportunities for the men and women in uniform to explain and demonstrate to our fellow Americans the adequacy of our equipment, training, and combat strength. An honest appraisal of our defenses should convince the public that we are using, and will continue to use, our available resources to the best advantage in our national interest."

Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army: "Each year, Armed Forces Day offers the American people an opportunity to see at firsthand how their Military Establishment is accomplishing its missions in the defense of our Nation. The United States Army extends a cordial invitation to all Americans to visit its posts and activities on Armed Forces Day—1960."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations: "The Navy has made great strides forward in technology, but the ultimate weapon of defense is still the alert, dedicated individual, both in and out of the Armed Forces. On this Armed Forces Day we invite our fellow countrymen to visit our bases, inspect our facilities, and meet our Navy men and women in order that they may become better informed of the status of their Navy."

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: "On this 11th Armed Forces Day, we in the U.S. Air Force rededicate ourselves to the preservation of freedom and continued peace.

"Our Air Force is a powerful deterrent to aggression. While our Nation will never commit aggression, we must stand ever ready to defend our freedom.

"We salute our sister services, proud of our position on the integrated defense team which serves to protect our cherished heritage."

Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps: "Armed Forces Day, 1960, is an excellent opportunity for Americans to become better acquainted with their Armed Forces and with the vital role played by each of the services in maintaining our national security. The U.S. Marine Corps, our Nation's amphibious force in readiness, extends a hearty 'welcome aboard' to one and all."

Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard: "In these difficult times, it is imperative that our Nation maintain a strong and efficient Military Establishment. I urge, therefore, that all Americans take advantage of this Armed Forces Day to find out what is being done to protect our hard-won heritage of freedom."

## SENATOR WILEY SAYS WASHINGTON WORKLOAD PREVENTS HIS ADDRESSING REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, BUT RESTATES OFFER TO CAMPAIGN AFTER PRIMARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following is the text of a message I sent to Mr. Claude Jasper, chairman of the Republican Party of Wisconsin:

I find that it will be impossible for me to address Republican convention this year. Critical world situation, legislation of vital interest to Wisconsin, and important weekend conference demand my presence in Nation's Capital. I stand ready, however, to assist after the primary. The year 1960 offers the Republican Party of Wisconsin a new opportunity to serve the people both in the State legislature and the U.S. Congress. The programs endorsed by the convention will go a long way toward showing the voters that we are ready, willing and able to meet the economic and political problems facing State and Nation. Ours must be a party responsive to the challenges of today. With warmest regards to all my friends, I remain,

Sincerely,

## THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the tragic events which affect the destiny of the free world, with consequences no one can foresee, are naturally absorbing the attention of all public-spirited Americans and even more particularly of those who, like ourselves, are charged with responsibility in Government.

Public opinion is still confused and uncertain as to what may be the consequences of these events. I think it useful therefore that the comments on the contemporary crisis of three well-known and distinguished columnists be brought to the attention of as wide an audience as possible, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first, by Mr. Walter Lippmann, was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and is entitled "First of All." The second is by James Reston and published in this morning's New York Times, entitled "The Summit Tragedy." The third is an article written by Drew Pearson, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Ike's Hopes Crashed With U–2."

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

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin?

It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are hard words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to "stage a worldwide readiness exercise" which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the "exercise" was just a shade worse than sending off the U–2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates' "exercise" was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the "exercise" to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the "exercise."

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion, and mainstay of the non-Communist world, cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

---

[From the New York Times]

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY—BREAKDOWN OF PARLEY SHAKES WORLD'S FAITH IN WISDOM OF TOP LEADERS

(By James Reston)

PARIS, May 18.—The tragedy of the Paris Conference, which ended tonight, is that it shook the confidence of the world in the wisdom and judgment of the two nations that hold the key to war and peace.

What troubled Paris tonight was not primarily what President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would do now—which nobody knows—but the realization that the two most powerful nations in the world are also the least experienced of the great powers: both subject to the element of accident, to the ingrained habits of the past and to the whims of personal pride and caprice.

This was the conference that everyone lost. It did something no one thought possible; it outfailed the Paris Conference of 1919. After 41 years President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President de Gaulle made Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando look good.

It was this sense of uncertainty about the giants of the world that dominated the atmosphere in Paris today. Here was Mr. Khrushchev this afternoon in the great hall of the Palais de Chaillot shouting at the West, paying deference to the glowering Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky on his left and threatening to smash American planes like an impudent cat against a wall.

EISENHOWER SILENT AND ANGRY

Here, too, was the President of the United States, angry and silent, visiting cathedrals while his allies praised his dignity and sympathized with the failure of his last great chance for an East-West accommodation, but condemned in private his absent-minded behavior on the reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union.

Everyone was trying to be very considerate and hopeful about the mess, but all had to admit it was a mess, brought on by the unplanned blunders of Washington and the savage planned reaction of Moscow.

The general reaction to the two men was quite different. One was restrained, the other was violent; one was silent and defensive today, the other loud and offensive.

One was trying to remove misunderstandings, the other was exploiting them. But the main point was that both were shaking the world, one by accident and the other by design.

The nub of the whole thing seemed to be that both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, for different reasons, had lost control over the direction of the immense power they are supposed to govern.

The fact that the President came here and announced that he grounded all flights over the Soviet Union for the rest of his term in office is clear enough proof that, if he had been aware of the fact of these flights at this sensitive moment, he would not have approved the flight of the U–2 that was downed in Soviet territory on May 1.

CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES SHAKEN

The President has conceded this here in his private talks with Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle. They do not condemn his objective or his personal motives; in fact, he is so obviously disappointed by the melancholy turn of events since the sky-spy case that the British and French leaders are more sympathetic to him now than ever before.

Nevertheless, the lack of control and discipline over the Central Intelligence Agency by General Eisenhower, and the failure of the State Department to retain civil authority over the administration's intelligence-gathering activities have inevitably shaken the confidence of the Allies in the judgment of the Nation that is their primary line of defense.

Mr. Khrushchev lost control too, apparently for different reasons. General Eisenhower led his party out of isolationism, but Mr. Khrushchev has been engaged in the even more delicate operation of fraternizing with the "capitalist enemy."

By doing so, he was going against the militant Communist philosophy that nothing matters except the class struggle. Many of his own powerful associates in the Communist Party's Central Committee apparently did not approve of the manner in which he was hobnobbing with the capitalists, and the Chinese Communists felt that this whole process of itinerant good fellowship was bound to create what they called ideological confusion within the Communist world.

So long as it appeared that Mr. Khrushchev might sweet talk the Russians into West Berlin, his jaunts were tolerated. But when this dream began to fail, and particularly when it was discovered that President Eisenhower was responsible for sending the U–2's over Soviet territory, the other leaders of the Soviet Union, it is felt here, demanded change—with or without Mr. Khrushchev's approval.

Western leaders who were present at the Monday meeting at the Elysée Palace with Mr. Khrushchev got the impression that the Premier was nervous and perhaps even a little unhappy in his about-face role. But by this afternoon, he was as hard as Vyacheslav M. Molotov and as vivid and vituperative as Andrei Y. Vishinsky.

The last time Mr. Khrushchev saw Paris he was the benign and jovial Mr. K. He made a special point then with President de Gaulle that their conversations should be held without anyone present except the interpreters.

JOVIALITY IS PUT ASIDE

This week all was changed. The jovial Mr. K became the arm-waving naughty Nik, and Marshal Malinovsky was there as a witness of his every word and move, even when Mr. Khrushchev said goodby to President de Gaulle.

None of this was missed by the press of the world or the diplomatic corps of Paris, and the inevitable reaction was not only that the giants were quarreling—which always terrifies the world—but that they were blundering in a most extraordinary way.

This was particularly true of Mr. Khrushchev after he got well into his new role. He overplayed every card he had. He was rude and primitive. He was not only a boor, but what is worse in Paris, he was a bore. And instead of splitting the Allies, he even drove the press of London and Paris to the President's support, which is not easy to do.

There are the things that have spread the feeling of uneasiness about the leadership of the great powers. The two men who started out to reduce tensions ended up by increasing them here in Paris, and the question now is how far the present "dukes-up" attitude will go.

About this, no one really knows, probably not even Mr. Khrushchev. For until he gets back to Moscow and reports to the Central Committee, there is no way of knowing what will happen to Berlin, or for that matter what will happen to Mr. Khrushchev.

---

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

IKE'S HOPES CRASHED WITH U–2

(By Drew Pearson)

It is apparent that a lot more than a former Air Force officer and some photos of Soviet airplanes came down with that U–2 plane May 1 flying 1,300 miles inside Russian borders. With it came down Ike's greatest ambition and, more important, mankind's hopes for better understanding and eventual world peace. Also gone aglimmering may be the Republican chances of electing a President in November.

Mr. Eisenhower's greatest ambition after 40 years as a military man was to go down in history as a builder of peace.

This became more and more apparent to those who talked to the President weekly at his legislative conferences in Washington and to Republican Party leaders. One of them confided shortly before the summit conference here that it was difficult to get the President to concentrate on domestic problems any more. When the subjects of water pollution, education, and taxes were raised in conferences Ike would listen impatiently and then change the subject to foreign aid or international problems.

When THRUSTON MORTON, Republican national chairman, tried to persuade Mr. Eisenhower to take Vice President NIXON to the summit, he urged that NIXON go from its start to the finish. Ike flatly refused, finally compromised that NIXON come as a standby, all of which caused the frank GOP chairman to exclaim to friends: "This guy doesn't seem to know that we've got to win an election. All he's interested in is peace!"

HOPES GO GLIMMERING

All this of course has now gone glimmering—both political hopes and personal peace hopes—gone with the flights of Pilot Francis Gary Powers over Russia.

Regardless of the considerable fumbling of the Eisenhower administration there are two great things Ike has had as a salesman for peace. One is his background as a military man which made it possible for him to sell better relations with Russia to the isolationists and the GOP doubters as could few other American leaders.

Second, Ike has had the smile, the personality, the gestures that won millions of people to his support. The Spaniards have a word for this contagious charm: sympatico. Ike had it and used it effectively to win friends for the United States all over the world. Recently he confided to GOP leaders that he planned two more trips abroad following the scheduled, now canceled, trip through Russia before his term ended. He loved this type of international salesmanship and wanted to devote to it the rest of his months as President.

However, big dreams are sometimes upset by small details. And bad administration shows also that no man can serve as President of the United States on a part-time basis.

LOOSE ADMINISTRATION

For 7 years extremely efficient Press Secretary Jim Hagerty plus a sympathetic American press have been glossing over the fact that President Eisenhower doesn't know what is going on in a large part of his administration and that it is impossible for any man to be an effective President yet spend several days every week away relaxing at golf and almost every evening relaxing over a bridge table.

Franklin Roosevelt spent almost every night until 1 a.m. in private study. Mr. Truman knew the intimate details of government as few others in his administration. On the eve of such an important conference as the summit here, with great hopes for permanent peace at stake, they would have required that all flights over the Soviet Union be cleared with the White House. But the looseness of the Eisenhower administration permitted the left hand to do what the right hand knew not.

The tragedy of this great anticlimax to President Eisenhower's fine work for peace is that we have been posing as moral leaders of the world and as custodian of honesty and righteousness. We have caught many Soviet spies, but catching spies doesn't absolve us from getting caught spying. And once we were caught, all the Madison Avenue techniques which had been so effective in selling Mr. Eisenhower in election campaigns seemed to evaporate.

We have let the Russians outpropagandize us at every turn. Even here in Paris the Russians got the first headlines Monday by issuing their ultimatum before Hagerty, supposedly trained in the best newspaper and Madison Avenue techniques, could get his statement to the American press.

---

## THE DEPARTMENT OF MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGES, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a summation of the record of a very outstanding department of the University of Wyoming, the department of modern and classical languages. The dynamic head of this department of the university is Dr. A. J. Dickman.

This summation records the participation of the special students in the Fulbright exchange program during recent years. Considering the relatively limited numbers of students coming under Dr. Dickman's tutelage at the university, one is at once impressed by the high percentage who have met the severe requirements of the Fulbright program and who have represented both our University of Wyoming and the United States very effectively overseas.

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

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

WYOMING FOREIGN LANGUAGE BULLETIN

(Editor, Adolphe J. Dickman)

(Published by the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., spring 1960)

GOOD NEWS: FULBRIGHT AWARDS OF LANGUAGE STUDENTS FOR 1960–61

The department of modern and classical languages is happy to announce that three of our students have been granted Fulbright scholarships for the year 1960–61.

Miss Kay Kepler, from Laramie, Wyo., major in zoology and minor in French, will study at the University of Melbourne in Melbourne, Australia.

Miss Katherine Ann Wells, from Kansas City, Mo., major in art and minor in Spanish, will study at the Central University in Caracas, Venezuela.

Miss Patricia O'Melia, from Rawlins, Wyo., major in French and minor in Spanish, will study at the University of Besançon, France.

These students are proof that the University of Wyoming graduates continue to receive excellent preparation in their studies and are able to compete with the best in the country.

We are listing below those University of Wyoming graduates who have received previous Fulbright awards in foreign lands:

Byrl D. Carey, Jr., University of Glasgow, Scotland, 1950–51.

Michel Hoch, University of Paris, France, 1952–53.

Beverly Rogers, University of Nancy, France, 1952–53.

Elizabeth Beresford, University of Rennes, France, 1952–53.

Virginia Evans, University of Bordeaux, France, 1953–54.

Stanley Brooks, University of Rennes, France, 1954–55. Appointed lecturer, 1955–56.

Sally Jackson, University of Bordeaux, France, 1955–56.

Robert J. Hall, University of London, London, England, 1955–56.

Larry S. Slotta, Delft Technical University, Delft, Holland, 1956–57.

Thomas L. Hanks, University of Paris, France, 1956–57.

Robert Mahoney, University of Oslo, Norway, 1957–58.

Donald Ericksen, New South Wales University of Technology, Sidney, Australia, 1957–58.

Mary Lee Herman, University of Durham, England, 1958–59.

John B. Morgan, Delft Technical University, Delft, Holland, 1958–59.

Barbara Smith, University of Clermont-Ferrand, France, 1958–59. Appointed lecturer, University of Grenoble, France, 1959–60.

Don M. Ricks, Bristol University, Bristol, England, 1959–60.

Joan Anderson, University of Oslo, Norway, 1959–60.

Robert Sullins, Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris, France, 1959–60.

We should like also to mention that Darlene Huhtala, graduated in 1950, won a French Government award as assistante d'Anglais at the Collège de Jeunes Filles at Amiens, France, for 1951–52. Charles Sargent, Jr., graduated in 1958, received a Rotary scholarship for the year 1959–60 to study economics at the University of Lyons, France; his major was economics, his minor, French. Hjalma Person, graduated in 1958, won a Scandinavian seminar scholarship for 1959–60 to study in the Scandinavian countries; her major was art, her minor, French. James Couch, who graduated in 1947, won a Mexican Government award for 2 years of study at the National University of Mexico after obtaining in 1948 his master of arts degree in Spanish at the University of Wyoming.

## HOW TO TUNE IN ON THE WORLD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance of an informed public opinion in all the countries of the free world is emphasized by the recent collapse of summit talks in Paris. In this process of getting the facts to the people of all the countries, including those behind the Iron Curtain, radio is an indispensable instrument. Shortwave radio particularly makes possible intercontinental communication. By this means there is an exchange between our people and those of the rest of the world on points of view, approaches to international problems and also their cultures and characters.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which emphasizes the importance of listening to worldwide shortwave broadcasts, entitled "How To Tune in on the World," by Arthur Settel, which appeared in Pageant magazine for May, 1960.

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

HOW TO TUNE IN ON THE WORLD

(By Arthur Settel)

If you'd like intelligence reports direct from behind the Iron Curtain—

Or the inside information explaining those incomprehensible headlines from Laos and the Chinese-Indian border—

If you enjoy live entertainment from such exotic spots as Nyasaland, Quito or Cairo, a ringside seat at a real-life drama of rescue at sea, a listening post in the war of nerves as the great powers hammer away at one another—

All you need are:

1. A shortwave radio set.

2. The patience of Job.

3. The stamina to go without sleep indefinitely.

4. An ever-loving wife willing to go visiting alone, sleep alone, virtually live alone.

5. A soundproof den where you can fiddle with static-laden frequencies without bringing the house down on your head.

These are the requirements of the bona fide shortwave radio listener who seriously undertakes to become an eavesdropper. You will not need:

1. Knowledge of any language except your own—English.

2. A skyscraping antenna built at staggering cost on the roof of your home.

3. An intimate knowledge of electronics.

The rewards for the conscientious listener to shortwave are varied. Whether it's tom-tom music from Ng'oma, hot jazz from Moscow, or the chimes of London's Big Ben—it's all for free, available in unlimited volume. There are analyses of political problems from sources of every hue in the spectrum; commentaries on architecture, religion, rock 'n' roll; folksy chatter and bantering tidbits; anniversary celebrations, interviews and book reviews—from every corner of the globe. You can eavesdrop on fatuous chit-chat among radio hams, ship-to-shore telephone calls, exchanges between commercial airline pilots and their control towers.

Shortwave listening has been compared to photography: you get as much out of it as you put into it. You can buy a shortwave receiver for as little as $25 (RCA), or a shortwave transistor portable for as much as $275 (Zenith). Shortwave listening combines the features of travel without motion, rubber-necking without fear of detection.

But perhaps its greatest dividend is the power it gives you to ransack the world's most elaborate and expensive storehouse of ideas—elaborate because virtually every culture known to man is ceaselessly airing its views these days; expensive because sending shortwave—as opposed to receiving—costs a very pretty penny.

The United States, for instance—one of the smaller spenders—has appropriated $22.3 million this year to operate the Voice of America 84 hours a day in all languages. The Soviet Union and its satellites are on the airwaves 387 hours a day in all languages, at an estimated annual cost of $170 million. European, Latin American, African and Asian Governments have lower time and money budgets, but all consider shortwave broadcasts vitally important to their information, propaganda and communications programs.

So within the span of a single-evening's monitoring, your shortwave will bring you the following typical mishmash of programing: German language lessons; a Bible lesson from the Andes; a biography of Nikita Khrushchev from Moscow; a discussion of country houses from London; yodeling from Switzerland; a talk on astrology from Madrid, and a police call from your own neighborhood.

The most important listening usually comes after dark, when the air is suddenly shot through with verbal fireworks. The not-so-cold war warms up perceptibly as words and ideas rather than bullets and bombs fly crazily in the great artillery duel between East and West. With your dials twirling, you hear the most dramatic struggle in history for the minds of men.

Although there are no nerve-rasping commercials on international shortwave, there is hardly a broadcast without a hard or soft sell behind it—sometimes shyly peeping out from under a thin veil of kultur. At other times, the propaganda is so obvious that it will send your blood pressure soaring.

Radio Moscow's gems, for instance, are particularly maddening. Broadcasting on 15 to 24 frequencies simultaneously, Radio Moscow can perform breathtaking acrobatics in its policy postures. Take, for instance, the case of RICHARD NIXON.

Until his visit last year to the Soviet Union, where he officially opened the U.S. exhibition, the Vice President was among the top 10 on Moscow's hate parade, second only to J. Edgar Hoover in the number of times he was denounced for his views on Soviet expansionist aims and communism in general. But when it served the Kremlin's purpose, NIXON'S name was dropped from anti-American broadcasts, and his statements paying tribute to Russian industrial progress and the people's desire for peace were freely quoted. For the time being, NIXON was no longer included among the ruling circles bent on atomic war. The erstwhile "missile rattler" was now "well informed," "a believer in coexistence."

But once he had returned home, NIXON again—on Russian radio—resumed his role as provocateur, supporter of the policy of encirclement, and a member in good standing of the ruling circles driving America toward the brink. Moscow Radio was back in form.

While others heard about it secondhand, the shortwave listener was treated directly to Moscow Radio's best example of the hard sell when Premier Nikita Khrushchev toured the United States last September. American shortwave listeners were told of the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions, but every

broadcast included a clear threat that the Kremlin was ready to fight to have its way, and had the means to do so.

And what did the programs beamed to Russia say? (This is an advantage of shortwave listening—not even the Kremlin can prevent eavesdropping.)

"America is a rich, capitalist country," said a Captain Vasiliyev over Radio Volga early in September in a program intended for Russians. "But it is a paradise only for a small number of imperialist magnates. The billionaires use the money they make from sucking the blood of the workers for golden bathtubs, swimming pools filled with champagne, and carousing."

Such statements were somewhat different from those Premier Khrushchev was delivering in New York, Washington, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Detroit.

What are the short-wave broadcasts—most of them government-sponsored—trying to sell us that we don't already have? The Russians, the Red Chinese, the Czechs, the Rumanians are all, of course, trying to sell us communism. But what about the naughty songs coming to us over the airwaves from Paris; the opera from Rome; the symphonies from West Germany; the folk songs from Mexico; the travel talks from Montreal? Chiefly, they are designed to acquaint listeners with the broadcasting country; perhaps entice us to go there one day and spend a vacation—and some dollars.

With all this mass persuasion going on, language is no clue to the identity of the country whose broadcast you're hearing. A Russian-language newscast is usually the Voice of America trying to catch some ears in the Soviet Union. Polish-language broadcasts come from London, Greek-language broadcasts from Warsaw, discussions in Turkish from Bucharest in Rumania.

Radio National de España in Madrid broadcasts in Chinese; Radio Luxembourg in Hungarian. Radiotelevision Italiana transmits in 24 European languages, plus Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, and Esperanto. The Vatican City Radio—perhaps most logically of all—programs in Latin. Radio Cairo broadcasts in Hebrew to Israel, although the Egyptian Government, which owns the station, doesn't officially recognize Israel's existence.

But you can't twirl the dial without bumping into a program that is perfectly understandable to you, because nearly every country in the shortwave business broadcasts part of the time in English.

So, if the corny comedy and the contrived drama of domestic television begins to pall, if you become weary of giant, economy-size, commercial commercials—get a shortwave radio set. You'll find uncontrived drama, unconscious comedy, and a wide, wide world ready to entertain you, confound you, or invite you to visit lovely Tanganyika and exotic Singapore.

## A GARDEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, why do people put a geranium, or a lily, in the window instead of a book, or a photograph, or an article of clothing? Why do people plant morning glories and lilac bushes and rose bushes in their meager yards? Why do men who have achieved a degree of independence and a competence buy a place in the country? What is there about the country which draws the majority of mankind like a magnet, even if all their days have been spent in the roar and dust and smoke of a great city?

The answer is found in the first book of the Bible:

And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.

Man has never been able to throw off the influence of that early environment.

The Lord God planted a garden
In the first white days of the world,
And set there an angel warden
In a garment of light enfurled.

So near to the peace of Heaven,
The hawk might nest with the wren;
For there, in the cool of the even,
God walked with the first of men.

And I dream that these garden closes,
With their shade and their sun-flecked sod,
And their lilies and bowers of roses,
Were laid by the hand of God.

The kiss of the sun for pardon,
The song of the birds for mirth—
One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth.

## EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, for the special attention and leadership he has given to the Library Services bill. He was one of the first in Congress to recognize the need for and introduced legislation giving status to library services. As chairman of our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee he has supported funds necessary to operate and broaden this program.

It has been my pleasure to join the Senator from Alabama and others in sponsoring S. 2830, extending the Library Services Act of 1956 for 5 additional years. The original act will expire in 1961, and I am grateful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has favorably reported a bill—S. 2830—to extend this important program.

Mr. President, this program has been of great benefit to many rural communities throughout the United States. Because of the pace of modern living, with changes and discoveries of far-reaching importance occurring almost daily, there is a growing need for making current information available to all segments of our population who want to form their opinions based on actual facts. The rural services libraries are meeting these objectives for an important part of our population, and at the local level they are received with ever increasing enthusiasm. While we are making great progress in bringing library services to more people, there are millions who do not now have access to local public libraries. Many of these people come from rural families who would welcome an opportunity to obtain greater knowledge and improve themselves through books and other information obtainable only through the library service program. A 5-year extension of this program would maintain existing programs and would assist in extending this service to new areas.

Mr. President, this program is an outstanding example of cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, and local communities in filling a basic need by assisting rural communities in improving their educational opportunities. I would like to pay tribute to the librarians in the local areas who have helped to guide this program to assure its success. I would also pay tribute to the men and women who serve without compensation on the boards of public libraries. These outstanding leaders have given unselfishly of their time and efforts in making library services available to thousands of local communities who would otherwise be deprived of this service.

Mr. President, I am especially proud of the fine library program we have in Mississippi. It is growing. This is evidenced by the expansion of this program into many new areas of our State. Since January 1957, 14 Mississippi counties have added new library services, 13 counties have access to bookmobile service for the first time, 6 new multicounty library systems have been created, and 32 towns have public libraries for the first time. Also many of the existing library services have been expanded and modernized. Of significant importance is the statewide book pool which has been established to furnish a clearinghouse for unusual and duplicate book titles.

Our local leaders cooperating with State and Federal library services have done an exceptional job in developing this program.

I predict that with the passage of S. 2830 more people will avail themselves of this service. It will greatly strengthen our educational program and make possible a better way of life for millions of our people.

I hope that this bill will receive the full and unanimous support of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Boswell B. Perkins, although a relatively young man, has compiled a distinguished record of public service as a former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and as a former counsel to Governor Rockefeller of New York. He has been active in numerous legal activities and is presently a partner in a leading New York law firm.

As chairman of the special committee on the Federal conflict of interest laws of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York, Mr. Perkins supplied important leadership in the compilation of a comprehensive report entitled "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service." The legislative recommendations in this report have been embodied in a bill of which I am a cosponsor (S. 3080). The report is considered a milestone in efforts to deal with the complex issues in this field.

Recently, Mr. Perkins discussed the recommendations of his bar association committee in testimony before the Special Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. This testimony outlines a program for legislative action in this area which merits the attention of all Members. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that a copy of Mr. Perkins' testimony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXTRACT FROM PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROSWELL B. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS, OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY, MAY 13, 1960

The report of our special committee, which will be published by Harvard University Press in about a month, has two themes. The first is that ethical standards within the Federal Government must be beyond reproach, and that there must, accordingly, be effective regulation of conflicts of interest in Federal employment. The second is that the Federal Government must be in a position to obtain the personnel and information it needs to meet the demands of the 20th century.

These themes are coequal. Neither may be safely subordinated to the other. What is needed is balance in the pursuit of the two objectives. We need a longrun national policy which neither sacrifices governmental integrity for opportunism nor drowns practical staffing needs in moralism. We need a careful regulatory scheme that effectively restrains official conflicts of interest without generating pernicious side effects on recruitment.

The basic conclusion of our special committee is that such a scheme can be worked out. Our report and the Executive Conflict of Interest Act which we propose contain a recommended new program for achieving this result.

I shall state the 13 major recommendations of our special committee. As you will see, some of them point in the direction of broadening and closing loopholes in the present laws. Nevertheless, these recommendations for expansion and tightening will not, in our view, in any way adversely affect recruitment. Others of the recommendations point toward realistic adjustment of the laws in ways which will help facilitate recruitment, and I will return to these recommendations for a more detailed consideration after my listing of all 13.

The capsulized statement of these recommendations may seem underly general and vague to you. However, I ask you to keep in mind that each is backed up by precise statutory language in S. 3080, our proposed Executive Conflict of Interest Act, and a detailed technical commentary in our report on each provision.

Recommendation 1: Conflict-of-interest problems should be recognized and treated as an important, complex, and independent subject of attention and concern in the management of the governmental establishment.

Recommendation 2: The present scattered and uncoordinated statutes relating to conflicts of interest should be consolidated into a single unified act, with a common set of definitions and a consistent approach. Archaic provisions should be repealed.

Recommendation 3: The restraints contained in the present statutes should be greatly expanded in their scope by making them applicable to essentially all matters in which the public deals with the modern Federal Government.

Recommendation 4: Certain important restraints now covered in regulations or not at all should be included in the basic statutes, particularly restraints relating to receipt of gifts and coercive use of office.

Recommendation 5: The statutes should permit the retention by Government employees of certain security-oriented economic interests, such as continued participation in private pension plans.

Recommendation 6: Wherever it is safe, proper and essential from the viewpoint of recruitment, the statutes should differentiate in treatment between regular employees and citizens who serve the Government only intermittently, for short periods, as advisers and consultants.

Recommendation 7: Regular, continuing and effective enforcement of the law and regulations should be assured by emphasizing administrative remedies, rather than the clumsy criminal penalties of present law.

Recommendation 8: The statutes should create the framework for active and effective administration of the system of conflict-of-interest restraints, headed up with clear responsibility in the President. The President should designate, pursuant to the proposed act, an administrator to assist him in this function.

Recommendation 9: In addition to the statutes themselves, there should be a second tier of restraints, consisting of Presidential regulations amplifying the statutes, and a third tier, consisting of agency regulations tailored to the needs of particular agencies. The responsibility for day-to-day enforcement of the statutes and regulations should rest upon agency heads.

Recommendation 10: At all levels of administration potential conflict-of-interest problems should be headed off by preventive action, such as, for example, orientation programs for all new employees to acquaint them with the applicable conflict-of-interest rules, and periodic reminders as to such rules.

Recommendation 11: There should be more effective prohibitions and penalties applicable to persons outside Government who induce or participate in conduct by Government employees in violation of the conflict-of-interest laws.

Recommendation 12: Each committee of the Senate considering a presidential nominee for confirmation should be given the benefit of a full analysis, prepared by the administrator in consultation with the Department of Justice, of any conflict-of-interest problems the nominee's particular situation may present. The confirming committee should give due consideration to this analysis and to the protections afforded by a modern and effectively administered overall scheme of conflict-of-interest restraints, if one is put into effect.

Recommendation 13: The Congress should initiate a thorough study of the conflict-of-interest problems of Members of Congress and employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Let me now focus on three of the foregoing recommendations which would help to facilitate recruitment.

Recommendation 5 calls for clarification of present laws to permit the retention by Government employees of certain security-oriented economic interests, such as continued participation in private pension plans.

Hallmarks of modern American society are the pension plan, the group insurance plan, and other kinds of security-oriented arrangements. They are the basis of long-range economic planning by millions of individuals and families. Under present conflict-of-interest laws—passed when few, if any, of such plans existed—there is some doubt whether an employee of the Government may legally continue as a member of some plans maintained by his former employer, at least if contributions to the plan by the employer are regularly made which benefit the Government employee. This overhanging doubt presents a great deterrent or creates a severe hardship to the noncareer employee.

Our proposed act permits Government employees to continue their participation in certain private plans under some circumstances and with adequate safeguards. For example, it would permit a Government employee to remain a member of a pension, group insurance or other welfare plan maintained by his former private employer so long as the employer makes no contribution to the plan on behalf of the former employee who is in Government service. Similarly, a Government employee could continue to belong to certain of these plans even if the former employer does make contributions on his behalf, so long as the plans are qualified under the Internal Revenue Code and so long as the payments by the former employer continue for no longer than 5 years of Government service.

We think our recommendation No. 5 is extremely important. It is simple in concept, and, I am confident, acceptable even to the most ardent advocates of more stringent conflict-of-interest laws.

Our recommendation No. 6 calls for some differentiation in treatment between regular employees and citizens who serve the Government only intermittently, for short periods, as advisers and consultants.

To an ever-increasing extent the Government is dependent for information and advice—for learning not only how to do it, but what to do—upon part-time, temporary, and intermittent personnel. These serve individually, or as members of committees, but that service is in addition to their regular private work as scientists, technicians, scholars, lawyers, businessmen, and so on. Technically, they are, however brief their service, employees of the Government, and at present, all of the conflict-of-interest statutes apply to them. This fact has brought about both refusals to serve and conscious or unconscious ignoring of the statutes by those who do serve. It has also resulted in a welter of special statutory exemptions.

Our proposed act distinguishes, in a few key places where it is safe and proper, between rules for regular full-time Government employees and rules for what are defined as "intermittent employees." Under the proposed act, an "intermittent employee" is anyone who, as of any particular date, has not performed services for the Government on more than 52 out of the immediately preceding 365 days. The 52-day limit could be increased to 130 days by Presidential order in a narrow class of cases.

For these intermittent employees, we suggest certain special rules under the proposed act. For example, regular full-time employees would be forbidden to assist private parties for pay in transactions involving the Government; intermittent employees, who have to earn a living in addition to their occasional Government work, would be allowed to assist others for pay in such transactions, except in cases where the particular transaction is, or within 2 years has been, under the intermittent employee's official responsibility or where he participated in the transaction personally and substantially on behalf of the Government.

Similarly, since intermittent employees, by definition, are employed by organizations in addition to the Government, they would not, under our proposed bill, be subject to the rule forbidding their Government pay to be supplemented from private sources in return for personal services. Finally, the rules we propose as to receipt of gifts are somewhat different for the two classes of employees.

Our recommendation No. 13 deals with the problem of Senate confirmation. There is substantial evidence that the Government's efforts to recruit top-level executives have been impeded by the requirements of stock divestment imposed by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

This problem cannot be dealt with by statute. The confirmation power is a constitutional prerogative. However, this problem should be a subject of joint concern and increased cooperation between the executive branch and the Senate. There is some evidence that recently the executive departments have taken more pains to prepare their nominees for confirmation. Legal opinions have on occasion been furnished by the Justice Department; plans have been worked out in advance of hearing as to what need be sold and what could be kept, and representatives of the appointing department or agency confer in advance of hearing with appropriate authorities of the committee.

If the proposed act were passed, the Administrator would become the central repository for all information concerning conflict of interest and he would be expected to assist the executive branch in working out regular procedures for preparing nominees for confirmation. He could, in cooperation with the Department of Justice and general counsel to the agency in question, prepare a full analysis of the conflict-of-interest problems of the particular nominee. Over a period of time, these analyses might be given substantial weight by the confirming committees.

Furthermore, if a modern and effective system of statutory restraints is adopted by Congress and implemented by active executive branch administration, the confirming committees might be willing to place greater reliance on the statutory rules and procedures. One clear example is the procedure for disqualification recognized by the proposed act where a Government official holds a particular economic interest in a private entity.

For example, take the case of Robert Sprague, who came before you early in your deliberations. Mr. Sprague was nominated as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in January 1953. The Senate Armed Services Committee opposed his confirmation because he refused to sell his shares in his family firm, the Sprague Electric Co. His nomination was thereupon withdrawn on February 11, 1953.

I feel confident that if there had been on the books a strengthened version of the present 18 U.S.C. section 434, which is aimed at self-dealing, and if there were presently in operation a well-established and effective system for self-disqualification of officials from any matters in which they might conceivably have a personal economic interest, the Sprague appointment could have been saved. In other words, the confirming committees will relax their efforts to impose a broad wall of disqualification prior to assumption of office only if they can be assured that a strong and workable program exists for disqualification after assumption of office in specific situations. In brief, the confirming committees can be greatly aided in performing their function realistically, in the light of recruitment needs, only if Congress as a whole lends support by modernizing the entire structure of conflict-of-interest restraints.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was at the hearing at which Mr. Perkins testified, and I am delighted that my colleague has called attention to his testimony. Mr. Perkins gave a splendid account of himself, which makes both my colleague and me very proud of his performance.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague.

## SUMMIT FAILURE AND A WARNING FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the summit failure reaffirms the truth which we have long known and often ignored or forgotten, and that is that Soviet leaders of today, like those who have gone before, intend to continue their efforts to communize the world, liquidate freedom, destroy the capitalistic system, violate their obligations, step up their aggressive techniques, threaten their neighbors, continue their espionage and keep the world tense.

From the very day in 1933 when we recognized Red Russia until this good hour there has been little or no change in these Soviet objectives. The Senate document printed a few years ago showing the host of treaty violations by the Soviet Union speaks eloquently on this point. The convicted spies now serving long prison sentences are further evidence of this fact. The recent jamming of the Voice of America speaks plainly enough that truth is unwelcome. The threats to Norway and Pakistan show the bully at his worst.

For 27 years we have seen this pattern unfold. It is not new. It has not changed. Where there has been retreat from these objectives it came only because we were firm. Where Soviet words were softened they were only dictated by guile. When the hand of friendship was extended it was a sham and a mockery.

For the Congress these difficult bygone years have a lesson and a warning.

There are some who would sharply curtail the mutual security program—this collective economic, military, and technical effort in which we are mutually engaged with many other countries to strengthen both the resolve and the capacity of the free world to stand its ground and firmly meet the continuing Red challenge.

I could think of no greater mistake. To curtail this program would be to retreat. To ax it would bring dismay to those who need this help. To weaken would mean the destruction of one of the real assets which comes out of the ashes of the summit failure, and that is the conviction inspired in the peoples of many countries that the United States will not retreat. It will stand firm and honor its obligations and its responsibility to the cause of freedom and the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for consideration.

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

## AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, A SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement entered into on yesterday, the Senate is meeting at this time to honor one of our most esteemed, one of our most gracious, one of our most likable, and one of our best, if not our best, Member. I refer, of course, to the senior Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, who has graced the Senate for approximately 25 years, and who has made many contributions not only to the welfare of his State and to his country, but also to the free world as a whole.

JOE O'MAHONEY is one of those northeasterners who came West, settled down, and made his mark and established a great reputation.

He is known by many as Mr. Wool, because of the many activities he has pursued in behalf of the wool industry in his State of Wyoming. He is also known as Mr. Wyoming, because of his attitude toward all the factors which go to make up that great State. He is also known as Mr. Democrat. But to all of us he is known as a great Senator, a man whom we wish well in the years ahead and for whom we wish, along with Mrs. O'Mahoney, the best of everything in the future.

JOE O'MAHONEY is going into a well-deserved and well-merited retirement. We only hope that he will come back to see us occasionally, and that he will give us the benefit of his advice, his counsel, and his wisdom, and that he will keep in touch with us, so that we may continue to be better men and women because of our friendship with JOE O'MAHONEY, a Senator's Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we are assembled here today because of the decision of one of our Members to retire from this body. That we are not assembled here alone is testified to by the wide interest across the country in this particular moment in our history. I hold in my hand editorial comments selected at random from many papers in many sections of the country.

One reads: "May Happiness Hold Him Fast." Another: "A Champion of the West." Another: "His Record Will

Stand." Another: "When the People Were Involved." Another: "Hail and Farewell."

I ask unanimous consent that these be inserted in the RECORD in full following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. They point up the deep feeling of regret, and yet at the same time the pride and exaltation over this occasion which permits many of us to say something that is not only statewide, is not only personal, but involves all levels of American interests.

I make my statement today because I was in the State of Wyoming at the time the announcement by my senior colleague, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, was made a few days ago.

The days which have elapsed since I have returned from there have not helped me greatly to decide what ought to be said. I say that for a reason. When one speaks of a man whom he has known so affectionately, and with whom he has been involved so deeply and has grown to admire without exception on all occasions, it is difficult indeed for a mortal to select the right words to describe fully what is a deep, eternal emotion.

In the talk which has centered about Senator O'MAHONEY in Wyoming, one of the greatest tributes that is paid constantly to him is that he is known as "JOE." At the State convention, from which I have just returned, the name on everyone's lips was "JOE." No finer thing can be said from the heart about any man when he has reached this level of public life than that endearing phrase.

I said at the outset that this was an occasion filled with mixed feelings. While there were those of us who desperately and fervently hoped that somehow it might be possible for Senator O'MAHONEY to continue in this body, this was a matter which he, and he alone, had to decide. Those are considerations which none of us dare question. But they are considerations which all of us must, in full faith, understand and respect.

I wish to speak for just a moment about what I regard as the more exalting aspects of this occasion; the reasons why this is a moment for great pride. That pride stems, in part, from the knowledge that all the people of our State share with me the realization that we have a spokesman for us and for all the people in this body, which is sometimes described as the most exclusive club in the world. It stems from the great privilege accorded to me personally of having served on Senator O'MAHONEY's staff in 1955 and 1956. It stems from my student and teaching days in the field of American history and diplomacy, when the name of JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, as it is today, was on the lips of every student in America, when Senator O'MAHONEY wrote pages of our country's history by making that history himself. In short, it stems from knowing JOE O'MAHONEY and knowing what he believes in.

Some of the Members of this body are familiar with the story of Senator JOE's life before he entered the Halls of the Senate. It is a simple story, one that is inspiring to those of us who are working toward the building of a better world in which to live. It is marked with rugged individuality, initiative, and perseverance, and is well worth recounting at this time.

Senator O'MAHONEY was born in Chelsea, Mass., on November 5, 1884. His father, Denis O'Mahoney, was from County Cork, Ireland, and came to this country to make his home. He fought for the Union in the Civil War with the famed Irish Brigade.

Senator O'MAHONEY attended Cambridge Latin School, but left before graduation when his father died in 1903. He moved to New York to live with an elder brother, and, studying nights, while working in the daytime for a publishing house, he soon passed his college examinations. He then enrolled in Columbia University, earning his way by working at odd jobs, including freelancing several articles for the Associated Sunday Magazine.

One of those articles, entitled "One Hundred Years Hence," was dug up by an alert reporter 50 years later, and readers were astounded by Senator O'MAHONEY's predictions, made in 1906, of television, REA, nuclear science, and other modern marvels. One can see that even then my senior colleague had the imagination and foresight which marked him for leadership. He anticipated the future, and was not content merely to contemplate the past.

The ill health of a brother forced Senator O'MAHONEY to move to Boulder, Colo., where he took a job on the Boulder Herald and immediately immersed himself in the problems of the West, with which area he has now been concerned for half a century.

Early in 1916, Senator O'MAHONEY accepted a position as an editorial writer on the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Leader. The owner of the Leader was Gov. John B. Kendrick, a Wyoming stockman, who was campaigning for the U.S. Senate at the time. As the new editor, Senator O'MAHONEY plunged into the fray with great vigor.

So impressed was Kendrick with Senator O'MAHONEY's abilities that when he came to Washington he brought JOE O'MAHONEY along as his secretary, and one of the deepest and most lasting friendships that I think the annals of this body shall ever record was formed.

While serving in the position of secretary to Senator Kendrick, JOE O'MAHONEY attended Georgetown University, where he studied law, and received his law degree in 1920.

As Democratic national committeeman for Wyoming in 1932, he helped to draft the party platform. He regularly served on the platform committees of later conventions.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt named him as First Assistant Postmaster General under James A. Farley in March 1933.

Senator Kendrick passed away that November, and Wyoming's Governor, Leslie Miller, appointed JOE O'MAHONEY to Senator Kendrick's seat. Senator O'MAHONEY held that seat until his commission from the people was temporarily withdrawn in 1952. His tenure in Congress, which dated back to his secretarial days with Senator Kendrick beginning in 1917, was resumed 2 years later.

As a newcomer to the Senate in 1934, Senator JOE inherited his predecessor's committee appointments, including one on the Appropriations Committee. Eventually he rose to be chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, as well as chairman on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. In the latter position, he was an active advocate of programs to decentralize production and to expand air power.

He twice put through the Senate, by an unanimous rollcall vote, defense funds designed to make the air power of this country the most effective in the world. For his efforts in this field, he and the present distinguished majority leader were awarded the Gen. H. H. Arnold Trophy by the Air Force Association as aviation's Man of the Year in 1952.

Mr. President, in looking over the accomplishments of the senior Senator from Wyoming while he served this body, I scarcely know where to begin in recounting them. His activities and energies have been so diverse, so intense, and so successful that they defy grouping or generalizing. However, with the thought in mind that no one could possibly list all the significant contributions to humanity made by Senator O'MAHONEY, I would suggest that some definite guidelines appear in retrospect. In looking back at legislative history during the past quarter century four areas have the Joe O'Mahoney label—development of the West, his great dedication and devotion to the Constitution, and his labors for economic freedom.

As a member of the Public Lands Committee, Senator O'MAHONEY effected many impressive accomplishments in advancing the development of Wyoming and the West. When the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was created in 1949, he became its chairman. He was later urged to seek the position of Secretary of Interior when Harold Ickes retired, but he declined in preference to serving his State. He went back to the Interior Committee in 1954 when he was reelected.

Senator O'MAHONEY's constant battle for the development of the West's natural resources, however, began even before he was elected Senator. As assistant Postmaster General he appeared with Senator Kendrick before a Cabinet meeting to urge construction of the Casper Alcova project, later renamed the Kendrick project on Senator O'MAHONEY's initiative. As a Senator, he sponsored numerous bills affecting western reclamation and has been vigorous in securing appropriations for various projects. In 1944 he presented to Congress the overall bill for development of the Missouri River Basin, a program

which has transformed many acres of formerly arid land of the West into productive acres.

During the same year, Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator Millikin, of Colorado, introduced an amendment to the Flood Control Act which has protected the priority of western waters for irrigation purposes against diversions by downstream users. He was also instrumental in sponsoring and securing passage of the Upper Colorado River Basin storage project in 1956.

In 1937 Senator JOE worked tirelessly for legislation sponsored by another of my boyhood idols—Senator George Norris of Nebraska—to create the REA.

In the minerals field, the O'Mahoney-Hatch Act of 1946 has been a prime stimulus for the great increase in oil drilling discoveries and production in the Rocky Mountain area since World War II. Due to his identification with oil problems, he served as chairman of the special Senate Committee To Investigate Petroleum Policy in 1947. Those committee hearings have become textbooks for the oil industry. In 1943 he introduced and ushered through Congress the synthetic liquid fuels law which authorized the Bureau of Mines program for production of synthetic fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances. At this very moment his mineral leasing bill is pending Senate action.

I doubt if there is a man in this Chamber who would not agree that Senator O'MAHONEY has done more to preserve the intent of the U.S. Constitution than any other person during recent history. Long a recognized authority, he has frequently been called upon in the Senate to settle questions bearing on the constitutionality of proposed legislation. He has never let us forget for a moment the principles of the separation of powers.

He has labored tirelessly to maintain the balance between the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

His opposition to President Roosevelt's attempt to pack the Supreme Court, his fight against the drafting of labor during World War II, and his exposition of the constitutional principles at stake in the Strauss case all bespeak the depth of his conviction and the splendid vigor of his courage in defense of the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is difficult to single out any one contribution Senator O'MAHONEY has made to this Nation as the outstanding one, but certainly high on that list would be his ever vigilant fight for economic freedom. A man who has stood first and foremost for fair play and fair competition he has led the attack on stifling monopolies and concentrations of economic power.

The hearings and reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee, created on the initiative of and chaired by him, have become "bibles" and are on the shelves of every university library in the country.

In the book entitled "Congress Makes a Law" by Stephen Kemp Bailey, published by the Columbia University Press in New York in 1950, on page 119 is to be found the following account of the effective speech by Senator O'MAHONEY in support of the Full Employment Bill of 1945:

> Then, after a full day of debate on the first Radcliffe amendment, the high point of the sponsor's strategy was reached in the dramatic speech of Senator O'MAHONEY. It is rarely that a speech on the floor of the Senate actually changes stubborn Senate minds. O'MAHONEY's presentation was an exception. It is generally conceded by friend and foe alike that the Wyoming Senator's dramatic, illustrated lecture on the economics of S. 380 had a marked effect on the final vote. With the use of charts and graphs placed in the well of the Senate floor and against the back wall of the chamber, O'MAHONEY breathed economic respectability into the pending legislation. With the attitude of a patient professor he explained technical economic concepts to his colleagues, emphasizing that he was opposed to deficit spending and that was why he was supporting the bill. He pulled out all the stops in the semantic organ: "I am arguing for the investment of private capital under a free enterprise system, and the elimination of deficit spending"; or again, "The chart (on the back wall) was not prepared by any 'leftists.' It did not come from any organization interested in Federal spending. It came from the Cleveland Trust Company of Cleveland, Ohio"; or finally, "There is nothing in this bill which is in any way antagonistic to big business or to wealth."
>
> He flattered the collective ego of Congress: "Mr. President, this is a bill to vest in Congress the power and the responsibility of meeting the issue, instead of continually delegating the power to the executive branch of the Government. This, Mr. President, is a bill to restore the functions of Congress."
>
> At the close of O'MAHONEY's presentation, Senator Taft addressed the chair with the words, "Mr. President, I think that I can agree with about 90 percent of everything which the Senator from Wyoming has said." Aging Senator Bailey walked out of the Chamber shaking his head and saying, "If I'm ever tried for treason, I hope JOE O'MAHONEY can defend me."

He exerted tremendous leadership in the eventual enactment of the Full Employment Act which provided for the stabilization of business and employment. This led to the establishment of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and the Congressional Joint Economic Committee of which Senator O'MAHONEY served as chairman during the 79th, 81st, and 82d Congresses.

In 1955–56, it was my privilege to serve on the Senator's staff.

I should like to share several personal memories I have of Senator O'MAHONEY, who has meant so much to me, and has unselfishly done so much for me.

It was during this time that I experienced a learning process and a personal inspiration for integrity in public service that no textbook ever written for use in academic halls could ever supply. Many times I have had occasion to state that during the wonderful year I served with him, Senator O'MAHONEY himself was the finest professor under whom it was ever my privilege and opportunity to study.

I recall that during the course of hearings which he so tirelessly conducted, often alone, when he was assaulted again and again and was interrogated by batteries of experts in their respective fields—and, it mattered not, what those fields were, Senator O'MAHONEY proved himself to be the master of all. During the study of the concentration of power in the Electric Bond & Share Corp., after a host of the finest lawyers from Wall Street had done their best with their case, in opposition to this one man, the chief spokesman for the legal counsel of the electric utilities said to me, following one of those long and tortuous sessions:

> McGEE, let me say just one thing: I would rather face all the lawyers in New York at the same time than face that boss of yours alone.

That was a great tribute to the mental clarity, the wisdom, and the conviction commanded by Senator O'MAHONEY when under tremendous pressure.

I remember that during the General Motors Corp. hearings, a monumental inquiry into the accumulation of economic power in this country—which Senator O'MAHONEY pioneered—after days and days of hearings, one of the spokesmen for the giant corporations would say, "But, Senator, the statement you have just now attributed to me is not what I said yesterday."

Then Senator O'MAHONEY would say, "Let the clerk read the record."

And when the clerk read the record, it immediately became apparent that Senator O'MAHONEY's recollection was faultless.

Senator O'MAHONEY has consistently demonstrated an almost unbelievable faculty for accurately recalling the proper interrelationship of facts—with the result that always he was able to ascertain the truth, the point of quest in all the hearings.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to refer to a bit of personal philosophy of Senator O'MAHONEY's that has served as a guideline to me. As I left my service on his staff, he said to me, "If you decide to go into politics, I hope you will remember one simple rule that I have always found most helpful: It is wise not to try to 'keep books.' Do not 'keep books'; do not remember old scores; do not try to hold old grudges, because they will detract from your central purpose and will woo you away from the main path."

I have had many occasions to reflect upon that perceptive counsel—and always with the conclusion that it is the wisest of all.

I think it might be said of my beloved colleague that: "He ever bore, without abuse, that grand old name of 'gentleman.'"

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire to complete his statement without interruption?

Mr. McGEE. If it is permissible, I should like to complete my statement as a base for a tribute, if that will be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that the able former Senator from Colorado and former Governor of Colorado, the Hon-

orable Edwin C. Johnson, has come to the floor of the Senate. When I told him that we today would pay, in our limited fashion, our humble measure of tribute to one of the greatest Senators of the West, the distinguished Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Ed Johnson said he wanted to be on the floor. I do not know how long he can remain with us.

I shall be happy to wait until the completion of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. I do not want to interfere with his presentation.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Colorado asked me whether I wished to continue. I said, "Yes." The Senator from Colorado did not tell me the reason for his request. I should certainly say it is important that we acknowledge the presence of the distinguished former Senator and former Governor of Colorado at this time, and I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Our cherished friend, the former Senator from Colorado, is well known to every Member of the Senate. He served here with great distinction for three terms and has been the Governor of Colorado for three terms. No living citizen of Colorado holds the respect, admiration, and veneration of Colorado's people to the same degree as this remarkable man who sits beside me.

Ed Johnson of Colorado appeared this morning before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been one of the great leaders.

The junior Senator from Colorado could not express a deeper regret at losing a friend than he does upon the departure of the able senior Senator from Wyoming.

The junior Senator from Colorado has a vital stake not only in Colorado; he has a vital stake in the senior Senator from Wyoming.

It is my humble judgment that if it had not been for the senior Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished former Senator and former Governor of Colorado taking an active part in the senatorial campaign in Colorado in 1956, the junior Senator from Colorado would not be here today. It is too bad the majority leader is not present to hear this. If the junior Senator from Colorado had not been elected to the Senate in 1956, the Democratic Party would not have had a majority the following year. The Democrats needed one vote to have a majority in the Senate. They seem to have forgotten that. One vote gave us a majority in the Senate in 1957. It was a close race. The Democrats did not think they could win in Colorado. But when the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] came into Colorado and spoke, as he has always spoken in his legislative career, about the concentration of economic power in this country in the hands of giant corporations, the voice of Senator O'MAHONEY was heard, and was heard not only in Colorado, but also throughout the Nation.

He spoke about the cost-price squeeze on the farmers and ranchers of our two States. He spoke about the power of monopoly, and how it can control the economic lives of working people, white-collar people, and small business people. He warned that the tremendous concentration of economic influence in the hands of a few persons demands the constant vigilance of watchdogs who will act in the people's behalf. He was at his fiery, fighting best that night, and I feel certain his words influenced many Colorado citizens to vote for the Democratic candidate.

When the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] came into Colorado, we held a great meeting at the West Denver High School, and the meeting was televised throughout the State. The junior Senator from Colorado, then a candidate, introduced Ed Johnson, who, in turn, introduced Senator O'MAHONEY. And between the hammer and the anvil, I was able to be elected to the U.S. Senate. I say this by way of emphasizing my appreciation of some of the many things we owe to the great senior Senator from Wyoming.

The Carroll family has always felt most warmly and strongly toward the O'Mahoney family. Mrs. O'Mahoney, the former Agnes V. O'Leary, of Winchester, Mass., has been a great source of strength and comfort to Senator O'MAHONEY ever since their wedding in 1913.

Senator O'MAHONEY's contributions to the political and the economic history of the Nation have been truly outstanding.

As other Senators have said, during the 1930's Senator O'MAHONEY headed the T.N.E.C. study, which took inventory of our economy, and formed a sound basis for legislation passed thereafter.

I wish to say of the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that as a speaker and as a constitutional lawyer, he has had few peers in this body; certainly this fact is widely recognized. Coupled with his brilliant mind and forceful delivery, he has a rugged, western independence. All Senators have the highest respect for him. We pay the utmost attention to the amendments he proposes and to the arguments he makes.

The announced retirement of my friend and teacher, Senator JOE O'MAHONEY, has evoked expressions of deep regret from all over the Nation, and most especially from the Rocky Mountain West.

In our part of the West, no two States share a closer community of interest than Colorado and Wyoming. And with all due respect to other Members of this body, I doubt that any Senator will miss JOE O'MAHONEY's presence, leadership, and splendid guidance more than the junior Senator from Colorado.

Of all his accomplishments as a legislator, he may be remembered most in the Rocky Mountain West for his excellent service as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, followed by his unique achievements on the Committee on the Judiciary—and particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on which I have been privileged to serve.

JOE O'MAHONEY deeply loves the West, and has battled in the great tradition of western progressives. He has a capacity for fierce indignation and dedicated effort against those who would extract great riches from our Nation's soils and waters without making a contribution for the benefit of future generations.

His knowledge of corporate structure and financing, and of the nature of monopoly, is broad and deep. There are corporate empires in this Nation far richer and more powerful than many of our State governments; some of them, indeed, have in past years held the people of various States in economic subjugation. The tendency today is toward ever greater concentration of economic power. JOE O'MAHONEY has stood fearlessly against many of these giants in his time. He has not only defied them successfully—he has turned the searching spotlight of public information upon them so that the people might know of what is involved. Serving with him has been one of the great experiences of my own legislative career.

At this point, I wish to insert a tribute to Senator O'MAHONEY which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on May 11, 1960:

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

A BIG CHANGE FOR WYOMING
(By Pasquale Marranzino)

U.S. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY sent word to his Wyoming constituency that he is hanging up his gloves and will not seek reelection.

The news isn't surprising, but it comes as a disappointing change to Wyoming Democrats who have been voting for the craggy-faced, bushy-browed Senator since 1933.

Only once in that interim, 1952–54, did the colorful lawyer fail in his bid to go to Washington as Senator, swamped in the overwhelming GOP victory that brought Frank Barrett into office.

His impressive career was halted last June in the midst of a typical O'Mahoney battle. He led the forces that successfully opposed the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Commerce Secretary. Weary from days of testifying and speaking against the nomination, O'MAHONEY collapsed as he left the Senate floor, a victim of a stroke.

Even though the stroke kept him bedridden for months, it couldn't lick JOE. He made an amazing recovery and continued his work from his hospital bed by telephone and in consultation with his staff and colleagues.

JOE's most brilliant—and possibly one of the most vital coups for the commonweal—came in those days of the Roosevelt administration when the Wyoming Senator led the fight to keep intact the size of the U.S. Supreme Court. F.D.R., who had hoped to enlarge the Court and pack it with birds of his feather, broke his party pick on JOE's stubborn opposition.

This break with F.D.R. was made after considerable wrestling with the O'Mahoney conscience. He had been one of the first New Dealers. He helped write the Democratic platform that carried Mr. Roosevelt into power. And he was rewarded with the first Assistant Postmaster General job in that first administration.

The 75-year-old Senator has Colorado roots. He was born in Massachusetts and came West in 1908 to Boulder. There he

worked on a Boulder newspaper as city editor and also was a correspondent for the Rocky Mountain News and the Associated Press. He left Boulder in 1916 to go to work for a Cheyenne paper owned by the late Gov. John B. Kendrick.

His newspapering was interrupted when Kendrick ran for the Senate, JOE serving as campaign manager and secretary. He went to Washington, with the successful Kendrick, as secretary. When Kendrick died in 1934, O'MAHONEY was named to the job.

Although JOE's close New Deal associations made him a national power, he never placed the good of the West in second spot.

He battled for reclamation, for rural electrification, for domestic wool, for the farmer and rancher, and for more water to irrigate more acres and help his arid State.

In recent years he has been a thorn in the side of the Eisenhower administration. Although a New Dealer, he didn't have the New Deal propensity for big spending. He was tight-fisted with the dollar and kept hammering away at inflation, high prices, and Government participation in private industry through foreign deals.

He probed the national oil import program and suggested that the administration quit having the big oil companies formulate foreign policy. He was an ardent supporter of the antitrust laws, asking for crackdowns on meatpackers, insurance companies, and monopolies.

He has served long and well and with devotion to the West. Retirement for JOE will be rough, but we expect he still will remain the No. 1 Democrat in Wyoming.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see my old friend, JOE O'MAHONEY, sitting here today; and I am delighted to see him.

He has been referred to as a statesman; and he is that.

He has been referred to as a great lawyer; and he is that.

He has been referred to as "Mr. Democrat"; and he may be that.

He has been referred to as "Mr. Wool," and I fancy that he is.

But I think of JOE O'MAHONEY as a man, and I think of him with affection and respect, because we have sat together and have battled together for so long in probably the most controversial committee of the U.S. Senate, the Judiciary Committee. Out of my esteem for Senator O'MAHONEY, I can testify that conversely to our differences, my regard and my affection for him have grown with the years.

We have differed very frequently on many things, and we have fought most stoutly on this floor on many things. But always his word has been his bond, and what he had to say here was always dictated by conviction, plus what he thought was in the interest of the people of the United States of America.

In brief, Mr. President, as we look back upon the record of Senator O'MAHONEY, we see most clearly that one outstanding feature of his career is that he has given so much more than he has received, and that his contributions to the well-being of this country are priceless and immeasurable.

Mr. President, I count myself fortunate that I can call Senator O'MAHONEY my friend. I count myself fortunate that I have been enriched by my association with him.

As a man, Senator O'MAHONEY symbolizes what I have always thought of as the real enfoldment of history. A man is not a means to an end; he is an end in himself. So I think of Senator O'MAHONEY as a man unfolding over a long period of time, as an end in himself. And during that long period of time he has, indeed, had great influence upon many people, and has enriched the country.

So, Mr. President, I rise today to say of Senator O'MAHONEY, blessed is he; and blessed, also, is his consort, who has stood so nobly beside him for so long a period of time.

I salute Senator O'MAHONEY as a friend. I wish we could keep him here. But I know the verities that have dictated his retirement.

To him I say, good luck, and God's blessing.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield.

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it has been a great privilege to me to serve in the Senate with Senator O'MAHONEY. We have been together in the Senate for nearly 26 years. I have great admiration and respect for him, and I consider that his record of service is one of the most outstanding in this generation.

One of the recollections I will carry with me as long as I live is of the debate between Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas, the then majority leader of the Senate, and Senator O'MAHONEY, when President Roosevelt recommended passage of the bill which provided for the "packing" of the Supreme Court. On that day, Senator O'MAHONEY delivered extemporaneously one of the greatest orations in opposition to that bill that it has been my privilege to hear. The debate between the two was very forceful, and at times was bitter. It has always been my conviction that the speech delivered on that day by Senator O'MAHONEY was one of the impelling reasons for the withdrawal by President Roosevelt of the Court-packing bill.

Senator O'MAHONEY is a great constitutional lawyer; and throughout the years he has been alert, active, and very effective in his efforts to preserve the Constitution and our fundamental principles of government.

I simply wish to say to Senator O'MAHONEY today that I shall always treasure our very close association; and I wish to express my deep regret at his retirement, which will be a great loss to the Nation; and I desire to extend to him my cordial regards and best wishes for the future.

I pay my respects to Senator O'MAHONEY as a very great Senator and a very great American.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I was still a student at the University of Georgia when the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] first became known to me. That was during the controversy to which the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has just now made reference—the fight over the so-called Court-packing bill.

The able senior Senator from Wyoming took a leading role in opposing that proposal; and, from reading the press reports about it, I became very much impressed with the ability, knowledge, courage, and eloquence of the senior Senator from Wyoming. At that time I had no idea that I would ever have the privilege of sitting with him in this body and knowing him intimately.

Mr. President, one of the things which makes service in the U.S. Senate so pleasant and rewarding is the fact that the nature of our work in this body serves to bring all of us together in a close, intimate, and highly personal relationship. During the short period of time I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, I have come to know well the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, and knowing him, my respect for his eloquence, his judgment, and his character has increased. I know that he will fight the battles of the people of this great country against all odds and obstacles. I have seen him do it with courage, with credit to his State and Nation, with distinction to himself, and—yes—with a great degree of success.

The Senate of the United States will not be the same without JOE O'MAHONEY. His years of service in this body has enhanced its distinction and prestige. He is without doubt one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever sat in the U.S. Senate.

When I think of JOE O'MAHONEY, I think of him as a truly great liberal; a liberal of the stature of Borah and Walsh; a liberal who, while proudly bearing the liberal banner, has not used his liberalism as an excuse for introducing coercive proposals which would restrict the liberties of the people rather than protect them.

I am happy to pay tribute to this great man today. We will miss him, but we hope we will have the benefit of his wise counsel and respected judgment for many years to come.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

Mr. McGEE I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in the Black Hills of western South Dakota, where my home is, the name of JOE O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is widely respected. We are neighbors and during the years I have been in Congress we have come to regard JOE O'MAHONEY as almost as stanch a defender of the interests of western South Dakota as any Senator from South Dakota could be.

I feel a personal sense of gratitude for the great help Senator O'MAHONEY has given me on legislation, both when I was in the House of Representatives and here in the Senate. A number of

years ago it was my privilege to work with him in securing the enactment and the extension of legislation dealing with the development of synthetic liquid fuels. In Wyoming, South Dakota, and Montana we have many coal deposits that have possibilities in that field; and JOE O'MAHONEY took the lead in securing the enactment of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act.

Again, when we were legislating for the development of our uraniferous lignite deposits, it was because of JOE O'MAHONEY's understanding that we were able to get timely legislation from the Interior Committee that was needed to permit development and protection of claims in the coal reserve.

Again, when working on water conservation projects—and I have in mind particularly the Pactola Reservoir in South Dakota—I went to Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Senator Ken Wherry, of Nebraska, who also understood the problems in that field, and was successful in having the initial funds provided which made possible the starting of that project.

But, Mr. President, I rise to speak not alone because of these instances of personal legislative association with Senator O'MAHONEY. I rise to speak because I want to pay tribute to the service he has given as a constructive legislator in broad fields of national interest.

During many years when I was in the House of Representatives I was on the Military Appropriations Committee, or, as we then called it, the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department. During much of that time Senator O'MAHONEY was a member, and later chairman, of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Military Appropriations in the Senate. I know something of the battles he has fought to get sound defense, and at the same time to try to prevent cost-plus contracts. Senator O'MAHONEY has been a leader in trying to see that the United States got sound defense, and honest defense, for every dollar spent.

I want to allude also to the matter which has previously been mentioned by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from West Virginia, the place Senator JOE O'MAHONEY played in the great, historic constitutional debate which took place in the Congress in 1937. I was a freshman Member of Congress then in the 75th Congress. The great epochal fight of that year was the battle over the proposal of the then President to reorganize the Supreme Court, the proposal generally known as the Court-packing plan.

I did not particularly know Senator O'MAHONEY personally at that time, but I was impressed by the fact that among younger Members of the Senate when that great battle took place, which was marked by the participation of men like Senator Pat McCarran, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Senator Burton Wheeler, and others, JOE O'MAHONEY, a younger member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary that year, was given the opportunity and responsibility of writing the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. And I have never forgotten—I have cited on many occasions—the ringing words with which he closed that report. I am paraphrasing now, but I remember the sense of it: That the Court-packing plan should be rejected so decisively that such a proposal would never again be presented to the representatives of a free people.

Mr. President, the free people of the United States will always be indebted to JOE O'MAHONEY for the contribution he made in preserving the independent judiciary of this country.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, few men have served in this body with such great legislative skill as has the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. Few men have served so effectively in this body, in our long history, dealing with so many complex subjects, as has the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming.

In all of these broad and diverse areas, Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming discharged his duties and responsibilities with great care and with great skill.

Many Members come to this body and specialize in one subject or two subjects. But, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming has left many monuments in this body that will stand for years to come.

I remember, when just out of school, studying that great undertaking by him, in the late 1930's, I believe it was, the Temporary National Economic Committee. It is one of the finest studies ever made of the complex American economy. But the Senator from Wyoming was not content with just that problem. At the same time, he devoted great energy and skill in the field of appropriations, first covering military appropriations, then interior appropriations, and later, after the war, the Atomic Energy Commission.

In all of these areas, his work was remarkable indeed. He served as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with great skill. His work as a member of the Judiciary Committee in the field of constitutional law and in the field of antitrust law is well known to our colleagues and to the entire Nation.

In all of these endeavors, the senior Senator from Wyoming brought to this body a keen mind, born of intellectual honesty and great logical and legal skill that made it possible for him to concisely define a matter with such clarity that at the conclusion of any presentation made by him there could be no doubt as to the issues.

In addition, I must say that in his long labors in this body he has always maintained a fine sense of humor. He is a kindly and gentle man, always respectful of the rights of other Members of this body.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks heretofore made. We will indeed miss him, but we will always look forward to his wise counsel and advice in the years to come.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to be numbered among those who are very sorry to know of JOE O'MAHONEY's decision to retire as a Member of this body at the end of his term.

New England, as everyone knows, Mr. President, is a very generous area, but one of the most generous things we ever did was to give JOE O'MAHONEY to the West and to the Nation. It has been well said today by the junior Senator from Wyoming that after JOE O'MAHONEY arrived in the West, he was almost immediately appreciated by the discerning people of Colorado and later by the people of Wyoming, and he progressed rapidly and constructively up the ladder until he came to the U.S. Senate, where it was my good fortune to become acquainted with him some 20 years ago.

JOE O'MAHONEY is one of the most human, friendly, sympathetic men I have known as a Member of this body.

There is one thing which has been said about him which perhaps needs a little explanation. The junior Senator from Montana referred to the fact that in the West JOE O'MAHONEY is frequently referred to and is known as "Mr. Wool." I will say that if there is any wool in the system of JOE O'MAHONEY it is not Shropshire wool, because in the 20 years I have known him I have never seen any wool growing over his eyes. Time and again I have seen JOE O'MAHONEY exercising his astute legal mind and preventing the Senate from making mistakes which it would have had reason to regret later.

Politically, I think JOE O'MAHONEY is perhaps almost in a class by himself. He is a liberal without being reckless, and he is a conservative without being static. I hope everybody understands what I mean by that, but that is the only way I can describe him politically.

Once more I say we are very sorry he has decided to retire from this body. I join with all the others in expressing the hope that in the years ahead he may have improved health and enjoy life and happiness for many years in the future.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this privilege to join with my colleagues in expressing sincere regret that one of the ablest and finest Members of this body has decided to retire. I express to him our deep appreciation for the type of public service he has rendered over a long period of time.

The junior Senator from Virginia was first privileged to know his colleague in 1933, while serving on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was then the First Assistant Postmaster General. Later in that year, as I recall, he was appointed a U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, as my colleagues know, the junior Senator from Virginia is interested not only in the history of our Government, but also in the preservation of our Constitution as it is written and not as some people think it should have been written. The junior Senator from Virginia believes that there are absolute prohibitions in the Constitution, which should not be overridden either by the legislative branch or by the judiciary, for reasons of expediency, whether they be political, social, or what not. Consequently, it has been a source of the greatest pleasure to me to serve with one of the best constitutional lawyers who has been in this body for many years.

I was privileged to be in the House of Representatives when the Senator from Wyoming made a great speech against the packing of the Supreme Court, in order to get decisions which were desired. The Supreme Court did not have any positive prohibitions in that regard, but it was desired that the Court interpret the Constitution to meet so-called new social needs.

I was privileged to be a Member of this body when Senator O'MAHONEY presented, as few Senators have ever equaled and as perhaps none has surpassed, the appropriation bills for the Department of Defense. He was familiar with every detail of those vast operations and expenditures.

I was privileged to be a Member of this body when the issue was raised, for political expediency, of passing a Federal law to prohibit the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. There never has been a finer, better, clearer speech made on that subject than was made by the Senator from Wyoming. The subject did not involve his home State at all, but it did involve the Constitution, which provides that the States shall be the judges of the qualifications of their electors, provided they do not impose a different qualification for the electors of Federal officials than for the electors for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. As I have said, that subject did not involve his State at all, but it did involve the Constitution, which he loved, and which he knew. He did not want to see first one pillar and then another pulled from that great instrument, until in the end it would collapse and carry down with it the glorious structure which, as Daniel Webster said, has united national sovereignty with States rights and individual liberty.

Again only 3 years ago, in 1957, there was not a finer speech made on the floor of the Senate than was made by our distinguished friend in behalf of the Anglo-Saxon, cherished right of trial by jury, when he insisted that if criminal contempt proceedings were to be invoked the defendant should be entitled to a trial by jury.

Mr. President, I cannot add anything to the tribute which has been paid to our friend, but I can say I agree with all of the things which have been said about him today. There is no one who appreciates more than I the type of service he has rendered his State and his Nation, first in the executive branch of the Government and later in the legislative branch.

No one regrets more than I to see that type of clear and radiant mind, possessing courage of conviction, leave us in this period.

We never before have been in such need of legislators who know what the Constitution means, who can present to us the decisions of the court interpreting it, and who have the courage of their convictions to express their views on the floor of the Senate.

Again I say, Mr. President, I regret to see our colleague retire, but he will do so full of honor, to go back to his beloved State with the knowledge that his memory will be kept green in the hearts of those with whom he has served.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Before expressing my fervent hope for many, many happy days in the future for our beloved friend JOE O'MAHONEY, and before expressing my regret upon hearing his decision to retire, may I begin by saying to JOE O'MAHONEY that it is good to have you with us today. You have made a magnificent recovery with the fine Irish fighting spirit which you have always displayed on the floor of the Senate. I know you are going to enjoy many, many happy years in retirement, during which we will continue to benefit from your counsel, your suggestions, and your recommendations.

Many times it has been said that JOE O'MAHONEY is a man of great judgment, great perspicacity, and great comprehension. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said, he had the good judgment a long time ago to move into the West. He had the excellent judgment, having moved into the West, to remain in the West. I know that every Senator who has served with him in the Senate recognizes the tremendous contributions which JOE O'MAHONEY has made to his adopted area of the country, which he has come to love so well, and which in turn has come to love him so enduringly.

Anything which JOE O'MAHONEY did for the West—and he did a great many things—inevitably was helpful to the great State which I am happy to represent. South Dakota and Wyoming are neighbors, and we share a great many of the good things of life. Of the oil which bubbles from the bowels of the earth in the State of Wyoming, they share a little better than we do. But we compensate for that deficit by having more productive grainfields.

By and large, however, the attitudes of the people in our areas, the challenges which they confront, the occupations in which they engage, make us not only good and friendly neighbors, but also make us concerned about each other's problems.

In at least three different instances I have had personal opportunity to work closely with JOE O'MAHONEY, and to observe the skill with which he approaches a legislative problem or a public problem.

We used to have around these parts what was known as the conference of Western Senators, when another great fighting Irishman by the name of Pat McCarran was among us. Of late, we have not been meeting as frequently as we should, but in that conference of western Senators, JOE O'MAHONEY's voice was always raised skillfully, intelligently, and persuasively to try to unite us, across party lines, behind projects and programs beneficial to the great West. In that connection I came to know him very well.

Early in my days in the Senate I was privileged to be a frequent guest of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that of all the committees in the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary is the most neighborly and hospitable, which I testify because my experience has been that whenever I have had a bill which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the members of the committee have invited me to sit with them, to confer with them, to counsel with them, and to answer questions, treating me as though for a day, or a series of days, or a week, I was a member of the committee.

There were hotly contested and very difficult decisions to make in connection with the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, which was before the Senate in my first year in this body, because it had carried over from the period when I was a Member of the House.

I used to sit in the hallowed confines of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and, being a layman and not a lawyer, I always was overwhelmed by the erudition which was evident in the committee. I was greatly impressed by the manner in which the members of the Judiciary Committee dissected a piece of proposed legislation, the manner in which they made it into a tool, as would a carpenter, for legislative consideration. During those times this great draftsman and lawyer, JOE O'MAHONEY, was always present with his wise counsel and sound advice.

Finally, I was privileged to serve with him when he was the active chairman of the Theodore Roosevelt Commission. There he was, a great Democrat—referred to a couple of times today as "Mr. Democrat of the West"—devoting his talents and his skills toward bringing proper recognition to another great westerner, one who happened to be a Republican more closely identified with the State of North Dakota than the State of South Dakota. However, it was left to South Dakota to perpetuate the memory of Teddy Roosevelt in the immortal granite of the Black Hills in Mount Rushmore's famous piece of sculpture by Gutzon Borglum. In that famous monument we have commemorated and perpetuated the memory of the great Theodore Roosevelt. JOE O'MAHONEY, who led that commission, was most generous to all his associates, as he was in every other way.

I regret that he is leaving the Senate, but I rejoice that he is leaving the Senate in good health, in good vigor, and in good mind. I know those factors will enable him to continue to make contributions to the welfare of our country for many, many additional years.

JOE, wherever you go and wherever you roam, we wish you an abundance of luck, and we hope some of those good days will be spent on the South Dakota side of the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota and Wyoming.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Senator O'MAHONEY is one of the closest friends I have ever had in the Senate. He and I worked very closely together on the Committee of the Judiciary. I know that no Member of this body can take his place in the committee or in the Senate. I have watched his work in the Judiciary Committee for many years. Not one time has he ever made a move without being guided solely by the public interest. The public interest and welfare to him has always been the paramount consideration.

Today JOE O'MAHONEY is the most highly respected and the most influential member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I know that he is one of the most highly respected and ablest Members of this body. His retirement will leave a void which cannot be filled.

JOE is a Senator's Senator. In my judgment he has been one of the great Senators in the history of the United States. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity, who has been guided in all of his affairs, personal and public, by patriotism and by what he believes to be for the welfare of our country. I know that no man in the modern history of the Senate has waged a stronger campaign to protect the American system of government than has JOE O'MAHONEY. In addition, both in the committee and in the Senate, he has been one of the most effective Senators.

JOE, we hope for you a long and fruitful life. We are going to miss you in the Senate. You occupy a place I think cannot be filled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was greatly shocked when I learned that the Senator from Wyoming had announced that he was retiring from the Senate. I know, of course, that he made that decision, as he made all of his decisions, based upon the realities. I was shocked not so much in knowing that he had made the announcement as I was to realize that when he went away it would leave a great void here in the Senate.

I first came to know Senator O'MAHONEY a good many years ago. In fact, it was when I first came to the House of Representatives, in January 1937. I used to come over to the Senate quite often to listen to Senators debate. I soon learned to admire Senator O'MAHONEY's keen intellect. Of course, I knew something about the tremendous job he did with the TNEC, heading up one of the great economic studies of this country, one that has stood as a monument to him since it was made, and which will continue to help chart the course of our history.

JOE O'MAHONEY has been not only a great Senator, a great leader, a great advocate, a great originator, but at the same time he has been a man who is realistic and is willing to meet conditions as they actually exist and not necessarily as we might wish them to exist.

I recall particularly that in the early part of 1937, in February, if I remember correctly, President Roosevelt, in whose Little Cabinet Senator O'MAHONEY had served, presented what was called the Supreme Court packing plan. There followed a long, hard, and sometimes, I think, a bitter debate in the Senate over that question.

Members of the House would come to the Senate to listen to that debate. JOE O'MAHONEY is the one who pulled that one out of the fire. He was one of those who helped work out a final solution which was agreed to. I recall at the time seeing the piece of paper in his hand as he stood on the floor of the Senate reading off the terms and conditions of the plan that had been agreed upon. He stuck that piece of paper, which was written out in the handwriting of President Roosevelt, in his pocket. I dare say that he still has it as one of his souvenirs.

I said he was a great originator. He has originated a great many pieces of helpful legislation. I remember that a good many years ago—it must have been 10 or 12 years ago—he introduced a plan in the Senate which would have set up some kind of central organization for the purpose of making credit available to small business.

Senator O'MAHONEY left the Senate for 2 years, unfortunately. While he was gone, I introduced his bill, and I have referred to it many times, as I said, as originating, so far as legislation of the Senate was concerned, with Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senators will remember that year before last we finally passed legislation to set up a credit system for small businesses throughout the country. That was based largely upon the legislation that had been initiated by the Senator from Wyoming. I could go on and on and give many cases, involving mergers and consolidations and antimonopoly legislation, and such matters.

JOE O'MAHONEY has been one of the greatest friends the American free enterprise system has ever had in the Senate. He has always tried to move in such a way that would make certain that the free enterprise system, under which we have grown great in this country, should be continued.

I regret to see JOE O'MAHONEY leave the Senate. I know he is taking the right course. He knows that in his own heart, or he would not have made the decision. I wish for him and for his loved ones many more years of good health, great happiness, and success. If any man has earned that right, that man is JOE O'MAHONEY.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join the great number of friends of Senator JOE O'MAHONEY in expressing sentiments of regret that he is leaving the Senate. I have always considered JOE O'MAHONEY to be one of the ablest Members of the Senate. I am sure that the lawyers in the Senate regard him as one of the greatest lawyers in this body.

One of the yardsticks in determining the worth of a Senator is not the amount of publicity he receives through all the news channels, but the impact he has upon the deliberations of the Senate. JOE O'MAHONEY is leaving a record of a wholesome impact upon the deliberations of this body. His name is attached to much important legislation, and especially that affecting the Western State he has been so much a part of.

I am sure that what all of us have liked most about JOE O'MAHONEY is the fact that he has always used such good judgment in all important matters coming before the Senate.

I know that all of us will miss him a great deal. I agree that he is entitled to years of rest, happiness, and enjoyment, and I hope those will come to him.

I hope, too, JOE O'MAHONEY, that you will continue to come back here as long as we who are here have the privilege of serving in the Senate. You will always remain one of our most loved and respected colleagues.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to start on a personal note. Some 11 years ago Mrs. Holland and I moved into what was then the Wardman Park Hotel, which since has become known as the Sheraton Park Hotel. At that time we found that our close neighbors on the same floor were the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and his gracious and charming wife. They have been such wonderful neighbors, such considerate friends, and such altogether kind people to have near us, that I cannot help express the hope that the Senator's retirement from the Senate will not mean that they will leave us at the Sheraton Park Hotel, because we would very, very greatly miss the many kindnesses and many acts of consideration which have characterized their every attitude toward us.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to hear all that has been said, and there may be repetition in what I may say about the Senator as a Senator. He is a great Senator. He is a Senator's Senator. In addition, he is a gentleman and a scholar in the truest meaning of both of those words.

I have been impressed with two things about him as a Senator, which I wish to state for the record. One is his scholarly qualities, the second is his strong support of the Constitution. Everything he has handled, every speech he has made, every position he has taken in the 14 years I have had the chance to observe him, has been based not only upon conviction, but also upon great knowledge and a firm grasp of the facts lying behind the principles which he advocated.

I remember that every year he used to handle the defense appropriation bill. We have become so hurried in the Senate, in these later years, that I am afraid we are departing from the practice which he invariably followed in handling that great bill, covering the tremendous amounts of money involved in it, and serving the completely necessary objective of the defense of our Nation, with such thorough finesse from beginning to end that any Senator who wished to know about anything in the bill was

assured the chance to learn just exactly what it meant. I hope the Senate may always have both the leadership, in the chairmanship of its committees and subcommittees, and the necessary time, to handle matters of such great importance with the skill, with the finesse, with the patience, and with the scholarly grasp which the Senator from Wyoming always exhibited in handling that most important of all our appropriation bills.

That same scholarly quality pertains to so many other matters which he handled that I shall not attempt to mention them all. One of the finest speeches I ever heard made was the Senator's speech in support of the admission of Alaska to statehood, at a time when the effort was not successful, but when the predicate was being laid for the success which came a few years later.

I recall that when I came upon the floor on that occasion the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming made some comment about an incident in connection with the admission of my own State in 1845, and he pointed to a similarity between that incident and something which pertained to Alaska. The RECORD will show a colloquy based upon that comment, indicating the breadth and the depth of his grasp of the problem to which he was addressing himself.

There have been many, many other bills and objectives to which the Senator from Wyoming has addressed himself, and as to which he has demonstrated his great ability, including, among others, measures having to do with the production of wool and the protection of that strategic agricultural industry, as to which we have a deficit rather than a surplus. In that field he has long been an authority.

In every field where he has accepted leadership, he has been an authority by reason of his scholarly grasp of the facts. That is true of antitrust matters and monopoly investigations. It is true of conservation measures and programs for national resource development. It is true of various matters which have not been popular for him to handle.

I heard a Senator mention a while ago the great speech of the senior Senator from Wyoming on the so-called Court packing bill. Surely that was not an easy thing for him to do, coming, as he had a short time before, from an executive position as First Assistant Postmaster General under the same administration that was making the suggestion to which he objected. But he had a perfect constitutional background on which to base his objection.

I remember that in my rather brief service in the Senate, I have heard him speak, I believe this time before a committee, although he had spoken earlier on the floor of the Senate, on the poll tax question. He showed a scholarly grasp of the Constitution, and of the record made by those who drafted it, which few persons possess. He took a strong position, based on the Constitution, a position which others who were as liberal as he wanted to bypass by passing a Federal statute in order to ban the poll tax. He kindly, but with complete firmness, swept that contention aside, because, he said, the Constitution does not permit it, and it would require a constitutional change to take away from the States the right to fix the qualification for electors which is given them by specific words in the Constitution.

I remember when the Senate was debating a bill which he was supporting, the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The question arose as to the place of jury trials in our Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence. I remember how sternly and strongly the senior Senator from Wyoming took the position, which probably was not an easy one for him to take in his State, that the right of jury trial to one accused of criminal contempt out of the presence of the court was an inherent right under the Constitution and under the Anglo-Saxon system of law, and must be protected regardless of how worthy was the objective which the proposed legislation under consideration sought to serve.

There have been many matters of that kind which I could mention. I shall not take the time to do so, because I know other Senators wish to speak.

I simply say that I wish we had more Senators, and the assurance of more Senators in the future, willing to acquire a thorough grasp of all the facts, willing to be national in their point of view, rather than provincial, willing to stand back of, behind, under, and in support of the Constitution, in every way within their power, and to insist that it be observed, as the Senator from Wyoming has invariably insisted.

Senator O'MAHONEY found time in his busy life as a Senator, only 3 or 4 years ago, to go to my State and to consider the adequate establishment of a great national park there, a park which was then in the making, and to come back to the Senate and, as chairman of the subcommittee, take a position which I think was right, and which I think subsequent events have justified. I believe his decision will be justified more and more in the minds of millions of people as the years pass in the future.

Senator O'MAHONEY was and is a Senator's Senator, the Nation's Senator, a servant of the Constitution, a very great and outstanding American.

I tell you, "JOSEPHUS"—because that is what I have always called you—I shall miss you terribly. I shall not know where to go when I need constitutional advice, which I very frequently do.

Good health, good luck, good fortune, and a long life to you and your lovely lady.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, much has been said in the Senate this afternoon about the outstanding public service of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. With those statements I not only am in accord, but I appreciate the Senator's great service.

Much has been said about his great influence in the halls of Congress. That, too, I appreciate fully and understand, because I have had the privilege of serving with Senator O'MAHONEY for many years.

But that is not what I desire to discuss. I wish to refer to his qualities as a friend and as a neighbor. As has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], Mrs. Carlson and I, too, have had the privilege of living at the Sheraton Park Hotel for 10 years as a neighbor of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming and Mrs. O'Mahoney. This has given us many opportunities to meet and visit with them. It is always a pleasure to have the privilege of meeting them in the lobby or in the halls. No matter where we meet, they are always friendly. It is like greeting friends from home when we meet them. It is then that we have taken pleasure in speaking of things pertaining to everyday life. Those friendly greetings and casual visits always reminds one of the type of friendly neighbors the O'Mahoneys are.

There is one thing especially which Mrs. Carlson and I have noticed, and for which we commend Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney. Every Sunday morning they go to church. I think that is not only a mark of distinction, but it shows that the Nation can have confidence in the type of people it sends to the Halls of Congress to legislate in their behalf. They are sound, substantial people, having a firm religious background. Mrs. Carlson and I have appreciated that, and have remarked it on many occasions.

There is another side of life besides one's public life in the Halls of Congress. It is the life of the individual as he conducts his everyday home life and activities. Someone has said, "actions speak louder than words." I know of no finer example than the one we have in the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and Mrs. O'Mahoney. Mrs. Carlson and I have enjoyed very much our associations with them. We appreciate their friendship. We shall miss them. But we wish them much rest, which is well deserved and well earned after these many years of public service.

To Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney, Mrs. Carlson and I say, Godspeed and God's blessing.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with much regret that I learned that my good friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, planned to retire and not seek reelection. One of the men who have impressed me most during the time I have been in the Senate has been the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. He is a profound lawyer.

Someone has said that a lawyer must possess at least three qualities. First, he must be a man of integrity—the most important quality. Next, he must be a man of industry, one who is willing to work, because the law is a jealous master. Third, he must possess knowledge—knowledge of the law and knowledge in general. The profound senior Senator from Wyoming possesses all these qualities, and he is known far and wide as being one of the ablest lawyers in the United States.

Next, the Senator from Wyoming is an able Senator. He is a man of principle—and possibly that should be the

first quality of a Senator. He possesses a keen mind, and he is a hard fighter. These qualities are essential to a Member of Congress.

Senator O'MAHONEY has great courage. I have seen him take positions which may not have been popular in his own State, because the particular problem involved may not there have been considered of paramount importance. I personally shall never forget the magnificent fight he waged on the floor in 1957 in favor of the preservation of the right of trial by jury. For this he earned the everlasting gratitude of millions of Americans.

In the debate over proposed changes in Senate rule 22, concerning the method of invoking cloture, Senator O'MAHONEY demonstrated great courage. He believes the U.S. Senate to be the greatest deliberative body in the world; and he opposed any rule which would enable a bare majority of the Senate to limit debate here.

Senator O'MAHONEY is a natural leader of men. He is a handsome man. He is a man who commands respect. He is tactful, forceful, and vigorous. He is decisive. He does not quibble. He does not mislead.

The great senior Senator from Wyoming is a fine American. He is a true patriot. He stands for the best ideals for which our country was founded. He believes in individual liberty and personal freedom. He believes in the free enterprise system of this country; and, in fighting against monopolies, he has helped maintain the private enterprise system of these United States.

It is with very deep regret that I learn that Senator O'MAHONEY is about to leave the Senate. I cherish his personal friendship. As a lawyer and as a Senator, he is able and profound. As a man, he is kind, courageous, and true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, both Senator O'MAHONEY and I were born in Massachusetts and were raised in Massachusetts. The only thing I hold against him is that he left Massachusetts. But perhaps that was just as well, because he would have been a difficult Democrat to defeat; so perhaps his departure from Massachusetts made it possible for some of us who are Republicans to win at the polls.

My family and I had the honor and the pleasure of knowing Mrs. O'Mahoney long before I knew Senator O'MAHONEY. From knowing her and her family, I knew she had chosen well when she selected JOE O'MAHONEY.

When I came to the Senate, I had the opportunity to meet Senator O'MAHONEY, and to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee, and to debate with him there, and also on the floor of the Senate, from time to time. He always injected humor into the debate. He always had great knowledge of the subject he debated, and he always had the lightness of touch which is so characteristic of those of Irish descent in Massachusetts.

As members of the Appropriations Committee, Senator O'MAHONEY and I have served together on the Defense Subcommittee. There, he was one of the first to realize the importance of building up our defenses, for the greater security of our country. He always proposed the making of substantial appropriations for improvements in missiles and in the air defenses and the aircraft of our country. All of us knew that he realized, as did we, that there was a great future in the air and a great need to build up our defenses in the air, as well as our defenses on the ground.

Mr. President, because of my necessary attendance on committee meetings, I have not been able to be in the Chamber throughout the session today, to hear all the tributes which have been paid to Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, I do not wish to reiterate; but I desire to assure Senator O'MAHONEY that I have very greatly enjoyed his personality and our friendship, and I have always been benefited by his outstanding speeches.

All Members of the Senate have the greatest respect for Senator O'MAHONEY, because of his intelligence, his conscientiousness, and his integrity.

When Senator O'MAHONEY retires, he will be greatly missed by every Member of the Senate.

All of us wish him the best of fortune.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a few days ago, I had the opportunity to express my regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] had decided to retire from the Senate at the end of this session.

The departure of Senator O'MAHONEY from the Senate will be a tremendous loss to this body. It will also be a very great loss to me, personally.

As a youngster in my teens, I had the opportunity to watch Senator O'MAHONEY perform on the floor of the Senate; and many times since then I have had the opportunity to follow his career.

Perhaps one of the best sermons ever delivered by a Chaplain of the U.S. Senate was delivered here by the late Peter Marshall, who, at the opening of the Senate session, one day, delivered this short but meaningful prayer:

> O Lord, help us to stand for something, lest we fall to stand for anything.

Over the many years of his service in this body, Senator O'MAHONEY has, on this floor, stood every day for something, and often times for a great many important things.

Some of us have felt that if a nation were to be great, it must have great liberals and great conservatives, and sometimes persons who were a mixture of both. If our Nation had not had great liberals, there would not today be a free and independent United States of America. If our Nation had not had great conservatives, the ancient landmarks which have guided us so well would never have remained.

Senator O'MAHONEY is an outstanding liberal who has consistently fought to improve and strengthen the basic freedoms of our country; and as a conservative he has fought, in good times and in bad, to preserve the foundations of our country.

Perhaps Senator O'MAHONEY's greatest achievement has been his courageous and determined stand throughout the years to resist the trend toward monopoly on the part of big business, and to make it possible for the American ideal of free enterprise to survive.

He has fought that battle since the day he came here, and he is still in the very thick of that battle. As a matter of fact, today on the floor I asked how he is coming along with hearings on what I think is one of the most vital issues facing America today—the situation whereby large corporations do $6 billion worth of research at Federal expense, and take out patent rights to deny to others the right to use that knowledge which was developed at Federal expense. Senator O'MAHONEY is conducting hearings on that question now. I asked him how the hearings were coming along and what the chances were of getting a bill out of the Judiciary Committee on that subject. He told me, as is so characteristic of him, "Well, the time is short. We are still pressing for it, and I believe we have a chance."

Mr. President, fighting monopolies is a rather thankless task, because those who would be most affected by antitrust laws, those who are most interested, and those who understand the legislation best are those who would benefit by monopolies. There are, of course, exceptions to that statement.

It is a rather thankless task, but surely a spiritually rewarding undertaking to one who knows what it means to preserve the freedom of the Nation's economy.

Senator O'MAHONEY has fought for conservation of our natural resources for a long while, and also for the development and effective use of those natural resources.

He has been a supporter of civil rights legislation. Yet those of us who have on occasion differed with him on the merits of such legislation have admired him for the conservatism which he has shown in efforts to preserve the ideals of America, as in 1957 when he offered the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill. That amendment, to preserve jury trials for persons accused of crimes and to retain the right to be tried by one's neighbors and peers, was the most important amendment adopted to that bill.

It would be very difficult to add much to what has been said by others here of the great achievements and accomplishments of Senator O'MAHONEY, and it would be far beyond my abilities to do so; but I do wish the Senator to know that we shall truly miss him. I hope we shall have occasion, particularly during those events when the Senator will be available to us, to visit with him and have his views for the benefit of those of us who will attempt to carry on, in some measure, in his tradition.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the most eloquent voices, logical minds, and pleasant personalities with which this Chamber has ever been graced has been embodied in the distinguished, able, revered, and venerable senior Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY has brought to public life a conception of public duty, and dedication to the public welfare, and devotion to the principles which have made our country and our Government great. The record he has written is one to which, down through the decades, young men will point with pride; and, along with those of lesser talents, perchance now and then one may come along with equal talents who will seek to emulate him.

As he voluntarily departs this forum at the conclusion of the present session, Senator O'MAHONEY carries with him the love and the esteem and the respect of every Member of this body and of uncounted teeming multitudes who have watched his work, who have admired his record, and who hold his personality in affection.

As I close, I wish to bid you, Senator O'MAHONEY, the best of wishes and Godspeed as you journey forth in this romantic career which for you has not yet ended.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is difficult to add to what has been said about Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. He is my neighbor, and represents my neighboring State of Wyoming.

I felt a strong sense of personal loss when I learned of the decision of Senator O'MAHONEY to retire from the Senate at the end of his term in January. For years before I came to Washington I was very much aware of the towering reputation of this great Democratic Senator from my neighboring State of Wyoming, and it has been a privilege to serve for this brief period with him.

During his years in the Senate, JOE O'MAHONEY has implemented in many ways his strong belief that there can be no permanent political liberty without economic freedom. His name has become almost synonymous with antimonopoly legislation. It was under his leadership, as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, that an inventory was made of our economic system which served as the basis of legislation to protect our small and middle-sized businesses from entrenched wealth and great concentrations of economic power.

Another high moment came as floor manager for the Full Employment Act, which established the Council of Economic Advisers for the President, and the Joint Economic Committee, two guiding factors in the management of our fiscal affairs.

JOE O'MAHONEY's love of the Constitution has been an inspiration to everyone around him. His knowledge of it, combined with his keen legal mind, has made him an authority who will be sorely missed.

His dedication to conservation, and to all of the pressing problems of the West, is well known. His years as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were productive and profitable ones for the section of the country which he and I represent.

Mr. President, there are some men with whom we walk who bring challenge and inspiration. JOE O'MAHONEY is one of these. His departure will leave a great void in the Senate.

All of us will miss him sorely. But we know that when we visit with him we may partake anew of the inspiration and the spirit of this great man and may learn from his great intellect.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is a time for rejoicing, and for sorrow. It is a time for sorrow because we are expressing our first farewells to JOE O'MAHONEY. It is a time for rejoicing because we have opportunity to tell Senator O'MAHONEY, and to tell the world, how we feel about him. It is very clear from what has been said this afternoon that we think very well indeed of him. And we should, as should all the people of this Nation. For, whether they realize it or not, their lives have been improved and their lot bettered by the contributions to the national welfare made by this outstanding U.S. Senator.

JOE O'MAHONEY's vision, which is unusual, has been translated in ever so many ways into constructive action. He has been, during his legislative career, a specialist; but, unlike most specialists, his interests and talents have not been confined to one interest or to one area. They have roamed far and wide and helpfully.

I shall not be repetitive by seeking to give a detailed account of his career, a service which has been performed by others, and in better manner than I could.

However, I do wish to say that although he comes, as I do, from a State with a small population, his talent, his integrity, his keen intelligence, and his devotion to country quickly carried his reputation beyond the boundaries of Wyoming, beyond the boundaries of the West, and over the entire country. A great lawyer, an expert in economics, Senator O'MAHONEY has one of those penetrating and incisive minds which are the envy of those of us less well equipped. His warmness, his liking for people, his unfailing courtesy, his wonderful qualities as a Christian gentleman—all these have endeared him, and endear him, to everyone who knows him.

His was the decision, and he has made it; a decision to leave the Senate after this year. Much as we regret that decision, none of us can quarrel with it, because this is a determination which must be entirely personal. But for me, should I be fortunate enough to return to this great body next year, there will be always something missing, with the familiar figure of JOE O'MAHONEY absent from his accustomed place so near the desk I occupy.

Mrs. Bartlett has asked especially that she be permitted to join me in expressing affectionate greetings to JOE O'MAHONEY, and to wish for Mrs. O'Mahoney and him in their honored and deserved retirement the best of whatever they may wish.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is always a sad time when we rise on the floor to take more or less formal notice of the departure of a friend. At a time like this it is only natural that we review, I suppose, the qualities of the friend which have impressed us most and which we admire most.

In my 6 years in the Senate it has been my good fortune to serve with our good friend, JOE O'MAHONEY, on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I think it is at this place rather than some other areas where he is perhaps better known that I have come to appreciate him and the work he has done the most. I am not unaware that he is the father—yes, he could be called the grandfather—of oil shale development in this country. I will go so far as to call him the great-grandfather of oil shale development in this country, because he was the first to recognize the tremendous importance of this resource and what this great natural commodity of ours can mean for this country. We have still to reach the real threshold of its development, but one among us saw this many years ago and devoted himself unstintingly to progress in this field, as he has in many other areas.

When I think of JOE O'MAHONEY in the days ahead, I shall think of a great lawyer. Only a few weeks ago, in connection with some proposed legislation before our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I saw the brilliant, incisive, mental play which demonstrated to everyone present the great legal ability he has and the clarity with which he sees legal problems and their relationship to constitutional law.

I shall always think of JOE O'MAHONEY as a fighter, as what we in the West call a "scrapper." This is not to be taken in the wrong sense, but instead in the sense that all of us respect a man who believes in something and is willing to carry forward a real fight to espouse the principle.

There was in Colorado some years ago a man whom the Senator may remember, by the name of Alva Swain, who used to write a column called "Under the Capitol Dome" for one of the Denver newspapers. He once wrote an article entitled "The Last Mile." In this article he pointed out how many people in the world had failed because they had failed to walk the last mile. This illustrates, I think more than anything else, the quality which has made our friend so great and which, above all others, will endear him to my heart, because no matter what the words, what the circumstance, what the situation, what his health, he has always been willing and

ready—yes, anxious—to walk the last mile. This is why, in my opinion, he leaves behind him a great wealth of accomplishments.

I cannot question, and it is not for any of us to question, the motives which induce him to depart from us. Health, yes. A desire to be with his wife, yes.

All I can do, my friend, is to wish to you a continuation of the life which has been productive of so much so far. I am sure, that so long as the Lord wills you to be on this earth, life will continue to be as productive, no matter whether it be in the Halls of the U.S. Senate, in Wyoming, or in some other place.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When I arrived in Washington, D.C., almost 16 years ago, one of the very first Senators I met was JOSEPH O'MAHONEY. From that day until this I have become more and more aware that he is a person who works for and votes for his own convictions. When a man follows his convictions without being led astray any time, that man is worthy of being a leader.

JOSEPH O'MAHONEY has served on the Committee on the Judiciary for many years. Well do I remember many occasions, when the heat of debate was pretty hot, when JOE would step in to pour some oil upon the waters, so to speak, and to bring the two parties, or the parties broken up into factions within the committee, together. He would bring out of chaos some legislation which was worth while.

I appreciate his friendship, his leadership, and his activities in the Congress of the United States.

The story of the political life of JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, is one of a man who prepared himself to be a good politician. I use the word "politician" in the sense of one working for the good of his country. It was 44 years ago that JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a young lawyer with newspaper experience, came to Washington as secretary to former Senator Kendrick of Wyoming. From the first day Senator O'MAHONEY came to Washington, his career as a politician and servant of the people was set out before him, and he served to the best of his ability.

He has served with distinction the people of his State and Nation through the trying years of "boom and bust," through the troublesome thirties, and the war years. It is in the more recent years of his long and colorful career that I have had the pleasure and honor of working with him in various ways in the Senate. It is especially in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate where Senator O'MAHONEY has distinguished himself in our history and endeared himself to respecters of sound judgment and law.

Many is the time that I have known this colleague to stand on the unpopular side of the fence because he knew it was the just and right side of the fence. The leadership in the Senate from both sides of the aisle will miss his good judgment and his forceful way of leading legislation through the Senate.

I feel it is a personal honor that I can rise to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the distinguished service he has rendered the Senate and the Nation. I regret to see him retire but I wish for him many happy and healthy years in the future.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for yielding.

It is an honor for a Senator to pay tribute to so renowned and distinguished a Senator as is Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming. I would like to pay my tribute to our dear friend and colleague by recalling two physical instances to his mind so that he may have visually before him how I feel about him and the impact he made upon me.

In 1957 during the debate in the Senate on the civil rights bill the senior Senator from Wyoming sponsored a jury trial amendment with which I did not agree. Yet I remember so distinctly that the senior Senator was coming from Wyoming in a plane one day and was not due to arrive until late in the afternoon. The Senate marked time until he arrived. He then stood in the aisle next to the desk of the acting majority leader and made his speech on the amendment with such eloquence and force and with such erudite citation of legal authority as literally to sweep all before him. Although I was not persuaded, I greatly admired the character, the loftiness of mind, the erudition, and the eloquence which was displayed by him on that occasion.

There is one other physical circumstance which is very appealing to me, and I hope will be to him. Early in the days of airplane travel from New York to California, I frequently took one of the small Boeing planes which were then available in order to carry on my profession as a hard working lawyer. Invariably the plane would stop at Cheyenne, which I came to know pretty well. The city had a quality which always made me feel as we landed that I was at last in the West. It had a clean quality. It had almost a nobility as it appeared, sharp and distinct against the clear western sky. It is a quality one cannot identify. Yet one would know what it meant, what it stood for, and that it was the portal to a great, new, adventurous land.

Senator O'MAHONEY has always appealed to me as that kind of personality. He is like the city, clean and sharp in the atmosphere. We know what he represents, what he means, and what his objectives are. They are expressed very clearly.

These are two pictures in my mind which I shall always hold very dear. The Senate is a difficult place in which to serve. There are many pitfalls. There are not only the pitfalls of election but, more importantly indeed, the pitfalls of policies and the pitfalls of personal relationships in this Chamber. I know of no man who has made a more enviable reputation here than has Senator O'MAHONEY. I know of no man who has more friends as shown by what has occurred today, no man whose personal presence has been more beloved, and whose personal presence will be more missed. I hope in the days ahead, when all of us wish for our colleague health, happiness, sunlight, fresh air and all the joys of retirement, he will not forget us. I know he will not. He will have the responsive feeling of warmth for us which we will have for him.

May I again express to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] the sense of privilege which comes to me in being allowed to participate in these ceremonies and in saying au revoir to a dear friend and colleague.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the people of the United States, and the Senate particularly, have suffered three body blows in recent weeks. We suffered first the untimely death of Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, and then the announced retirement of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. We must now sadly add to those the announcement by our beloved colleague, JOE O'MAHONEY, that he, too, will retire at the end of the 86th Congress and will not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. President, the Senate and the Nation can ill afford this loss. The Senate will not be quite the same without the benefit of his incisive thinking and eloquent expression developed from his vast experience, his broad outlook, his creative and independent approach to every problem, large or small, and his unfailing and militant dedication to the public interest, which have been made available to the Senate and thereby to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, others of our colleagues have commented upon and will pay tribute to the great variety of services which Senator O'MAHONEY has rendered as one of the great defenders of economic freedom and as a leader in our time in pointing to the perils of monopoly and to the dangers inherent in the great concentrations of economic power.

No one in the Senate or in public life has been a keener appraiser and opponent of all forms of arbitrary power in the body economic and the body politic. Hence his unfailing insistence on the provisions of the Constitution and his opposition to the increasing usurpation of and delegation of powers vested in one of the three branches of our Government by and to another branch.

No one has more stoutly resisted the encroachments of the executive upon the legislative branch of our Government. Senator O'MAHONEY's public career is so replete with battles for the enduring principles which have made our country great that it would take hours to list them in detail. I wish, however, to refer to one great service that he has rendered, which is very close to some of us,

and to me particularly, and that was the fight he initiated in Congress to bring in Alaska and Hawaii as States of the Union.

Senator O'MAHONEY was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950 when that committee held the first full-length hearings held for the Senate on the admission of Alaska as a State.

As might be expected, he conducted that hearing so thoroughly and searchingly that the groundwork was effectively laid for the debate which followed. In that debate his eloquence was memorable. I should like to read, from the many speeches he made in behalf of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, a few excerpts, which illustrate his power of expression, his fervor, and the great skill with which he presented the cause. My only regret is that I shall not be able to simulate here the clarion voice with which he delivered these sentiments:

A glance at this map, Mr. President, makes it clear that Hawaii and Alaska are the arms of Uncle Sam stretching toward the Pacific. Are they going to stretch forward carrying the torch of liberty and freedom, or is the Congress of the United States going to say, by rejection of the statehood bills, that we do not actually believe in the principle of self-government and freedom about which we talk? We promised statehood when we incorporated these Territories. We have promised repeatedly statehood in our political platforms. The arguments against statehood are as thin as air; the arguments for statehood are unassailable.

But up to this hour, Mr. President, the two remaining incorporated Territories of the United States, extending into the Pacific Ocean, which, as Secretary Seward predicted in 1867, has become the center of the great world political struggle, have been denied statehood. The contest is on to win the minds of the teeming millions of the Old World.

How true that was 8 years ago, and how true it still is.

How easy it would be for us in the Senate to say that, so far as we are concerned, we want the word to go out from that melting pot of the Pacific—Hawaii—that we do believe in freedom for all men and self-government for all men, and that we are not imperialistic colonizers, as Jacob Malik has called us.

It is only necessary to look at this map and to turn our minds back over the pages of history to know that the march of freedom has been westward around the globe. Whenever the peoples of Europe felt themselves oppressed, or unable to govern themselves, they turned to the west. The movement of mankind toward liberty and freedom has steadily marched forward in a westerly direction across the face of the earth.

The march of freedom has been toward the west. The founders of our Government settled along the Atlantic Ocean, and when they were dissatisfied with economic conditions they also moved west. They crossed the Alleghenies, they crossed the Northwest Territory, they crossed the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, they crossed the Rocky Mountains, they crossed to the Pacific Ocean. Territory after territory was incorporated and State after State was created, and here we built up the greatest industrial power in all history, the greatest power that a free people ever created, because we have been devoted to the principle of granting opportunity to individuals.

Mr. President, that western trek has continued up into Alaska, and now again we come face-to-face with what may be a mortal combat with arbitrary political power and arbitrary economic power. We have carried freedom, political, and economic freedom, steadily west across the North American continent. We carried it into Alaska in the beginning, but Alaska now is held back from development because it does not have the statehood which this bill would grant. People who enjoy political and economic freedom in the United States are loath to move into a territory where their activities are controlled from beyond their borders, controlled, let it be said, by Government bureaus in Washington, insofar as some things are concerned; controlled by private organizations on the Pacific coast of the United States so far as other things are concerned.

At this point, Senator Knowland asked Senator O'MAHONEY to yield, which he did. And after Senator Knowland had spoken, Senator O'MAHONEY continued:

Other Senators have come onto the floor since the discussion began, and I should like again to bring out the point that the march of liberty and freedom has been westward across the face of the globe, and now it has reached Alaska and Hawaii. It has reached an Iron Curtain, a curtain which has been lowered not alone by the totalitarian dictators of the Kremlin, but by some of us here at home who do not comprehend what has been transpiring in the world. The progress of freedom may be stopped unless we carry it forward.

How timely that summons today, and what a legacy of guidance is that last sentence before Senator O'MAHONEY was again interrupted:

The progress of freedom may be stopped unless we carry it forward.

That was the real beginning of the legislative fight which brought the two States into the Union. The bill that year was defeated by a single vote. It was recommitted by a vote of 45 to 44. However, the impulse and the impact which was given to statehood for Alaska by JOE O'MAHONEY, with the fervor of his conviction, his masterful marshaling of all the arguments, and by his eloquence, carried the cause of statehood to victory a few years later.

When the history of this decade is written—the fifties—a decade of much frustration and stress and turbulence, no achievement will stand out more in the history of our Nation than the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and the carrying thereby of the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest north and farthest south. There in his Senate seat sits the father of that great achievement, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. Alaska and Hawaii will always be grateful to him.

Mr. President, as JOE O'MAHONEY leaves us at the end of the 86th Congress, he will be retiring not merely as the senior Senator from Wyoming. He is not even merely a great western Senator, although of course he is that. He is a national figure. If we go back into the history of this great body during this century, I am sure that very few will stand with equal eminence. I think of William E. Borah, of Idaho; Hiram Johnson, of California; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin; Thomas Walsh, of Montana. I believe I have exhausted the list. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is the peer of those giants.

JOE, we are going to miss you. But you will leave a record of achievement that is immortal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had no knowledge, until I entered the Chamber a few moments ago, that the Senate was engaged in paying a deserved tribute to one of its greatest Members. This morning I was engaged in work in the Committee on Appropriations. It was a happy circumstance that brought me here at this time, because I would indeed have been deprived of attempting to express sentiments of my heart if I had not had an opportunity to say just a few words on this occasion.

It is sad for me to try to imagine or contemplate the Senate without JOE O'MAHONEY. JOE O'MAHONEY is a Senator in the great tradition of the Senate. JOE O'MAHONEY is a great independent. No group, no cult, no class, no organization, however powerful it might be in these United States, could move JOE O'MAHONEY the smallest fraction of an inch beyond the limits that were dictated by his conscience and by his great intellect.

It is unfortunate that from these great independents, men not only of ability but men of character and courage, we should lose one of those who remain.

Mr. President, there have been few phases of legislation which affect the lives of the people of the United States that have not felt the impress of his genius and his capacity. He has operated in farflung fields—from antitrust laws to military appropriations, from matters affecting the Department of the Interior to atomic energy operations. In every one of those assignments he has contributed greatly. He has drawn on the reserves and on the store of his physical strength and of his intellect and of his courage.

The Constitution of the United States will lose one of its greatest friends in this body when JOE O'MAHONEY departs from these halls. He knows the Constitution of the United States. When he swore at the desk of the Vice President to undertake to defend the Constitution, he was not uttering empty words. He took that oath to his heart. Would that every man who comes into the Senate would respect it and have the courage to defend it and to express the convictions of his mind and heart with the same freedom and the same determination that have characterized JOE O'MAHONEY.

All of us cannot be so eloquent as the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. God has vouchsafed to him the great gift of expression which few men enjoy. But more of us could emulate the courage and the intellectual honesty with which he approached every one of his assignments.

I repeat: The Senator from Wyoming is a Senator in the great tradition. He is a Senator in the great tradition in his ability to express himself upon the floor of the Senate. He can speak eloquently, intelligently, and convincingly on more different subjects than can any other Member of this body. He can do it with-

out a prepared statement. He can do it without typewritten pages. He can do it on the spur of the moment, on the impulse of his heart and his mind, and in his devotion to his senatorial duties.

I have laid great store on a few rather elemental characteristics of men in measuring them and cataloging them in my mind, and in reserving to them a place in my heart. One trait of character which has always appealed to me is loyalty. Senator O'MAHONEY is loyal to every cause in which he has ever believed. He is loyal to every friend he has ever had. I say that as one who has been vouchsafed the great benediction of enjoying his friendship over a period of almost 28 years. His outstanding characteristic, however, is what, in this day, is called intellectual honesty; what we used simply to call courage; and in the common vernacular what we call guts. Senator O'MAHONEY has this trait. This characteristic has stood out in the Senate time and time again, as this man followed the dictates of his own heart and his own conscience.

We are in a time when we almost catalog Members of the Senate. We have our professional liberals and, indeed, we have our professional conservatives in the Senate. But I can look at JOSEPH O'MAHONEY and say, "There stands a man." When his convictions told him to do so, he took positions which caused the conservatives to call him a radical; and when his convictions told him in other circumstances not to follow blindly a path which was laid out by others, he took positions which caused the radicals to call him a reactionary.

All in all, to me, those traits sum up JOSEPH O'MAHONEY as one of the great Senators who have adorned the Chamber of the Senate of the United States.

I salute you, my friend; and may a benign providence attend you for many years to come in the manner to which your services entitle you.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in the words of tribute today to one who has been my good friend over the years, both in the other body and here, our able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

We have often agreed and often disagreed on various issues. But whether in agreement or disagreement, Senator O'MAHONEY has always been most courteous, most cooperative, and most kind to me personally. More often than not, I suspect, particularly in our work on the Committee on the Judiciary, we have stood shoulder to shoulder on important matters.

I am especially familiar with Senator O'MAHONEY's great contributions in legal and judicial affairs. His work in this field has been prodigious, and his many activities to improve the judicial process, to reform the antitrust laws, and to strengthen our laws against subversion are important milestones in the progress our Nation has made.

I remember very vividly the manner in which Senator O'MAHONEY so successfully championed the so-called Jencks decision bill to protect the FBI files against Communist agents. It so happens that I was then serving in the House of Representatives, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and was working there on legislation in this field. Senator O'MAHONEY was most helpful, cooperative, and effective in this joint venture, as he has always been in those issues, objectives, and principles to which he attached himself.

Senator O'MAHONEY's place in the history of this body and in the history books of the Nation is secure. His name is written indelibly on the statute books in numerous cases. We who have served with him in the Senate, the people of Wyoming, and indeed all Americans, can be very grateful for his long and fruitful career of public service.

I know that every Member of this body wishes him continued happiness and success in the days ahead. I express the hope that Senator O'MAHONEY will continue to contribute his very outstanding talents to those causes which he has so ably, effectively, and sincerely championed over the years.

We wish him Godspeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, people of New Jersey most certainly share the pride of all Americans in Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, and are grateful for his great achievements for our Nation that have been the product of a thoughtful, kind, and courageous, great American. We are also proud, however, that our opportunity for friendship with Senator O'MAHONEY has been more intimate than just as a U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY's brother sometime ago came out to Summit, N.J., to enjoy the relaxing and wholesome residential opportunities of that fine suburban town. There, he raised his family; there, his brother and our beloved colleague came on many occasions to visit, and from these visits New Jersey people came to know personally the man we honor today. Not long ago, a businessman friend of mine told me how as a young veteran he had met Senator O'MAHONEY in Summit, and the Senator encouraged him to go into business and to avail himself of the opportunity to start business with a GI loan. With this encouragement, Terry Dempsey started his business, and he is grateful daily for the consideration and kind advice of Senator O'MAHONEY. I know that this example of thoughtfulness can be multiplied thousands of times across the Nation.

The Senator's nephews are still living in Summit, and of this we are proud. The O'Mahoney name we know will be forever with us, through the achievements of Senator O'MAHONEY and the connections of his fine family.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in the deserved tributes which they have paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. I regret very much that he has concluded not to seek reelection. I am confident that had he done so, he would have been triumphantly returned by the citizens of Wyoming to another 6-year term.

I know of no man who is held in higher esteem, either on the floor of this body or in his home State, than is JOE O'MAHONEY.

It was my privilege to know him before I came to the Senate. During the 3½ years I have served in this body, my affection for and gratitude to him has increased many times over. He took me, a new and untried Senator, by the hand and showed me the ways of this august and sometimes inscrutable body, and has been kindness itself in making my way in this body easier.

We had a happy little joke together, Senator O'MAHONEY and I, because it has been my privilege since 1924 to have owned a small ranch property in the Jackson Hole area in Teton County, Wyo. I spent eight happy summers there, running a dude ranch for young boys of the teenage group, while I was going through law school and in the first years when I was trying to establish myself in the practice of the law. JOE O'MAHONEY knew that; and when I came to the Senate, he was kind enough to refer to me as the "summer Senator from Wyoming."

I had the privilege, on one occasion, of appearing with Senator O'MAHONEY on his regular television program, which is shown all over Wyoming. We found ourselves able to agree on a number of matters involving conservation, irrigation, and the development of water resources in his home State. He presented me with great courtesy to his audience, and some of my friends in Jackson Hole later wrote me notes telling me they had enjoyed the program and saying how happy they were that Senator O'MAHONEY had done me the honor to refer to me as the third Senator from Wyoming, although one who was in residence only during brief periods in the summer.

I wish my good and dear friend long life and happiness, and reassure him on a point on which I am sure he needs no reassurance; namely, that he has the undying and lifelong admiration and respect of every one of his colleagues who serve with him in this body.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the great leaders of the Senate of the United States has announced his plan to retire. His colleagues will miss JOE O'MAHONEY, the senior senator from Wyoming.

On many occasions in the last half dozen years we have sat here and listened to him, as with vigor and courage he stood in the Senate to fight, as he believed he should, for that great panorama of causes which he undertook to espouse.

I have known him also as a fellow member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a committee primarily charged with responsibilities to the western States of America, including my own; charged, too, with the determination of legislation for the territorial areas owned by our country.

Not once, but again and again, I have seen the senior Senator from Wyoming give of his valued time to causes in which other States in the West were vitally interested. My own State has been no exception. I very much doubt that congressional approval would have been given to important reclamation projects for California had not the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, having determined them to be in the public interest, helped to make them become a legislative reality.

Surely the admission of the two new States to the Union is in part the result of his belief in their honorable availability to become States of our beloved Union.

Mr. President, beyond all those things, I am most honored to call JOE O'MAHONEY my friend.

Over the years since our country was born, there have been in the Senate Chamber great leaders of thought, some sitting on the Democratic side of the aisle, and some on this side of the aisle. One of the reasons for their renown is that on many occasions they stood impervious to any and all cries for blind partisanship. They spoke out for what they believed to be in the interests of the people.

On many occasions I have listened to the senior Senator from Wyoming describe colorfully and most entertainingly his friendship with one of the great Senators who graced this Chamber for so many years, and who came from the State which I now have the honor in part to represent. Hiram Johnson was an outstanding Senator. I think perhaps I can indicate the warmth of my respect and my feeling for Senator O'MAHONEY when I say of him that the plane upon which the great Hiram Johnson operated is also the plane upon which Senator O'MAHONEY has operated.

All of us who are Members of the Senate hope to see much of Senator O'MAHONEY in the future.

We pray that his health will continue to be restored, and that he will find great comfort from the friendships he will take with him from this Chamber when this session concludes. Those friendships will continue with him all the rest of his days.

To Senator O'MAHONEY, Mr. President, I say good luck and God's blessing.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President——

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the announcement by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], that he will retire at the end of his present term of office has been a cause for extreme and genuine regret.

When Senator O'MAHONEY leaves the Senate, at the end of this session, he will be able to look back over the span of a quarter of a century during which the Senate has seen him devote his skill, his energy, and his voice to the everlasting betterment of this body, this country, and its people.

Except for a temporary political setback in 1952—or what he, himself, terms "a leave of absence"—he has served continuously in every Congress beginning with the 73d.

Although Senator O'MAHONEY was struck by illness almost a year ago, he rallied with his characteristic courage and vigor; and he has continued to maintain his well-deserved reputation of being a Senator's Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY was sworn into office for his present term—following his temporary "leave of absence"—on November 29, 1954. I well remember that date, because 3 days later I, myself, subscribed to the same oath of office.

During the last 5½ years, I have come to know Senator O'MAHONEY extremely well and intimately, through our service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His contributions to the work of that committee have been limitless, and he has justly earned the title of being one of America's outstanding conservationists.

Mr. President, regardless of whether the subject under consideration has been one in the field of conservation, reclamation, constitutional law, baseball, monopolies, or patents, Senator O'MAHONEY has continued to be an acknowledged expert in each.

He is a gentleman of the finest instincts, and he is a Senator in the finest traditions of statesmanship.

Certainly Senator O'MAHONEY will leave on the Senate the indelible imprint of his truly great characteristics and qualities.

All of us hope that he will return to this Chamber very often.

Mr. President, I echo the sentiments which have been expressed many times today by so many Members of the Senate when I say to Senator O'MAHONEY, good luck.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It would be difficult for me to add to the words of praise that have been expressed today for the senior Senator from Wyoming. Speaking at this point in the RECORD would be, in a sense, gilding the lily; but I join in the wonderful tributes paid to the senior Senator from Wyoming, and especially in those remarks addressed to him by his junior colleague, who knows him best and whose protege he is.

We all deeply respect him for the long years the senior Senator from Wyoming spent in government before he came to the Senate of the United States. Subsequent to that time he demonstrated a tremendous competence, not only as a lawyer, but as a legislator. He has been one of the most respected constitutional lawyers to serve in the U.S. Senate. When Senator O'MAHONEY rose to speak on a constitutional point he had the respect and the attention and the careful consideration of every man in the Senate, and this body does include some of the finest constitutional lawyers in the country today.

Senator O'MAHONEY's record in this Congress will be indelibly imprinted, not only upon the State of Wyoming, but upon all of the Far West, because of his dedication to conservation and the development of our great natural resources.

The State of Wyoming is indebted to her great senior Senator for his efforts in the field of water development, where he has been a leader. The entire West is indebted to and appreciative of Senator O'MAHONEY for his efforts not only in that field, but also in the field of mining, which is a field in which the West has needed help and support in recent years.

But aside from his interest in what one might call local considerations, those that directly affected not only his own State, but also the Far West, Senator O'MAHONEY has taken an active hand in legislation of great national consequence. He has devoted himself to the problems of the economy of this Nation, which is one of the least understood, and perhaps one of the least spectacular fields in which a legislator can engage, although it is one of the most important. In that area he has demonstrated the high competence that has been referred to by the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY has given leadership in the liberal principles of the Democratic Party in trying to maintain a national economy of great stability and of full employment.

Senator O'MAHONEY's stepping out of the Senate, for the unhappy reason which he has stated makes it necessary at this time, is not only a great loss to his State and to the area of the Far West, for which he was an outstanding spokesman, but also to the Nation as a whole.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to him, and my admiration for his great services, and to say to him that he will leave the Senate of the United States poorer because he is not here.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], following his announcement that he will retire late this year, after serving in this body for a quarter of a century. It has been my privilege to serve with the Wyoming Senator on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. During that close association I had an unusual opportunity to observe his keen insight into many of the problems which confront the public lands States of the West, including Wyoming and Idaho.

Likewise, I have been aware of his long and persistent efforts to protect the water rights of the Western States against encroachment by the Federal Government.

I have also had an opportunity to serve with Senator O'MAHONEY on the Appropriations Committee for many years. It is true that during the past few years he has not been a member of that committee, but I recall a decade or so ago when he rendered outstanding service in helping to draft the appropriation measures providing funds for the operation of the Federal Government.

Although I did not always agree with the Senator from Wyoming on appropriation items, I always recognized him as a champion of the interests of the West in all of the varied programs.

Mr. President, I also recall, back in 1936 or 1937, that the Wyoming Senator was intimately associated with the late Senator Borah of Idaho in their joint efforts to prevent the so-called court packing. At that time, of course, it was quite difficult for the Senator from Wyoming, being a Democrat, to oppose his Democratic President and leader. However, he received wide acclaim at that time because of the dauntless courage and indomitable determination he displayed in preventing what he considered to be a serious threat to the Supreme Court and to constitutional government.

I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming has made a wise personal decision in announcing his retirement. He is deserving of many years of leisure. I extend to him my own best wishes and the best wishes of the people of Idaho for health and happiness in his years of retirement. This felicitation also includes Mrs. O'Mahoney, who has so ably assisted him throughout his many years of public service.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to add a word of tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. I am sure that all of us are moved by mixed emotions on this occasion. We are proud to have been associated with a man who has been a Member of every Congress, beginning with the 73d, and who has for more than a quarter of a century devoted his exceptional talents to the work of the Senate. At the same time, we are deeply saddened to realize that his retirement from active public service draws near. The West, of course, has a special claim upon the distinguished Senator from Wyoming but, as a New Englander, let me say that we too would want to emphasize his birth in Chelsea, Mass., and his early education in that State before he went West as a young man. I had admired Senator O'MAHONEY at a distance for many years and appreciated his great qualities of leadership and statesmanship. As a new Member of the Senate in the 86th Congress, I have had the opportunity to know his warm personal qualities and his generous and sympathetic nature. In looking back upon a lifetime, rich in achievement and in contributions to the common welfare of our great Nation, Senator O'MAHONEY can be justly proud, as we are proud to be associated with him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when the retirement was announced of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, I spoke at length in recognition of his invaluable contribution to the American way of life, and expressed my sincere regret that time and circumstances have caused him to decide that he should not continue his service in the Senate beyond his current term. My remarks appear at page 10306 of the RECORD of May 13, 1960, under the heading "JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY: Wyoming's Great Senator."

Mr. President, all of us in the Senate recognize that the able and distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming is the outstanding constitutional lawyer of the Senate, and well qualified, in my opinion, to grace the highest Court of this land, and he has been so qualified for many years. He would have been an ornament to the highest Court in our land, just as he has been an ornament to the Senate in the great constitutional debates which have taken place in the Senate.

In my remarks of May 13 I pointed out the great bond of the cultural background that binds the people of Wyoming to the people of Texas. One year after the Civil War the Texas cattle herds were pointed north, and by 1868 they were in Wyoming, at a time when Wyoming had a population of less than 10,000. The longhorn cattle there helped to furnish labor for the many people who moved in. There resulted a blended population which came from the North and Southwest and South, and the older sections of the country. As a result there came into being a new, vigorous State, typified by the dynamic leaders which the people of Wyoming have sent to Congress year after year.

I have already referred to one of the Texans, John Benjamin Kendrick, who as a young man of 22 was one of the cowboys who followed a herd of cattle to Wyoming. He grew up 20 miles from where I was reared in east Texas. He was one of Wyoming's great triumvirate of Senators—Frances E. Warren, John B. Kendrick, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

In Senator O'MAHONEY's leaving the Senate, the Senate is losing one of its real treasures and one of the gems of its history. All the people of my State regret your leaving, Senator O'MAHONEY. All of us here have been proud, as all in my State have been proud, of what you brought to us in legal learning and constitutional knowledge. You have established a record of service in the Senate that will live as long as the history of the Senate lives.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Senator O'MAHONEY's decision to retire from the Senate is a cause of sadness to all of us. For more than 25 years, his service here has been that of a loyal friend, faithful steward, and eminent constitutionalist.

His grasp of national problems and his relentless efforts to solve these problems in the best possible way has made America stronger, and a better place to live.

The opportunities for independent business, the fertile valleys of the West which replaced desert wastes, improved management of our natural resources, and preservation of the sacred right of trial by jury all bear testimony to his long career of devoted and constructive service. The fruits of his efforts here will be enjoyed and appreciated by Americans in the ages to come.

We here in the Senate share the affection the people of Wyoming have demonstrated for this great statesman. We will miss him; his friendly counsel, his friendly association, and his sincere dedication to great causes.

Certainly we wish for him the fullest happiness in years to come: a restoration to full health, an opportunity to reflect on his magnificent career, and the secure knowledge that the best wishes and prayers of his colleagues follow him always.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY, announced that he will retire at the end of his present term and thus end one of the most outstanding 25 years of service in national affairs, I was filled with a sense of personal loss.

As one who has been a Member of this body for nearly 2 years, I felt the warmth of his friendship and the willingness with which he distributed his wisdom to those of us who have been comparatively recent arrivals to the Senate.

No greater tribute can come to any man than the tribute of the record he himself compiled in national affairs for a quarter century.

Some of the great milestones in legislation are embodied in his long and successful battle against monopolies, which have had the effect of stifling much of our business activity. I wish to assure Senator O'MAHONEY that I and others in the Senate will continue the battle that he nobly initiated against the monopolies and for independent business.

There is another field in which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming compiled an enviable record of direct interest to the people of my State. I refer to his far-reaching program for the development of our rivers, for the conservation of our precious supplies of water, and for the reclamation of our desert wastelands.

Throughout his long career, his policies were always within the framework of the document that he loved, respected, and lived by—the Constitution of the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY's monumental work in this Senate will never be forgotten. I join in the genuine expression that has already been stated by my colleagues who spoke of this great man. The expression that his spirit will continue in this Chamber, and his example will inspire those who are to follow him.

My wish is for Senator O'MAHONEY to enjoy in happiness and contentment the feeling of achievement in the comparative quiet of the years that are ahead of him. But I am sure that his sagacious counsel and vast experience and information will be made available to us even through the good Senator's retirement.

He is a credit to his State and to his Nation, and Senator O'MAHONEY's patriotism and dedication will long remain and be respected.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to be associated with the distinguished Senators who have been paying tribute to the senior Senator from Wyoming, JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, who has announced that he will not seek reelection to this body.

Outside of the State of Wyoming, I am confident that the people of no other State will receive this news with greater regret than the citizens of Hawaii. They have reason for their expressions of regret and also appreciation for Senator O'MAHONEY, both as a man and as

a public official. No other Member of the Senate developed a greater understanding of the people of Hawaii nor a greater appreciation of their qualities and worth in relation to their devotion to American institutions and the American way of life.

Senator O'MAHONEY first visited Hawaii in 1937. That was 23 years ago. On that visit, he showed clearly his belief that the only basis on which a territory could be considered for statehood was the kind of people that make up its citizenry. Doubtless, he was just as much intrigued by the scenic beauty of Hawaii as other visitors. I am certain that with his great interest in economy, he recognized the possibilities of Hawaii in relation to commerce and trade.

He was among the first, however, to say that Hawaii's real greatness would never be measured in terms of natural resources and wealth, but rather in terms of a people who have demonstrated to the world that men and women of different cultural and racial backgrounds, of varying hopes and aspirations, could live together with complete understanding and work cooperatively on desirable community goals. This was the thought he most often expressed on that first visit and through a long period of years he never ceased talking about it.

It was because of this conviction that during the next 23 years he worked, in season and out of season, for statehood. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he spent long hours planning the several hearings that were held on statehood. He gathered all available information and, with a skill and logic unsurpassed, he wove an argument for statehood that ultimately could not be rejected.

He persisted in this course until that day of March 12, 1959, when the Senate, by a vote of 76 to 15, granted statehood to Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union. For this the people of Hawaii will forever be grateful.

When an ordinary worker leaves his job, there is always someone to pick up where he left off. His place can be taken. This is not so with the poet, the painter, the sculptor, the musician, or any leader who is really creative.

Senator O'MAHONEY is leaving this body. There will be another Senator elected to represent his beloved State in the Senate of the United States, but there is no one who can take his place. Every one of his colleagues will be aware of a loss sustained. We are reconciled at this time, however, by the thought that we will have happy memories of our association with him. His influence will continue to be a constructive force in the life of the Nation.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in concluding these reflections this afternoon, I think it is significant that our colleagues here have recounted with a personal touch, with the warmth of personal memory, the contributions that Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has made to all. But I say, my colleagues, that these are contributions that are not alone for now. These landmarks of the pages of our country's history for the past quarter of a century are the guideposts that will steer us unerringly in the days ahead. And that to me is the great debt that we owe to my beloved senior colleague and my dearest friend, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Senator JOE, I wonder if you would like to have the floor at this moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The Chair is privileged to recognize the senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It may be appropriate for me to state for the record the remarkable coincidence that today is the 11th month after my suffering the stroke which took me to the naval hospital. Eleven months ago today I was taken into that hospital, utterly unable to stand or to use any part of my left side. I have made great progress, but it is that fact which has compelled me to make the decision which my colleagues have mentioned here today.

My heart is full of gratitude for what has been said by my junior colleague, Senator McGEE, of Wyoming, and by all the other Senators who have joined him on this occasion. I know very well, of course, that it is all beyond my deserts. I know how generous my colleagues have been, and I do appreciate it.

However, I want the record to show that I recognize the services I have had from a great staff. From the very beginning of my services in the Senate, when the late Julian Snow was my secretary, I have been surrounded by men and women who have loyally, intelligently, and devotedly served the ends of that office.

Today my administrative assistant, Mr. Mike Manatos, is the president of all the administrative assistants in the Senate. My legislative assistant, Mr. Jerry O'Callaghan, has been of immeasurable help to me in various committee work. I also wish to pay tribute to my personal secretary, Miss Marie Mathew; my press secretary, Mrs. Louise Love; and the other members of my staff, including Miss Mary Ann Ellis, of Sheridan, Wyo., Mrs. Mabelle Knight, Mrs. Betty Turk, and Miss Mary Normington.

I want my colleagues to know that I thank them most sincerely for this memorable occasion, which, of course, I can never forget.

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

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 11, 1960]

MAY HAPPINESS HOLD HIM FAST

Few Wyoming men achieve national importance, countrywide impact, and influence.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY did, in a Senate career which now encompasses more than a quarter of a century. The doing has redounded to the imposing benefit of Wyoming and the West.

Dignity and decision, O'MAHONEY character hallmarks, highlight his just-disclosed decision not to stand for reelection in 1960.

He said, in about so many words, that his ability to serve has been mitigated by reasons of health. (The Senator suffered a stroke nearly a year ago, from which he is effecting remarkable recovery.)

Senator O'MAHONEY left us to understand (and this is what we would have expected from him) that he will not compromise the public entitlement to complete effort, particularly in an arena of public service as eminent as the U.S. Senate.

Readers do not have to be told that this column has often and over many years contested with Senator O'MAHONEY on political ways and means. Honest conviction has prevailed and we are confident that mutual respect has not been eroded. The record of what we are talking about attests (above all else from where we sit) the Senator's formidability.

We praise Senator O'MAHONEY because, as it is said, he's got it coming.

Although born to Massachusetts, he is of and for Wyoming.

His talents, tailormade for Senate service, are immense. What has been going on between O'MAHONEY and the Senate is a love affair. One gauging it that way (a proper view) realizes just how difficult it will be for the Senator to move to the gallery of ex-Senators.

But move he will. The moment will be sad, historic, and regrettable. It will close a Wyoming political era. (Wyoming has given longer Senate tenure to but one other, the late Francis E. Warren, also of Cheyenne, whose more than 37 years service is a Senate record.)

The praise and tribute going out to Senator O'MAHONEY, from all parts of Wyoming, is warm, sincere, and bipartisan.

The hope of all is that good health will return to and abide with him, that happiness will hold him fast.

---

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang, May 11, 1960]

WHEN THE PEOPLE WERE INVOLVED

The term "statesman" is one of the most overworked in our modern vocabularies, but certainly it applies to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY who announced this week that he would not seek reelection.

There are many terms that apply to Wyoming's senior Senator: "scholar," "friend of the people," "spokesman for Wyoming," "attorney," "legislator," etc.

This man of many talents and a vast array of accomplishments has represented Wyoming and its people well. He is highly respected by his colleagues and in the area of monopoly law and in matters concerning water rights.

It will be a long time before Wyoming is represented by a man of his stature, courage, and intelligence. He operated within a firm code of morals and ethics. He was highly articulate in explaining that code in relation to issues.

He was even more articulate, if that is possible, in carrying Wyoming's story to all the Nation.

How do you tell such a man that his service is appreciated, that his courage is admired, that his works are the pattern for future generations?

Senator O'MAHONEY would be the first to turn from flowery praise. But some of the more blunt expressions which we use might not find favor either.

The best way we can think of putting it is like this: When the people were involved, as they are in just about everything, Senator O'MAHONEY was their spokesman—able, mature, and convincing.

We owe a lot to Senator O'MAHONEY. His type of lawmaker is all too rare. We hope the pattern hasn't been lost, because we need men like him in these times.

---

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, May 11, 1960]

CHAMPION OF THE WEST

If reports on his health are accurate, the decision of U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, not to seek reelection is a wise one. It is characteristic of the sober judgment of the 75-year-old lawyer-lawmaker who suffered a stroke about

a year ago. Although he has partially recovered, his health and that of his wife, who has had two strokes, is not good. Because of his tendency to push himself to the limit, his decision to retire well could prolong his life.

Senator O'MAHONEY's record in Congress is one of which the Nation and particularly the Intermountain West can be proud. Brilliant, articulate and forceful, he has worked hard for reclamation, wool, public land, and other programs he believed were for the benefit of the intermountain region. He was a stanch Democrat, but on many occasions demonstrated dramatically that he wore no man's collar. One was his vigorous fight against President Roosevelt's "court packing" attempts in 1937 and another was his long-term effort to cut waste in Government spending and to strengthen the economic welfare of the country.

O'MAHONEY, formerly a Cheyenne newspaper editor, went to Washington first in 1917 as secretary to Wyoming's late great Senator Kendrick. He was named First Assistant Postmaster General in 1933, but Senator Kendrick suddenly died that year and O'MAHONEY was named to succeed him. O'MAHONEY was in the Senate continuously for 19 years but was beaten in 1952 by the combination of the Eisenhower sweep and Republican Frank Barrett, vigorous spokesman for livestock and allied interests. He surprised the experts and staged a comeback in 1954. That term expires this year.

The voluminous report of the Joint Economic Committee, which he headed for years, is just one of the many monuments to Senator O'MAHONEY. The Tribune joins in paying tribute to a gentleman of integrity and stature, a forceful spokesman for the West.

---

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver Colo., May 11, 1960]

A BIG CHANGE FOR WYOMING

(By Pasquale Marranzino)

U.S. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY sent word to his Wyoming constituency that he is hanging up his gloves and will not seek reelection.

The news isn't surprising, but it comes as a disappointing change to Wyoming Democrats who have been voting for the craggy-faced, bushy-browed Senator since 1933.

Only once in that interim, 1952–54, did the colorful lawyer fail in his bid to go to Washington as Senator, swamped in the overwhelming GOP victory that brought Frank Barrett into office.

His impressive career was halted last June in the midst of a typical O'MAHONEY battle. He led the forces that successfully opposed the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as commerce Secretary. Weary from days of testifying and speaking against the nomination, O'MAHONEY collapsed as he left the Senate floor, a victim of a stroke.

Even though the stroke kept him bedridden for months, it couldn't lick JOE. He made an amazing recovery and continued his work from his hospital bed by telephone and in consultation with his staff and colleagues.

JOE's most brilliant and possibly one of the most vital coups for the commonweal—came in those days of the Roosevelt administration when the Wyoming Senator led the fight to keep intact the size of the U.S. Supreme Court. FDR, who had hoped to enlarge the court and pack it with birds of his feather, broke his party pick on JOE's stubborn opposition.

This break with FDR was made after considerable wrestling with the O'MAHONEY conscience. He had been one of the first New Dealers. He helped write the Democratic platform that carried Mr. Roosevelt into power. And he was rewarded with the first Assistant Postmaster General job in that first administration.



The 75-year-old Senator has Colorado roots. He was born in Massachusetts and came West in 1908 to Boulder. There he worked on a Boulder newspaper as city editor and also was a correspondent for the Rocky Mountain News and the Associated Press. He left Boulder in 1916 to go to work for a Cheyenne paper owned by the late Gov. John B. Kendrick.

His newspapering was interrupted when Kendrick ran for the Senate, JOE serving as campaign manager and secretary. He went to Washington with the successful Kendrick as secretary. When Kendrick died in 1934, O'MAHONEY was named to the job.

Although JOE's close New Deal associations made him a national power, he never placed the good of the West in second spot.

He battled for reclamation, for rural electrification, for domestic wool, for the farmer and rancher and for more water to irrigate more acres and help his arid State.

In recent years he has been a thorn in the side of the Eisenhower administration. Although a New Dealer, he didn't have the New Deal propensity for big spending. He was tightfisted with the dollar and kept hammering away at inflation, high prices and Government participation in private industry through foreign deals.

He probed the national oil import program and suggested that the administration quit having the big oil companies formulate foreign policy. He was an ardent supporter of the antitrust laws, asking for crackdowns on meatpackers, insurance companies, and monopolies.

He has served long and well and with devotion to the West. Retirement for JOE will be rough, but we expect he still will remain the No. 1 Democrat in Wyoming.

---

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, May 11, 1960]

HIS RECORD WILL STAND

When Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY lost his bid for reelection in 1952, an editorial writer for a Denver newspaper said:

"The empire's biggest loss and perhaps the country's was that of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, a statesman of national stature who never forgot the home folks."

Two years later, the citizens of Wyoming paid O'MAHONEY one of the highest tributes ever paid to a former public official. They insisted, through a tremendous, statewide draft movement, that he give up his law practice and run for the U.S. Senate again. He finally bowed to their wishes and agreed to run, and the voters returned him to the Senate where he belonged.

Although technically he went to Washington in January, 1955, as the junior Senator from Wyoming, he was not treated as such. Because of his 19 years in the Senate before his 1952 defeat and because of the stature he had attained during those years, he was given important committee assignments and his counsel was sought on many subjects.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, took up right where he had left off—as a statesman of national stature and a champion of the Rocky Mountain West.

Now, 8 years and hundreds of accomplishments after that 1952 election defeat, it appears that Wyoming, the West, and the Nation are going to have to do without the services of Senator O'MAHONEY.

In a letter to Democratic Party officials, convened in State convention at Thermopolis Monday, the Senator said he would not file for reelection.

And that was bad news for everyone. For many, many persons agreed that even at the age of 75 and in spite of his stroke a year ago he was a more effective U.S. Senator than most. In fact, it was said that even while he was in the hospital, operating by telephone and through his staff, he got things done more effectively than most Senators operating within the Senate Chamber.

Many believe he could have won reelection again this year, even with a minimum of campaigning.

But the decision was his, and he based it upon his own health and the health of Mrs. O'Mahoney, who also suffered a stroke 2 years ago.

In his letter to Thermopolis, the Senator reminded he told the people of Wyoming in 1954, when he agreed to run again, that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

"I have kept the faith with the people of Wyoming," he wrote. And indeed he has—for 25 long years.

For a quarter of a century, Senator O'MAHONEY has given his time and energy to the welfare of the people of Wyoming, the West, and the Nation, with Mrs. O'Mahoney always at his side.

He and Mrs. O'Mahoney richly deserve the many years of leisure and happiness their thousands and thousands of friends wish them.

Senator O'MAHONEY's presence on the floor of the U.S. Senate will be sorely missed. But his record will stand in history—a challenge to all future Senators from Wyoming.

Because he is a leader, the Senator undoubtedly will remain in the limelight of State and National Government and politics. And he and Mrs. O'Mahoney most certainly will remain very much in the hearts of Wyoming citizens.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 18, 1960]

HAIL AND FAREWELL

An impressive record of service to the Nation and to their party has been written by three veteran Democratic Senators who have announced their intention of not seeking re-election this year. It is a record that goes back to the middle 1930's, to the years when the New Deal of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was changing the course of the country's social and political history. Each of the trio now retiring—Senators GREEN of Rhode Island, MURRAY of Montana, and O'MAHONEY of Wyoming—first took his place in the Senate Chamber during that momentous period. In the years since, each has spoken with a strong and influential voice in the Nation's affairs and in Democratic Party councils.

Among them, Senator GREEN at 92 is the oldest and is, in fact, the oldest man ever to serve in either branch of Congress. Many years of Democratic Party activity, including two terms as Governor of his State, preceded Mr. GREEN's election to the Senate in 1936. In his four terms here, this Rhode Islander of Colonial Yankee ancestry has become identified as a "loyal liberal" on domestic legislative issues and an internationalist on foreign policy. When the 86th Congress organized last year, Mr. GREEN stepped aside as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee but retained a place in that group as well as in the Rules Committee. He is still chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library and a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

At 83, Mr. MURRAY is junior in age among Senators only to Mr. GREEN. First elected to the Senate in 1934, the Montanan has directed his attention mostly to matters in the jurisdiction of the Interior and Labor Committees. He is a member of both and chairman of the former, as well as being a member also of the Policy Committee. His claim to liberalism in social legislation is a valid one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, now 75, came to Washington first on the staff of the late Senator Kendrick of Wyoming and returned as Assistant Postmaster General under President Roosevelt. In 1933, he was appointed to

complete the unexpired term of Senator Kendrick and was elected in his own right in 1934. He was defeated in 1952, but was elected again in 1954. His present committee assignments—Interior, Judiciary, and Joint Economic—reflect his principal legislative interests. An effective orator and popular with his colleagues, Mr. O'MAHONEY was one of the "workhorses" of the Senate in earlier years.

Those who follow the Senate most closely will miss this threesome on the Democratic side of the aisle.

---

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, May 10, 1960]

O'MAHONEY HAS LONG OUTSTANDING RECORD AS U.S. SENATOR

(By Bernard Horton)

When Wyoming's Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY leaves his office next January, he will be ringing down the curtain on one of the most outstanding public service careers in the history of Wyoming.

His loss will be felt throughout the Nation—and particularly in Wyoming and the West. For this State and the entire Rocky Mountain West have never had a greater champion in any capacity in Washington.

At the end of this year, when his current 6-year term expires, the Senator will have served 25 years as Senator from Wyoming. During that time, he has gained a stature equalled by very few Senators, indeed.

O'MAHONEY was city editor of the Cheyenne State Leader from 1916 to 1920, when he entered law practice.

In March 1933 he was appointed first assistant postmaster general, and in December that same year, he was appointed by then Gov. Leslie A. Miller to fill the vacancy in the U.S. Senate caused by the death of John B. Kendrick.

On November 6, 1934, he was elected to both the unexpired term, ending January 3, 1935, and the full term ending January 3, 1941.

He was reelected November 5, 1940, and again on November 5, 1946.

He lost his bid for reelection in 1952, but 2 years later he submitted to a statewide draft movement and ran for U.S. Senator again. And this time, too, he ran for both a short term, to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Lester C. Hunt, and the full, 6-year term. He won both, and by virtue of the short term he served in the only Congress he might have missed since 1933.

When he was defeated in 1952, he was one of the most powerful Members in the entire U.S. Congress by virtue of his 19 years of seniority in the Senate.

He had won recognition far and wide as a statesman and champion of western development.

In 1952, for instance, the National Wool Growers Association gave him the title of "Mr. Wool" because of his tireless efforts in behalf of the domestic wool industry.

And it was he who, in 1950, secured legislation establishing a national forestry advisory board of appeals, to which livestockmen might appeal controversies which might arise in connection with the grazing of livestock in national forests.

When former Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman announced his approval of the $15 million trona project in Sweetwater County as a defense project, he gave O'MAHONEY full credit for gaining that approval.

It was O'MAHONEY who brought about the establishment of the alumina plant at Laramie during World War II.

Many times, he has been credited with saving Warren Air Force Base for Cheyenne, for he recognized its economic value to Cheyenne and Wyoming and the function it could serve for the entire Nation.

He has championed Wyoming's sugar beet industry. In 1952, an article in the Mountain States Beet Growers magazine paid him this tribute:

"The sugar industry, and sugar beet growers in particular, have always known the Senator to be one of the most sincere and helpful protagonists of the western sugar beet industry. He has never failed in championing the cause that has brought the sugar beet to a position of national prominence in our economy."

He has always been popular with labor circles because of his philosophy that "the prosperity of this Nation and all its people depends on full employment at good wages."

He has long been recognized as a leader in national and international affairs, and he has been particularly recognized for his leadership in the field of national defense.

In 1952, he was named Aviation's Man of the Year for his leadership in contributing to a strong and more efficient airpower program for America.

Always he has been strong for clean and honest government. In 1951 he procured passage of an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act which provides for the cancellation of any procurement contract for the armed services if the contractor gives or offers to give any gratuity to any procurement officer or employee of the Armed Forces.

But those are just a few of the accomplishments for which he is recognized.

When Senator O'MAHONEY returned to the Senate in January 1955, after a 2-year absence, he was not looked upon as a freshman Senator, which technically, he was. He was given important committee assignments and his counsel was sought.

Right now he is a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee—all powerful groups.

When he bowed to the statewide draft movement in 1954, and became a candidate for the Senate, he said:

"The people, however, are entitled to a frank expression of the principles which guide me.

"1. I shall not be a candidate for reelection.

"2. No voter has ever heard my voice in personal attack upon any opponent, nor will any hear it so raised in this campaign.

"3. I have no personal nor partisan objective to serve and I pledge all the people that I shall labor for only those causes which in my judgment are for the public good."

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4029) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm.

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

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

---

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## RECONNAISSANCE SATELLITES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the summit conference is over. Its collapse has wrecked any hope of an early thawing of the cold war.

One thing is already clear. Mr. Khrushchev overplayed his hand. He left Moscow planning to split the free world asunder; he is returning to Moscow with the free world more united than before. His was the failure of a mission.

A second thing is clear: The unfortunate U–2 incident did not itself cause the collapse of the Paris meeting. It was merely the excuse Mr. Khrushchev seized upon to torpedo the conference.

I grant that the Kremlin leaders, with their Iron Curtain mentality, may be ultrasensitive about incursions into the air space over the Soviet Union. Yet Mr. Khrushchev's treatment of the U–2 flights was cynical in the extreme. He has tried to create the impression that an end to the U–2 flights would suffice to end the problem of aerial intelligence gathering. He knows better. He knows that both his scientists and our scientists are working around the clock to develop a reconnaissance satellite. The time is drawing close when the first model of such a satellite can be launched.

Mr. President, Senators are no doubt familiar with the revolutionary importance of the reconnaissance satellite. It will be equipped with cameras of incredible precision and other information-gathering and transmitting instruments. As an information-gathering device, it

will ultimately compare in efficiency to the U–2 as a modern jetplane compares to Kitty Hawk.

It will eventually be possible to manufacture these reconnaissance satellites in great numbers. Their orbits will crisscross over every portion of the earth's surface.

The reconnaissance satellite means that the age of the Iron Curtain is drawing to a close. It will soon go the way of the Great Wall of China.

What are we going to do about it? Think back 15 years ago when we first grappled with the political problems created by the atomic bomb. We took the right and proper course. We offered, subject to safeguards of elementary prudence, to place our atomic stockpile under United Nations stewardship. Only Soviet intransigence kept that program from being adopted.

There is only one military reason why we are developing the satellite—to safeguard our country and our free world partners from surprise attack. We ask nothing of other nations that we are not willing to do ourselves.

The reconnaissance satellite now gives our Nation another chance to act as a responsible member of the world community.

Mr. President, I have written to President Eisenhower, formally recommending that, subject to necessary safeguards, we offer to place our reconnaissance satellites at the service of the United Nations as a part of an international inspection program designed to prevent nuclear Pearl Harbors for any nation. If accepted, this offer would help to lay the groundwork for the beginnings of an enforceable disarmament program.

I have also respectfully suggested to the President that we now reappraise our technical program for achieving the first reconnaissance satellite, toward the end of getting in the sky at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Khrushchev can have no rational objection to such a move. After all, the Soviet Union, with its first sputnik, was the first to fly over the air space of other nations.

A still more important point. There is now growing reason to suspect that a man may be sitting in the Soviet spaceship circling the globe at this very minute and that the Soviets may very shortly attempt to return this man—alive—to earth.

Mr. President, it is our duty to build the armaments needed for our survival. But it is also our duty to do everything within our power to put the instruments of science and technology under effective international control. One great move in this direction would be to establish an international program for guarding against surprise attacks. The reconnaissance satellite will give us a chance to start such a program. Let us seize that chance.

---

## CONSTRUCTION OF SAN LUIS UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. (a) That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities, but no facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission or distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can through such contract be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities. The works (hereinafter referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed, so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area, as hereinafter provided. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure, all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956.

(b) No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed and which will be in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956. Said agreement shall recite that the liability of the United States thereunder is contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out its obligations under the same. No funds shall be appropriated to commence construction of the San Luis unit under any such agreement, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after it has been submitted to the Congress, and then only if either the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has disapproved it by committee resolution within said ninety days. If such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree that, if it later enlarges the joint-use facilities, or any of them, it will pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of those facilities as initially constructed before utilizing them for the storage or delivery of water and will bear the entire cost of enlarging the same and if, as a part of said equitable share, it makes available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of

such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and the use of the additional capacity for water service shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

SEC. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint-use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (i) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (ii) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction cost of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and amendments thereto, for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations and to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h–1) in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocation is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State;

(j) the State shall not serve any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area except as such service is required as a consequence of its acceptance of the care, operation, and maintenance of works under paragraph (g) of this section.

SEC. 4. If the Secretary proceeds to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis works under the terms of section 1 of this Act solely as a Federal project, the operation shall be subject to the following restriction: Whenever the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed one hundred and fifty parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity project.

SEC. 5. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contracts the terms of which are as nearly similar as is practicable to those required by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925; 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 6. The Secretary is directed to plan the works authorized in this Act in such a manner as to contemplate and make possible the future provision of Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties heretofore anticipated as a possibility by the Acts of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) and August 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 937). Construction of additional works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary, and the works have been authorized by Act of Congress.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. Said base sum of $290,430,000 shall, however, be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands or interests in land available to the Secretary pursuant to sections 2 or 3 of this Act which decrease the costs which would be incurred if the works authorized in section 1 of this Act (including provision for their subsequent expansion) were constructed solely as a Federal project. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, but not to exceed in total cost the sum of $192,650,000, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit: *Provided*, That no funds shall be appropriated for construction of distribution systems and drains prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after a contract has been submitted to the Congress calling for complete repayment of the distribution systems and drains within a period of forty years from the date such works are placed in service. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have only two or three very short comments to make. The Senators from California, I am sure, will desire to say a few words on this subject.

This is a project which I have personally inspected several times. It is a project on which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs worked at great length. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation successfully recommended to the Senate favorable action upon the bill. The bill was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House of Representatives.

I am pleased the House has taken the action it has taken upon the bill. I have examined, I think carefully, all the House amendments. If I correctly interpret them, as I think they should be interpreted, I believe the House has improved the bill.

Therefore, I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 44. I know the Senators from California will desire to express themselves upon this motion.

Mr. ENGLE and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico. I agree that the House work upon this particular piece of proposed legislation has improved it. It is substantially the same bill which passed the Senate. The language is a little different. I would say it is only different in the sense that it is somewhat more precise than was the language we passed in the Senate. As a consequence, I agree it would be proper to concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. President, I have gone over the amendments, as has the Senator from New Mexico, and as has, I believe, my senior colleague from California. I am sure my colleague agrees that the present provisions of the bill represent an improvement rather than the contrary, and that as a consequence no good purpose would be served by going to conference.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his assistance in handling this proposed legislation. The Senator from New Mexico has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years. He was the chairman of that subcommittee during the time I was the chairman of the equivalent subcommittee in the House of Representatives. He was the chairman of that subcommittee during the time I was the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at which time I had the privilege of working with the Senator on numerous western reclamation projects, including the upper Colorado Basin project.

Those of us from California, intensely interested as we are in water development, are deeply grateful not only to the Senator from New Mexico but also to his associates on the committee.

We are deeply grateful to the senior Senator from California, who has been a splendid leader in the water programs for the Far West, and also to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. President, I would not conclude my remarks without saying that we are very grateful indeed to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, who has been a constant friend of western reclamation during many years. Representative ASPINALL gave his tremendous and powerful support to this proposed legislation when it was before the House.

Our California colleague, Representative B. F. SISK, who is on the floor of the Senate with me today, is the author of this proposed legislation. To him we give great credit for his effort.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a year ago the Senate passed Senate bill 44, introduced by my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself. It has been described, accurately, I think, as one of the finest reclamation projects ever to come before a Congress. I am most grateful that the House saw fit to pass the bill earlier this week, with some amendments which I believe have improved the bill.

The legislation before us envisages a great storage reservoir to be constructed and used jointly by the Government of the United States and the Government of California. It will serve a Federal reclamation project on the one hand, subject to Federal reclamation law, and it will also serve a State project, the Feather River project, on the other hand, under State law. An expanded area of the Central Valley Project, a Federal reclamation project, will receive supplemental water in accordance with Federal statutes, and the lower San Joaquin valley and the parched areas of southern California will receive an additional water supply under State statutes.

I have before me a brief statement of the rather technical amendments which the House made in the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE-PASSED SAN LUIS BILL AND S. 44 AS PASSED BY SENATE

(Page and line references are to printing of S. 44, as it was passed to the House of Representatives on May 14, 1959.)

1. On page 2, line 9, after "facilities," the House bill adds a prohibition against construction of electric transmission or distribution lines if the Secretary determines on the basis of a firm 50-year contract from a local public or private agency, that necessary power to operate San Luis can be obtained at less cost than by construction and operation of Federal facilities.

2. On page 3, lines 14, 15, and 16, there is a clarifying change in the House bill which merely accurately identifies the report referred to.

3. On page 4, starting on line 12, the House bill adds provisions stating that the agreement with the State shall specify that the liability of the United States is contingent upon appropriations, and further providing that no funds shall be appropriated to commence construction until the agreement between the State and the Secretary has been submitted to Congress and has lain there during 90 session days without disapproval of either the Senate or House Interior Committees.

4. On page 5, starting on line 15, the House bill inserts provisions requiring the State, if it enlarges the joint-use facilities after initial construction, to pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of the facilities as initially constructed, and to bear the entire cost of enlarging them.

5. On page 6, on line 2, before "and provided further," the House bill inserts a requirement that the State's use of the joint-use facilities shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area.

6. On page 8, line 23, the House bill deletes the word "title" so that only the care, operation, and maintenance of the works shall be turned over to the State.

7. On page 9, in the middle of line 4, the House bill inserts a provision that any organization which has contracted with the Federal Government for water, in the event operation is turned over to the State, "shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations" as it would have under continued Federal service. This insures the continuance of the 160-acre limitation.

8. On page 9, after line 23, the House bill inserts a new subsection prohibiting the State from serving any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area, except as such service is required if it accepts operation under paragraph (g).

9. On page 9, after line 23, and the preceding new subsection, there is inserted by the House bill a new section 4 restricting the withdrawal of Federal San Luis water from the delta whenever Delta-Mendota water exceeds 150 parts per million of chlorides during the summer months, unless the Trinity project is adding an equal amount of water to the Sacramento Valley. Remaining sections are renumbered.

10. On page 10, starting on line 22, the Senate bill directly authorizes construction of an extension of CVP via Pacheco tunnel to serve Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties with certain provisos. The House bill has the effect of including these areas in the Central Valley service area and authorizes a report on feasibility, which would require a later authorization by act of Congress.

11. On page 11, after the sentence ending on line 18, the House bill inserts a provision that the authorization for appropriations of $290,430,000 shall be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands available which decrease the cost of the works to the Federal Government.

12. On page 11, line 22, after the word "interest," the House bill inserts a limitation on the total cost of distribution and drainage systems of $192,650,000, and adds the further provision that no funds may be appropriated for distribution and drainage systems until a contract for complete repayment has lain before Congress for 90 session days.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is the last happy chapter in the enactment of this beneficent bill which will serve the best interests of the United States, and of the State of California. It has the approval of the State and Federal Governments and their respective agencies. The President has urged it. The Vice President has urged it. I ask adoption of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from New Mexico if he will yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I recall, this is the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator inform me whether this bill, as it comes from the House, makes any substantial changes in the bill as it passed the Senate last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that there are no substantial changes. There are a few changes in wording, which I think probably improve the bill. Many of them

were suggested by Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, who is a stanch friend of those who wish to keep reclamation within reasonable bounds. I think the bill is a satisfactory bill. I believe no substantial change has been made in it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I recall, there was a lengthy debate on the floor last year on the acreage limitation feature, the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That has not been affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill has been strengthened, if anything. There was a possibility that the State of California could have diverted water from its share and put it on Federal lands. We did not think that was possible. It might have been possible, but the House added a provision which would make it impossible. It provides that in all Federal sections the areas must be supplied from Federal units. Hence, the 160-acre limitation would apply.

I think the House strengthened the bill. I do not believe it needed strengthening. Nevertheless, the House added a provision to safeguard the item which we had long debated. I can assure the Senator that I was interested in that point, because if the bill had been varied in any way, those of us who were trying to protect the situation would have been subject to criticism. I am sure the bill has been strengthened rather than weakened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate bill 44.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House amendment was concurred in.

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

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## OLD FOLKS, WITHOUT MEDICINE, DIE LIKE ANIMALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all too often we discuss major issues in terms of statistics and averages and we lose sight of the all-important human element. This is particularly true in the case of providing medical care for our senior citizens.

The statistics in this case, however, come to life in the actual hard experience related in letters from our older constituents. Here, for example, is a case study that tells the story better than any set of facts and figures. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SIR: It is some time since I wrote to you about not so very important matters to anyone but me. I waited so patiently for the age of 62 when I could have my pension and could have a little easier life. Well, I got my pension—$23.90 a month. Can an old person live on that? I am not a widow. My husband gets $68. He hasn't worked for many years. He has a heart condition. We can't even buy medicines. We could only dream of a hospital. We old folks must just die like animals. I know you have more important matters to think about, but please try to help us.

Respectfully,

———.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the calendar in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, when the Senate adjourns this afternoon, it will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

On Monday, after the morning hour, it is planned to have the Senate consider items on the calendar beginning on page 10, with Calendar No. 1374, Senate Resolution 279, a resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations, and continuing to the bottom of page 13, ending with Calendar No. 1407, Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a resolution authorizing the reprinting of a certain joint committee print.

I desire to give further notice that there are several bills on the calendar which have been cleared by the policy committee, and which may be taken up on motion in the early part of next week. Among such bills are: Calendar No. 921, Senate bill 2168, a bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; and Calendar No. 924, House bill 8315, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized School District, Missouri.

On Tuesday it is planned to have the Senate consider the President's veto message on Senate bill 722, the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What date did the Senator say the veto message would be taken up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On Tuesday next.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to note that. I hope, for the RECORD, that it will not be postponed until Wednesday. I wish to be present, but I cannot be present on Wednesday because of an important engagement in Harrisburg.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] stated at the opening of the session today that it would be taken up on Tuesday, and that if it were not possible to complete consideration of the debate on the question of overriding the veto, it would be carried over until Wednesday.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that the Senate can conclude the debate on Tuesday. If the Senate is ready to vote on Tuesday, I hope the vote will not be postponed until Wednesday, merely in order to accommodate Senators who cannot be present on Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was not the idea. The idea was that if the Senate could not conclude debate on Tuesday, it would go over until Wednesday; but the majority leader expressed the hope that debate will be concluded on Tuesday. We shall do the best we can.

It is expected also that the agricultural appropriation bill will be reported next week, and it is hoped that it can be considered at an early date.

As other legislation is reported and cleared by the policy committee, it will be announced and considered expeditiously. We are coming into the home stretch of the session. It is very important that committees meet and report proposed legislation as soon as possible.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. May I inquire of the Senator what may be taken up on Monday? I was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is planned to consider measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1374, on page 10, and including all of pages 11, 12, and 13, plus the possibility, if time and circumstances allow, of consideration of the oleomargarine bill and the Stella School bill.

It is planned to consider on Tuesday the question of overriding the President's veto of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

## WORLD TRADE WEEK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Pennsylvania's two largest cities will be saluting World Trade Week this month. On Wednesday the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce and the Committee of American Steamship Lines gathered at the great river port of Pittsburgh for a 2-day foreign trade celebration.

On Sunday, May 22, World Trade Week will begin in Philadelphia, with a program including a cruise, an open house at the Philadelphia Naval Base, a distinguished service award luncheon, and many other events.

The third great Pennsylvania port, Erie, located on the lake of that name, and which is developing its foreign trade rapidly as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, is also very much interested in World Trade Week.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles describing World Trade Week and the importance of world trade to the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PENNSYLVANIA AND AMERICA'S MERCHANT MARINE BUILD SILENT PARTNERSHIP IN WORLD TRADE

America's merchant marine will salute Pennsylvania and make Greater Pittsburgh—one of the Nation's great river ports—an ocean port on May 18 and 19, during World Trade Week.

Some 40 steamship executives from 15 lines, representing all U.S. seacoasts, will journey hundreds of miles inland to Pittsburgh to spotlight the area's reliance on ocean commerce and merchant ships flying the American flag.

They will deliver a foreign trade message that means jobs to tens of thousands of manufacturing workers, farmers and miners in the Keystone State. They will reveal, for example, that over 80 percent of Pennsylvania's total work force of nearly 4 million workers earning $13 billion annually are affected directly or indirectly by world trade. And they will also reveal how America's passenger and cargo ship fleets connect the iron and steel capital with every major coastal city and county in the world.

The 2-day foreign trade celebration is sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh in cooperation with the Committee of American Steamship Lines. The committee's 15-member lines sail more than 300 passenger and cargo ships on the Nation's essential foreign trade routes under operating differential subsidy contracts with the Government.

Heading the east, west and gulf coast steamship operators, representing some of the oldest shipping interests to serve this country in peace and war, will be Mr. J. R. Dant, president, States Steamship Co., San Francisco, and vice chairman of the steamship committee, and Tom Killefer, the committee's executive director, Washington, D.C.

The shipping men's message will, in some way, touch the lives of every one of the 11 million Pennsylvania inhabitants in their efforts to better acquaint the citizens of Greater Pittsburgh and the Keystone State, a growing U.S. world trade center, with the meaning of foreign trade and to stimulate the movement of more exports overseas on American ships. This ties in with Secretary of Commerce Mueller's current promotion drive to increase export sales abroad from 10 to 15 percent in 1960.

The people in Pennsylvania directly affected by foreign trade work in manufacturing plants, in mines and on farms which either make products directly for export or need imports for their operation. The steel industry, for instance, imports nearly 30 percent of its required iron ore, more than 80 percent of its nickel, 90 percent of its chrome and other necessary ingredients. Farmers grow produce for canners to put up for foreign trade. Electrical companies ship complete generating plants as well as components to purchasers abroad.

And 670,000 metal-using workers, earning $3.7 billion in Pennsylvania, could well worry about their jobs if it weren't for ore imports. If all the imported ores used in the United States in 1958 were loaded aboard ships at one time, a fleet of 1,400 extra-large, 20,000-ton capacity ships would have been required.

Those indirectly affected by foreign trade in Pennsylvania include merchants who handle such items as coffee or sugar, those who finance foreign trade, those who make such things as the barges or railroads which must move goods for overseas shipment * * * and the housewife and the man in the street who must look daily to exports and imports to enjoy the thousand and one comforts and pleasures of modern living.

What is the dollar value of foreign trade to Pennsylvania?

According to a recently completed study by the steamship committee of the financial impact of foreign trade on the Keystone State; its share of total U.S. exports in 1958 was $1 billion, of which $225 million could be attributed to the Greater Pittsburgh area.

The effect of foreign trade on workers in the iron and steel industries is of major importance: the committee's study shows that in 1958 in Greater Pittsburgh 120,000 persons were employed by the steel industry, or about 17 percent of all steelworkers in the United States.

It further shows that Greater Pittsburgh's share of steel-mill products exported in 1958 was about $85 million.

Significantly, about 90 percent of Greater Pittsburgh's total work force of 775,000 are directly or indirectly affected by foreign trade. And without exports and imports, many of Greater Pittsburgh's 2,400 plants would be seriously crippled and payrolls cut.

Importance of exports to Greater Pittsburgh's key industrial firms is revealing too. Westinghouse Electric Corp., with 24,000 Greater Pittsburgh employees, manufactures 8,000 products exported to 148 countries—ranging from light bulbs to nuclear reactors. H. J. Heinz Co., with 2,800 workers in Greater Pittsburgh, has doubled its export volume since 1955, and sends shipborne canned goods and other products to some 200 foreign countries. All told, there are 270 Pittsburgh area exporting companies which export a multiplicity of goods to hundreds of overseas outlets.

Although Greater Pittsburgh is not a major farming area, Pennsylvania is the dairyland of the Atlantic Coast States and plays a part in the exporting of agricultural products. It is estimated that 5 million acres are harvested in Pennsylvania each year and about 1 in 8 acres were probably devoted to export.

And it has been estimated that the Pennsylvania farmers' share of exports of processed foods in 1958 was about $18 million.

The story, then, to be told by deepwater shipping men in Greater Pittsburgh, May 18–19, is one of economic health and prosperity for Pennsylvania through overseas commerce, 99 percent of which moves in and out of this country by ocean ships.

---

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Some 200 importers and exporters of outlying areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York will join local shippers in celebrating Maritime Day, Tuesday, May 24, on a riverboat tour of the historic port of Philadelphia, America's leading import center.

One of the principal features of World Trade Week, the 5-hour cruise is sponsored by the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society and its affiliated organizations. It will be conducted aboard the Riverview Line's excursion steamer, *State of Pennsylvania,* which will sail from pier 4 south, foot of Chestnut Street, at 10:15 a.m.

The visiting exporters and importers will be guests of the Delaware River Port Authority. Approximately 900 persons are expected to take the cruise. The vessel will move down river to the Walt Whitman Bridge, where it will turn north and proceed to the giant Fairless Works of the United States Steel Corp. at Morrisville.

Off Pennsbury Manor, historic Bucks County home of William Penn, the Reverend James F. McElroy, chaplain and director of the Seamen's Church Institute, will hold shipboard memorial services for those who have given their lives in the service of the U.S. Merchant Marine.

Col. T. H. Setliffe, chief, district Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, will point up the progress which is being made in dredging the upper Delaware River channel to its authorized depth of 40 feet.

A buffet luncheon will be served, with music provided by the Girard College Band.

George Burnham, chairman of Mayor Richardson Dilworth's World Trade Week Citizens Committee, said the overall program of the week will be marked by special day to day activities.

The Philadelphia Naval Base ushers in the celebration next Sunday afternoon (May 22) with an open house day salute to international trade. Here the public will be invited to see the Navy's new guided missile cruiser, the U.S.S. *Galveston;* to inspect exhibits of the Navy's outer space project; and to tour other base operations.

City Representative and Commerce Director Fredric R. Mann will be one of the main speakers the following Monday, May 23 at the week's distinguished service award luncheon in the Barclay Hotel ballroom. The award will be presented to the PNB for its outstanding service in port promotional work.

Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh and head of the U.S. Board of Governmental Affairs Institute, will address the Council of International Visitors' luncheon on Wednesday, May 25, in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel.

The tugboat owners and operators of the port of Philadelphia will pay tribute to Capt. Horace O. Derrickson on Thursday afternoon, May 26, in the Seamen's Church Institute. Derrickson will receive the Maritime Service Award for safely guiding nearly 30,000 ships in and out of the port during 33 years of service as a tugboat skipper.

The Foreign Traders Association holds its annual World Trade Week banquet Thursday night in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General, Organization of American States, Pan American Union, is the principal speaker.

The Philadelphia chapter, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, celebrates Highway Transportation Day on Friday, May 27, and the colorful presentation of Aviation Day, Sunday afternoon, May 29, at International Airport, climaxes the week's activities.

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL FOR MEDICARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, like the King's horses and the King's men, the administration—through its Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—has marched up to Capitol Hill and marched down again, no less than eight times in the past year, promising each time to return with a sound proposal for solving the problem of financing the health care of America's growing number of aged. Poor Dr. Flemming, who would like to come to grips with the problem, but is not allowed to do so, must be getting pretty discouraged.

Each time Congress, along with the Nation's elderly and their families, has waited patiently for such a proposal. Each time we were cajoled into waiting until next time. Finally the administration put out a press release outlining their solution. There is still no administration bill before the Congress. And we will adjourn the first week in July.

We have waited patiently for an administration bill; but we can wait no longer. We must express publicly our views on the administration's proposal as reported in the press.

To begin with, it is clear that the administration is not really out to fight the foe of illness and its costs for the aged.

No pious expressions of sympathy can conceal the fact that the administration's plan just does not fit the needs of our aging citizens. Nor is the claim that the plan avoids compulsion an honest one. The $1.2 billion to finance the proposal would have to be raised through compulsory Federal and State taxes. The issue, therefore, is really, which type of compulsory financing do we want? The Democrats' social security approach of paid-up insurance upon retirement or the administration's plan which would require membership fees and deductible outlays after retirement?

More concretely, the administration's plan has these additional obvious defects:

First. It places a very heavy burden upon the States to raise, through taxes, at least $600 million in matching funds at a time when every State is in a precarious financial condition. After 15 States are still unable to match Federal funds for the medical care of the most needy aged under old-age assistance. These States could thus automatically exclude at least 2½ million people over 65 at the outset. And how long would it take for the rest of the States to join?

Second. It would be an administrative monstrosity requiring the Federal Government to develop complex administrative arrangements with 50 different State plans and perhaps hundreds of insurance companies.

Third. Regardless of the label used by the administration, the income limitations for eligibility—$2,500 for an individual, $3,800 for a couple—amount to a means test, requiring aged individuals to subject themselves to an income investigation to prove poverty—and on an annual basis. These limitations further exclude from eligibility at least 3½ to 4 million elderly citizens who have just as great a need for adequate health care at a minimum cost.

Fourth. It does not help the average older person very much. Even after a means test he would have to pay $24 a year to enroll. He still would receive no benefits until he paid $250 out of his own pocket—$400 for a couple. After all of this outlay, he would still have to pay 20 percent of the rest of the cost.

Fifth. The deductible feature of the proposal creates a major burden for all the aged electing the plan by forcing them to become bookkeepers, in order to prove that they have spent at least $250 in medical expenses. They would have to keep an accurate, authenticated record of every single medical expense they would incur.

Sixth. The deductible feature, by definition, sets up a barrier to an initial seeking of early medical diagnosis and attention on the part of the aged before they become seriously ill. It rejects the principle of preventive medicine which results in more effective and less costly medical practice. Under the administration's plan, an aged person must become catastrophically sick in order to benefit from it.

Seventh. The use of private insurance carriers, combined with redundant Federal-State administrative machinery, would sharply reduce that portion of the medical dollar returned to the individual in the form of direct medical services. Considering the recognized need for the most efficient use of the medical dollar, the administration's program for aging citizens is extravagant.

Eighth. The administration's plan rejects outright the sound principle of small premium payments during work life leading to a paid-up medical policy on retirement. Aged persons, after retirement—when income is low and illness high—should not be required to continue paying for basic medical coverage.

Ninth. Finally, and most important, an analysis of the actual medical expenses incurred in typical illnesses will reveal the illusory feature of the administration's plan and its unfavorable rating, when compared with the McNamara bill, S. 3503.

The following table shows the comparative amounts provided under each of the two alternatives, for a variety of illnesses. The one type of illness in which the administration's formula—80 percent of the excess over the first $250, or $400 for couples, plus a $24 membership fee—is more advantageous than the McNamara bill, for the patient and his family, would be in those cases requiring exceptionally long custodial care in institutions such as nursing homes. I cite example 6.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

*Medical expenses of patient and amounts paid under McNamara bill versus administration plan*

| Type of illness | Total medical costs | Amount paid by— | | Amount paid by patient or family | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | McNamara | Administration | McNamara | Administration |
| 1. Widow, 70, carcinoma of breast, surgery, 10 days in hospital; doctors' visits; 120 days in nursing home for terminal care | $1,850 | $1,500 | $1,280 | $350 | $594 |
| 2. Married man, 68, heart failure; 3 10-day stays in hospital; home care; doctors' visits; drugs | 2,160 | 1,600 | 1,408 | 560 | 776 |
| 3. Single man, 66, acute appendicitis; surgery; 10 days in hospital | 450 | 300 | 160 | 150 | 314 |
| 4. Married woman, 67, pneumonia; diagnostic X-rays; home care; doctors' visits; drugs | 200 | 130 | 0 | 70 | 224 |
| 5. Married man, 72, fractured hip; surgery; 10 days in hospital; home in bed 5 months; doctors' visits; nursing home 1 month | 1,195 | 850 | 636 | 345 | 583 |
| 6. Widow, 80, mild senility; year-round nursing home stay; monthly doctors' visits | 3,770 | 1,800 | 2,816 | 1,970 | 978 |
| 7. Married man, 70, carcinoma of stomach; diagnoses; 100 days in hospital; surgery; doctors' follow-up visits, etc | 3,775 | 2,825 | 2,700 | 950 | 1,099 |

Basis of cost estimates:

| | |
|---|---|
| Hospitalization | $30 per day. |
| Nursing home | $10. |
| Home health care | $5. |
| Surgeon's fees | Blue Shield schedule. |
| Medical fees | $25 first hospital visit, $5 thereafter; 10 home visits. |
| Drugs | Estimates based on type and severity of illness. |

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, an examination of this table reveals, first, that despite the claim by the administration that its plan is aimed at meeting catastrophic illnesses, the McNamara retired persons medical insurance program covers such cases more favorably for the aged patient and his family. Second, in the less catastrophic illness, which is more frequent, the administration's plan is of little value.

Furthermore, the McNamara program still leaves ample room for individual and family responsibility. No one would be "pampered" in this program of financing the basic costs of medical care for

the aged. For the same reason, private insurance companies are provided an unprecedented opportunity to offer supplementary policies, especially to cover medical and surgical costs, such as under Blue Shield.

S. 3503, the retired persons medical insurance bill, introduced by Senator McNAMARA and myself, along with 18 other Senators, would cover all retired aged men and women, the group whose health problems and ability to finance medical care are the most critical.

The McNamara bill would prohibit a means test for eligibility, and thus would avoid any degrading experience for the aged.

Its benefits have been shaped by modern principles of preventive medical care, oriented toward outpatient diagnostic services and restorative medicine through home health services, and related programs.

The individual need not wait until he becomes critically ill, in order to benefit from the provisions of the bill.

Specifically, the McNamara bill would provide to retired elderly Americans the following benefits:

First. Ninety days of hospital care per year, or 180 days of skilled nursing home care, or 240 days of home health services.

Second. Diagnostic services, including lab tests and X-rays.

Third. Payment of a major portion of expensive drugs.

Fourth. Research and demonstration programs to improve the quality and efficiency of health care for the aged.

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to compare the administration's vague and complicated jungle gym proposal with the McNamara bill so far as costs are concerned, it can be said in general terms that the administration cost figures—if all the States participate and if the estimated number of aged elect to become eligible—would be about $1.2 billion. Half of this would come from the Federal Treasury, and the other half from the States.

Under the McNamara bill, there would be little in the way of additional new costs to the Federal Treasury. While the total price tag would be about $1.5 billion by the time all benefits became available, about $1.1 billion would be paid for by an additional ½ of 1 percent social security deduction from payrolls—of the first $4,800. The remainder would be appropriated from the general fund, from which approximately $240 million is already being expended under existing earmarked medical care for old-age groups covered by our proposal. In other words, the additional new costs would be about $130 million from the Treasury, or general funds.

In actual practice, the retired persons medical insurance bill would protect many more millions of aged persons than would the proposal now being floated by the Republican administration. For this reason and the other arguments I have presented here, there is only one sensible answer to the issue before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the McNamara retired persons medical insurance bill.

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

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING—ANALYSIS: RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT

This suggested bill for introduction by Senator MCNAMARA proposes to do the following:

MAJOR PROVISIONS

1. Cover under a system of prepaid health insurance all retired aged (men over 65 and women over 62 who are not employed).

2. Provide for 90 days of hospital care per year, or

3. One hundred and thirty-five days care in a skilled nursing home, or

4. One hundred and eighty days of care at home in a supervised home health program.

5. Provide diagnostic outpatient services for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays.

6. Pay for a portion of the cost of very expensive drugs.

7. Provide for research and demonstration programs to improve quality and efficiency of health care.

RELEVANT DATA BEARING ON THE ABOVE PROVISIONS

1. We estimate that this bill will cover 14.8 million men and women as follows: 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries; 1.7 million who are receiving old-age assistance and no OASI; and 1.8 million other retired aged—men over 65 and women over 62.

The act would exclude from its coverage all men and women and their spouses who are working full time. In the ordinary case, these men and women will be covered by a group health insurance policy. The bill is thus limited to the retired aged. It further provides authorization for future participation by the railroad retirement.

2. Estimates of cost for the above provisions: Total cost, computed as conservatively as possible, is estimated at $1.5 billion or $101 per capita (i.e., per retired person); 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries would cost $1.14 billion: financed by a one-quarter of 1 percent increase in the social security tax on the employee and employer; 1.7 million old-age assistance recipients would cost $172 million estimated cost: to come from general revenue fund; and 1.8 million other persons would cost $182 million: to come from general revenue fund.

3. Hospitalization: This bill provides for 90 days hospitalization for the aged but aims at reducing excessive use of hospitals through the following features:

Provision is made for diagnostic services as a preventive program.

An incentive is provided to use nursing homes and home health services instead of hospitals when not needed.

Cost of hospitalization $1,023 million.

4. Skilled nursing home care: For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 1½ days of care in a skilled nursing home following a physician's certification—total days authorized, 135; total estimated cost, $215 million.

5. Home health services: For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2 days of home health services by a community-sponsored agency—total days authorized, 180; total estimated cost, $10 million.

6. Outpatient diagnostic services: The bill provides for preventive services through early diagnosis of incipient illness by means of X-ray and other laboratory tests—estimated cost, $111 million.

7. Very expensive drugs: A portion of the cost of very expensive drugs prescribed by a physician using generic names is included in the insurance program. The amount and kind of coverage is to be determined by the Secretary after a year's study—total estimated cost, $147 million.

8. Effective date: The bill would provide for phasing the effective dates of the various benefits so as to provide an opportunity to build up the financing fund, conduct adequate planning and develop the necessary facilities:

Hospitalization effective July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Nursing homes, January 1, 1963, and not later than July 1, 1963.

Home health services, January 1, 1961, and not later than July 1, 1962.

Diagnostic outpatient services, July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Very expensive medicines, July 1, 1962, and not later than July 1, 1963.

The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to designate the dates within these periods when the act would be effective.

9. Summary:

| | |
|---|---|
| Cost of benefits ($101 per retired person): | |
| Hospitalization | $1,023,000,000 |
| Skilled nursing homes | 215,000,000 |
| Home health services | 10,000,000 |
| Diagnostic services | 110,000,000 |
| Expensive drug benefits | 147,000,000 |
| Total | 1,505,000,000 |
| Revenue source: | |
| From OASDI tax (¼ percent on employer and employee, ⅜ percent on self-employed) | 1,150,000,000 |
| General revenue | 355,000,000 |
| Total | 1,505,000,000 |
| Offset to general revenue: | |
| Federal share of OAA recipients' medical costs (estimated) | 133,000,000 |
| Federal expenditures for medical care of others who would be covered (estimated) | 100,000,000 |

10. Research and demonstration:

The bill would direct the Secretary of HEW to conduct research on the health care of older persons and on improvements in the quality and efficiency of health services.

The Secretary is also authorized to conduct appropriate demonstration programs on how to meet the health needs of older persons as effectively and efficiently as possible in their communities.

11. Other important provisions:

Persons receiving social security benefits or old-age assistance payments are automatically eligible for benefits. Other individuals who have not earned in the preceding month more than the amount set in the retirement test under OASI will be covered.

The Secretary is to publish annually a listing of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies which are included for payments under the act. It is expected that for hospitals, the Secretary may use the A.H.A. accrediting service; and that for nursing homes, only those will be included which meet adequate standards for care and rehabilitation.

State health agencies can be given authority to inspect whether standards are being met and whether professional services are adequate.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer the act with a national health service advisory council.

The Secretary may use the services of private nonprofit organizations in administering the program.

Railroad retirement and Federal employee pensioners could come under the program at any time such legislation is enacted.

## THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the present world situation and its implications on the work of this body. I have welcomed the expressions of national unity which have come from the leadership on both sides of the aisle of this body during recent days. Surely it is important that America should be united at a time of serious international crisis, at a time when our President has been gratuitously insulted by the dictator of the Soviet Union. I, for one, hope that partisan politics will not interfere with efforts to find solutions to pressing international problems now or during the coming political campaign.

Yet I must say in all candor, Mr. President, that I applaud the comments of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as they appeared in the press this morning. I felt that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] did the country a service by pointing out that it is a little premature to start making political capital out of a situation in which we should be trying to find a unified solution; and that it is a little early in the day for the declared candidate of one of our two great political parties to start shifting from a "let's sit down at the summit and have a peaceful discussion with Mr. Khrushchev" line to the old line of "let's shake our fists at the Communists, and let's be a little concerned about whether the opposing political party might be 'soft' on communism."

Mr. President, I can assure that young gentleman that the Democratic Party is not "soft" on communism—never has been, and is not now; and I can also assure the Vice President of the United States that the American people are quite sincere in their search for peace, and that they mean to continue that search with intelligence and persistence.

I suggest that the attitude our country should take in this regard was very well expressed in an article entitled "First of All," which was written by Walter Lippmann, and was published today in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the 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 the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin? It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are hard words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to "stage a worldwide readiness exercise" which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the "exercise" was just a shade worse than sending off the U–2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates' "exercise" was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the "exercise" to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the "exercise."

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion and mainstay of the non-Communist world, cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it must be very clear, indeed, that in the field of international affairs the American people must have better leadership in the future than they have had in the past. This is perhaps just as important as it is to rally behind the President of the United States when international affronts are offered to him.

I hope that in this body there will be a climate of unity against foreign threats, to be sure, but one which will put peace as our most important objective, and which will see—in view of the tragic blunders which have been made during recent weeks—the necessity of refurbishing our alliances, and the desirability of gaining additional friendships by such actions as repeal of the iniquitous Connally amendment to the World Court bill—a climate which will make clear to the administration that if it requests ratification by the Senate of an intelligent nuclear arms test ban, the Senate will consider such a treaty fairly and intelligently, and will not be determined in advance to reject it—a climate in the Senate which will encourage a disarmament conference, in the hope that some small start along that line may be made.

In short, Mr. President, I hope we shall not be panicked into an insensate belligerance which could result in our turning our backs on peace. Instead, we must look forward clearsightedly and intelligently, with the interests of America at heart, to a continuing program of seeking world peace through law, which is the only practical and feasible alternative to an ever-accelerating arms race which in the foreseeable future could well bring destruction to all of us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

---

## FUSE POINTS OF A PLANETARY EXPLOSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, recently concluded a speaking tour of several cities in the western part of the United States. His topics included everything from conservation to world peace and civil defense bomb shelters.

In his speech at a Democratic luncheon in Los Angeles, on March 18, the Governor asked some particularly probing questions about world peace and our policies in pursuing world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Governor Meyner be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER, OF NEW JERSEY, AT DEMOCRATIC LUNCHEON, GALERIA ROOM, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MARCH 18, 1960

My talk tonight is concerned with some aspects of American security not very widely discussed.

I begin by asking a question of critical importance to every American citizen. Suppose, tomorrow, you should read in your newspapers that Communist China had successfully tested its first atomic bomb? How would you feel if you knew that the country with the largest population in the world—a country whom we declared to be our enemy when we said we would underwrite the security of Nationalist China—how would you feel if you learned that Communist China was now in possession of the ultimate weapon?

I can't think of a single event in the world today that would cut as deeply into American security as the possession by Communist China of atomic weapons. For China is one of the two or three countries in the world with the kind of dispersed population and industrial centers against whom a nuclear war might not necessarily be fatal.

By contrast, the United States has some two dozen highly concentrated population centers. Our heavy industry, most of it, is near those centers.

The moment Communist China develops its own bomb, the present policy of the nuclear deterrent becomes as obsolete as the idea of a underground shelter against a megaton atomic bomb.

The policy of the deterrent is based on the theory that you're going to be able to hurt an enemy more than he can hurt you if he decides to attack—and that therefore he won't dare to attack. This theory has holes in it even without respect to Communist China. But it loses all meaning when applied to Red China.

Let's consider a specific hypothetical instance.

Suppose Communist China should decide once again that it would not tolerate Nationalist Chinese military garrisons on Quemoy and Matsu. Suppose the Communists should decide to seize these islands so close to their own shores.

Now suppose, too, that the United States should issue an ultimatum to Communist China, saying we will use our battleships to prevent such a seizure. Then suppose the Communists issue a counterultimatum, ordering us to keep out of their internal affairs and saying that they will not tolerate any interference.

Suppose, further, that both sides mean exactly what they say. Communist China thereupon attacks Quemoy and Matsu, we jump in, and Communist China responds by using its new atomic weapons against our fleet.

Two years ago we could issue ultimatums and the Communists could only fulminate against us. But what happens when they have the atomic weapons? Will they hesitate to use them? Will they hesitate to fight a major war against the United States if they know they possess weapons that can be far more damaging against the United States than the same weapons used by us against them?

These are terrifying questions. These are life-and-death questions. These are questions with a deadline on them. These are time-bomb questions.

The moment Communist China develops an atomic weapon, our foreign policy will have suffered its greatest defeat since Pearl Harbor.

I make this statement advisedly.

Was there any way the United States could have stopped the development of an atomic bomb by Communist China? Is there any way it can stop the development today?

In order to consider these questions we have to go back a bit. We have to consider many other problems bearing on those questions. We have to consider our relations with the Soviet Union, we have to consider the relations of the Soviet Union with Communist China, we have to consider the various efforts made to set up an effective system of world control over nuclear weapons.

While Joseph Stalin lived, the record seems clear that the Soviet Union would not have been willing to get into the kind of hard-and-fast, enforceable, iron-clad arms control agreements that could have marked the beginning of a world system of effective nuclear control.

With the passing of Joseph Stalin, however, there came many changes in Soviet policy—internal and external. Things began to loosen up, inside and outside. The individual Soviet citizen began to be more important as a consumer. He was able to acquire things to make his life less drab. The Iron Curtain began to go up—not altogether but at least enough to allow for some important exchanges. People were allowed to see foreigners and mix with them. Soviet leaders and citizens began to see something of the outside world.

In its foreign policy, the Soviet began to indicate a willingness to give and take.

The one big blot in the recent history of Soviet foreign policy, of course, has to do with Hungary.

The suppression of the Hungarian freedom movement was as brutal and as uncompromising as anything the world knew under Joseph Stalin.

By contrast, the lenient policy of the Kremlin only a few months earlier toward the Polish freedom riots was startling. Why did the Kremlin give ground and make important concessions in Poland, yet crack down ruthlessly in Hungary only a short time later?

A possible answer is that the situation over Suez had erupted in the meantime. France and England jumped into the campaign against Egypt. The Soviet Union was convinced that France and England would not have acted without the full knowledge of the United States. It appeared that the attack on Egypt was just the opening state of what might be a world war. The Soviet promptly viewed Hungary in the total context of its world security position.

I claim no originality for this guess. Various European leaders have expressed themselves in this direction in attempting to account for the contradiction between the response in Poland and the response in Hungary to the freedom fighters.

In any event, with the notable exception of the Hungarian suppression, Soviet foreign policy has departed substantially from the go-it-alone methods of Joseph Stalin.

In one particular, Soviet policy has indicated a considerable willingness to negotiate seriously.

This is in the area of arms control, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons.

For the past 3½ years, the Soviet Union has sounded as though it meant business when it talked about bringing nuclear weapons under control.

On one point the Soviet has seemed especially anxious. This has been on the matter of banning nuclear tests.

Why?

Is it possible that the Soviet Union is no more eager to see nuclear weapons in the hands of Communist China than we are? How is it that in the 11 years since the Soviet Union was able to work with fissionable materials, it has not given any stockpiles of nuclear weapons to Communist China? How is it that there have been no missions of Russian atomic scientists and engineers in Peking, helping to set up the elaborate installations to release and harness atomic energy?

I have no way of knowing whether the present leaders in the Kremlin are apprehensive about the fact that by 1975 China will be the first nation in history with a population of more than 1 billion people. There is not enough space in China for 1 billion people. Where will they go? Southeast Asia? Too crowded already. Tibet is part of the answer, but perhaps only a small fraction. The main outlet has to be Outer Mongolia and southern Siberia.

Is it possible that this future danger may be considered more weighty than various ideological considerations? The Russian leaders, I believe, are Russians even before they are exponents of any philosophy.

Whatever the reason for the change in Soviet foreign policy these past few years, it is a fact that the Russians have been apparently eager to get into serious negotiations on nuclear arms control.

Were they hopeful that any effective agreements with the United States might lead to an effective plan for total world control?

Whatever the answer, it is nonetheless interesting that at the London arms control talks in 1957, the Soviet Union said they would accept a workable ban on nuclear tests. We knew then that we could have had such an agreement if we wanted it, but Governor Stassen was called back to Washington at precisely the moment it seemed that an agreement was about to be concluded.

I believe that Governor Stassen took his job seriously. It was an important job. That job was to make an effective beginning in stopping the runaway nuclear arms race. I believe the original instructions from the President convinced Governor Stassen that he was engaged in an enterprise in which he would have the full backing of the administration.

At London, Governor Stassen made considerable progress. He was able to get the Russians to agree to our first proposal, which called for an effective ban against further nuclear testing. But as soon as he was on the point of concluding what could have been an historic agreement, he was pulled out of London and given a new set of instructions. These instructions were to attach other conditions which it was certain the Russians would not accept.

The size of that blunder is incalculable.

If in 1957 we could have gotten started on world nuclear controls, it is conceivable that the United Nations might have been in a position to declare the testing or manufacture of nuclear weapons by any nation to be an illegal act against the world community.

Naturally, it would not have been as easy for the United Nations to exercise jurisdiction and control over countries that were outside its membership as it would have been over member nations.

We might have realized that we were only harming ourselves by restricting the jurisdiction of the U.N. We might have come to accept the fact that the purpose of the United Nations was not to dispense privileges but to exact obligations.

The U.N. is not an exclusive gentleman's club but a world organization set up to save the peace. It is supposed to govern the world, not just part of the world. The more dangerous a nation may be, the more important it is that the United Nations be in a position to deal with it. Indeed, if all the nations in the world knew how to behave themselves, we probably wouldn't have needed a United Nations in the first place.

In any event, the main point I am making is that we passed up a chance of historic dimensions when we didn't seize the opening we had in 1957 to get an effective agreement on a ban against nuclear tests. We lost time. We lost the chance to set up what might have become effective machinery that could have been extended.

And even today, we are backing and filling at Geneva. Our initial proposals at Geneva were sound. We had good men to represent us at Geneva. James P. Wadsworth was genuinely determined to arrive at an effective plan for nuclear arms control. The proposals he made calling for comprehensive inspection were absolutely correct.

But now that the Russians are coming around, now that they have withdrawn their objections to many of our proposals for inspection, we are shifting our ground. It is beginning to sound like the London talks all over again. And I naturally wonder whether Mr. Wadsworth is being Stassenized.

The trouble is that we have two foreign policies.

We have the foreign policy of the President. His ideas, I believe, are basically correct. What he says about the peace seems to me to be positive and important. He believes that world peace can only be based on world law. He has a clear idea of what the next war would be like.

But then there is a second foreign policy. This is what happens when the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon get into the act. The President may be able to initiate measures that point in the right direction, but these measures somehow manage to run afoul of obstacles bearing the labels of the AEC and the military.

In short, what the President advocates in foreign affairs often makes good sense. What

the opposition does inside his administration, however, keeps these ideas from getting past the stage of advocacy. The President appoints a Coolidge Commission to undertake a study and make recommendations on arms control. The Coolidge Commission makes its report, but the report is stifled. It is now several months since that report was turned in. The American people have a right to know what it says.

I began by saying we do not have much time. It is much more difficult today than it was 3 years ago to make a start in the direction of effective world control over nuclear weapons. It is much more difficult to head off Communist China's entry into the society of atomic powers than it would have been a few years back.

But one thing is certain. It is going to be even more difficult with each passing day unless we start moving now. Once Communist China gets the atomic bomb, then all our problems are multiplied hundreds of times.

What do we do now?

It seems to me we have to make a beginning. It seems to me we have to labor mightily, imaginatively, and powerfully in clearly defined directions. We have to make a serious effort to keep the Geneva nuclear talks from ending in stalemate.

If we can get an agreement to end nuclear tests with inspection and verification, let's grab it.

And if the Russians have objections to provisions that we honestly believe are essential to the effective operation of a ban, I believe we should carry our case direct to world public opinion. Peoples everywhere have a stake in what is going on at Geneva. The negotiations concern them. If we feel that good proposals are being blocked, it is our duty to let the world's peoples know about it.

The same holds true of the Russians with respect to us.

It is high time that both the United States and the Soviet Union recognized that 2.5 billion people are going to benefit or suffer by what they do or fail to do at Geneva.

Next, I believe we should turn our attention to the United Nations. I believe we should do everything we can now to bolster the United Nations and make of it a world organization strong enough to carry out world peace—strong enough, incidentally, to have universal membership.

For if the United Nations can be transformed into an agency with effective powers, then the real question will be, not should Communist China be admitted to membership, but rather what can the world do to make sure that Communist China doesn't stay out.

American security is too important to rest on the flimsy reed of military deterrents. It must rest on powerful ideas, ideas that have something to do with the creation of a world organization strong enough to underwrite essential national sovereignty and independence, strong enough to protect peoples against aggression, strong enough to carry out effective arms control, strong enough to deal with basic world tensions, strong enough to keep incipient world crises from becoming the fuse points of a planetary nuclear explosion.

If we are going to move in this direction, we had better begin moving fast.

And we had better give some thought to getting started on a foreign policy with followthrough built into it, a foreign policy concerned with getting specific things accomplished, and not just with preliminary ideas.

We have a tough job ahead of us. We can do that job if we give it the thought, the work, and the attention it requires. Thank you.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON SECURITIES LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 29, it was my pleasure to address a briefing conference on securities laws and regulations, at Atlantic City, N.J. The meeting, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., gave me an opportunity to discuss legislation and issues now under study by the Senate Subcommittee on Securities, of which I am chairman.

Mr. President, the address announces executive sessions on pending bills, and refers to possible future action by the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON SECURITIES LAWS AND REGULATIONS, SPONSORED BY THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC., ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., APRIL 29, 1960

Gentlemen, the optimistic title of this speech is "Securities Legislation—1960." Though I cannot promise action by Congress, perhaps I can give you my own thoughts of legislation on the stock market.

Philosophically, I am a good student of free enterprise. I believe that an overcontrolled economy can never promise to our distant descendants what our grandfathers did for us. Too much liberty, however, may of itself engender a need for discipline. Historically, at least, Federal discipline first appeared when the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee became involved in the stock market in 1933. I say "involved" advisedly, for the parade of abuses following the unrestrained freedom of the capital markets forced themselves upon Congress' attention.

I, who was only 10 years old in 1929, nevertheless would like to recall to you some facts resulting from those abuses. From 1920 to 1933 some $50 billion of securities were sold in the United States, at the end of which half were worthless. The aggregate value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange on September 1, 1929, was $89 billion. By 1933 the aggregate figure was down to $15 billion—a loss of $74 billion in 2½ years. The bond losses increased the total drop in values to $93 billion.

From 1932 until at least 1940 few people felt that corporate securities, whether debt or security, were proper mediums of investment. This exhaustion of corporate capital has been considered symbolic of a lack of confidence which the American public investors demonstrated in the functions of the capital markets.

In contrast the confidence of today's investors appears full blown. The 1959 Dow Jones industrial average closed at 679, a new peak, and a rise of 16 percent over the final 1958 final figure. The upsurge of the combined value of common stocks listed had broken all expectations. Of course, it would be foolish not to recognize that many closed below their similar 1958 quotations and that there is evidence since last year justifying a bearish attitude.

Moreover, last year's reported stock volume of the New York Stock Exchange was some 820,296,279 shares, the third largest yearly total in exchange history. And at present over 12½ million individuals in the United States own corporate securities, nearly double those in 1952.

Merely as a statistical comparison, I am convinced that the ballooning of stockholder ownership demonstrates renewed confidence by investors in our capital markets. I award a large measure of credit for this metamorphosis to the interest of Government in the stock market. Whether or not the diet of an average buyer can digest a prospectus, his appetite for facts has been whetted by the Federal securities laws. And he will never see many indisputably wretched stocks which cannot brave the publicity which awaits them under present law.

I need not tediously declaim before you the verses of these laws, for it is you who have charted the pathway between Scylla and Charybdis to find their practical operation. Suffice it to say that the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934 are predicated on a policy of disclosing pertinent facts to the investor—though you may believe it subverted. Later statutes, the Public Utility and Investment Company Acts, are paternalistic in nature. They followed painstaking studies by the newborn Commission illuminating flagrant betrayal of shareholder interests. In contrast to the latter two, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 has been called little more than a continuing census of the Nation's advisers.

### THE PRESENT REASON FOR LEGISLATION

But note my conviction that each of these statutes was written by Congress only when overwhelming necessity and abuses arose. Each act was fitted to clothe the form which demanded covering. Moreover, as information requisite for intelligent legislation was unearthed or stresses in them revealed, the statutes were reshaped or whole members added to them.

A good example of this history is found in the over-the-counter market. Two years after the passage of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Commission rules for registration of brokers were codified. In 1938 the Maloney Act incorporated into the statute a philosophy of cooperative regulation by securities associations. It also expanded SEC's authority in the over-the-counter market by granting it additional specific power to prevent fraud and safeguard financial responsibility.

By 1954 time had unraveled the fabric of the original Securities Act. It was, therefore amended to permit written offers before date of sale. According to Louis Loss, this type of revision is made every 20 years by the British to their Companies Act.

Of course, it is logical to ask whether new legislation is needed now. Do we have in 1960 the spectacular abuses we once faced? In all honesty, I cannot compare present market activity to that preceding the crash of 1929.

But abuses by a group quite outside the industry have become legion. Since the war new warrens of boiler room rabbits have been educated in the Federal securities laws, groups whose prolific activities often defy suppression from overseas. I will return to SEC enforcement problems later.

Moreover, on another count, I believe securities legislation justified. By this year, 20 years after the last major body of law, Congress can face its past. It now has sufficient awareness of segments of the stock market to fulfill promises made. Two pertinent illustrations are the over-the-counter market and investment advisers.

In the anxiety of Federal legislation in 1933 and 1934, Congress admitted frankly that it did not have access to facts on the activity in the over-the-counter market.

At that time there was no agency of the Government supervising nor a daily quotation service reporting on it. Once created, the Securities and Exchange Commission studied and reported to Congress information which became the broker registration, 15(d) reports, and Maloney Act amendments just mentioned.

Since 1938 the mystery of the over-the-counter market has been greatly dispelled; moreover, in number of issues traded it is much bigger than all the exchanges combined. As yet, however, I do not find that Congress has replied to its early promise nor availed itself of the information now heaped in libraries. That is, many companies in the unlisted markets are not reached by provisions of the 1934 Exchange Act affecting proxy practices, reports, and insider trading. For stockholder "democracy," corporate honesty, and elimination of conflicts of interest, these are the cutting teeth of the statute.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

You have no doubt espied the dormant shape of S. 1168, the brainchild of first, Senator FREAR, and then Senator FULBRIGHT. But I have no intention of introducing this orphaned bill in the 86th Congress. Nevertheless, the injustice of a double standard of investor protection is now put to you. As things stand today, some of the most salutary provisions of the 1934 statute are only applied when a company volunteers its stock upon an exchange. I believe enactment of similar legislation would close a capricious gap in Federal securities laws and culminate a half-century campaign waged on behalf of Federal standards for interstate corporations.

A note on the history of the Frear bill: The suggestion of extending such basic protection to shareholders of certain large, publicly owned companies was made on a number of occasions in the 1930's. One version of several bills embodying this idea, S. 1168, was reported to the Senate by the Banking Committee in 1957. Unfortunately for the bill, some of the provisions recommended by the committee did not receive SEC approval. The lukewarm support of SEC Chairman Sinclair Armstrong, who testified that the extra appropriation necessary to administer it would be better spent elsewhere, seriously weakened interest in the bill as reported, and it was allowed to die.

Before developing additional if less important current proposals in the over-the-counter market, I should like to praise the Commission for conscientious review of its acts with an eye to correction. Since its wide reaching legislative program of 1941, enforcement has revealed heavier strain on the original statutes. To cure these defects, the SEC submitted extensive proposals late in 1956 and again in the 85th and 86th Congresses.

Uninvolved with these suggestions until that time, I do not feel obliged to defend the Banking Committee or Congress against charges of inaction on the program. For in my first session in the Senate I held 7 days of hearings on the bills. Notwithstanding, the alleged necessity for immediate action seems hardly oracle inspired, since the bills were changed with almost each session of Congress.

DEBATE DURING HEARINGS

Moreover, I can speak personally of the value of "loyal opposition" by the industry. For example, an amendment to the Investment Company Act was objected to on the grounds of dual regulation. A suggestion from Senator JAVITS during the hearings resulted in unassayed compromise language with the ICC, overcoming opposition from one source.

Other suggestions from subcommittee members occasioned SEC modifications in regard to holding of customers' securities by brokers, their aggregate indebtedness, and the imposition of a $100-a-day fine for late reports. Moreover, the proposal for the fine was originally inspired by the investigation into SEC operations not of the Banking Committee, but of a House subcommittee, an investigation characterized by a former SEC Chairman as a "travesty."

Do not mistake me, however. The best tempering of legislative steel is in the fire of agency-industry debate—and the efforts of the Commission to make an alloy of suggestions without sacrificing its strength deserve praise.

Let me mention specific amendments in the Commission's present legislative program, S. 1178 through S. 1182. Of the 87 amendments to five securities acts and one to the Bankruptcy Act, I will concentrate on those perhaps less familiar to you.

AMENDMENTS IN THE OVER-THE-COUNTER MARKET

Under the Exchange Act of 1934 increased jurisdiction is sought over brokers and dealers, in the form of rulemaking with regard to their financial responsibility and lending, borrowing and holding of customers' securities.

One proposal so reasonable that it earned NASD support, would allow suspension of a broker-dealer license rather than the more drastic penalty of revocation. One which did not earn NASD support would give the Commission authority equivalent to that over the exchanges to make rules over "when issued" or "when distributed" trading in the over-the-counter market.

Let me not slight perhaps the most significant expansion of power in S. 1179, that allowing suspension of trading in the over-the-counter market. There have been several recent summary suspensions by the SEC under its present 10-day power over listed stocks, and a similar power, for successive 10-day periods, is requested for the over-the-counter issues. No matter what objection is advanced to this broad power, it might in the hands of an alert Commission prevent the sudden rise and fall, for instance, of an Oreclone stock—which you remember fell from quotes of 29 last January 14 to nothing the following day.

In other ways as well, the SEC proposals, more indirectly than former ones, seek to subject the over-the-counter market to increased agency direction and rulemaking power. This movement is the logical result of new importance of the market, and in harmony with my belief that Congress has the necessary information to follow the path set forth upon in 1934, 1936, and 1938.

Mention might be made of an amendment, passed twice by the Senate, to the Securities Act of 1933. It would increase the exemptive limit under 3(b) from $300,000 to $500,000. However, the accompanying new criminal and civil liability raised the specter of future suits and thus inspired opposition from the Small Business Administration.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS LEGISLATION

Though generally unrecognized, square in the bull's eye of the Commission's program are the investment advisers. If the over-the-counter market was mysterious in 1934, in 1940 the advisers could only be described as mythological. At the present time, however, 1,800 are registered under the act of 1940, ranging from the lowly touter to the lofty investment counsel firm of Madison Avenue.

The amendments to the act were worked out with the Investment Counsel Association, representing 50 firms. They received no advisers industry dissent.

A curious oversight in the Advisers Act is the basis for revocation of their licenses. Once registered, the license of the adviser may not be revoked for willful violation of the act itself. Moreover, an insolvent registrant under the Exchange Act and Advisers Act may have his license revoked as a broker under the first, but not the second. For the latter does not even permit the denial of an adviser's license for violation of the 1933 or 1934 acts.

It is more alarming that under the present act the SEC cannot require books and records to be maintained. To prevent fraudulent financial practices which have recently occurred, the amendment would require bookkeeping subject to reasonable inspection as distinguished from actual investigation.

As written, the act penalizes fraud only when committed by registered advisers—those who are not registered or who do not choose to do so are immune. The proposal here would parallel earlier statutes in extending the penalty for fraud to any person under jurisdiction of the act, including those exempt from registration.

It should be clear that of five statutes proposed for amendment, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 is sadly inadequate. And, insofar as advisers resemble brokers, the bill is sheltered in the wing of my sympathy for over-the-counter legislation.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED

Since I have not been chary in giving you my thought on future legislation, I can announce executive hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Securities on S. 1178 through S. 1182 during May or early June. I shall devote myself to their passage as the subcommittee sees fit. My justification for the first major revision of Federal securities laws in 20 years is, as I have indicated, demonstrated need in enforcement areas, outmoded machinery for registering small issues and controlling advisers, and improved reconnaissance of the over-the-counter market.

SEC APPROPRIATIONS

I now turn to a subject even more cherished by the Commission than its protean legislative program. That subject, of course, is money. The testimony of the Commissioners has convinced me that their task is becoming larger and more important in the second postwar decade, whereas their appropriations and employment in proportion to increased workload have become smaller.

For the current fiscal year (1960), the SEC appropriation is $8,100,000, only $395,000, or 5 percent, above that for fiscal 1959. For fiscal 1961 the Bureau of the Budget allowed $8,900,000, representing 1,092 positions. The House reduced this figure by $375,000, or by 46 positions.

Under its acts the Commission is entitled to collect the following fees: Under the 1933 act, 10 cents per thousand dollars' worth of aggregate offering price of securities registered. For fiscal 1960 there is estimated $1,500,000 from this source; and in 1961, $1,866,300. Under the 1934 act, from stock exchange sales for fiscal 1960, there is estimated receipt of $1,080,000; for 1961, $1,100,000. From other sources there is estimated a sum of $28,700 for both years. Subtracting estimated fees from 1960's appropriation gives a net cost of $5,491,300; for 1961, $5,905,000.

It is immediately apparent that the fees charged by the Commission in nowise support the cost of its work. You know that they go directly to the Treasury. What is the overwhelming need of the Commission for more money?

A large chunk of its workload is processing registration statements under the 1933 act. In fiscal 1959 there were 1,226 statements filed, 1,119 examined; in 1960 it is estimated 1,600 will be filed, of which 1,452 will be examined; in 1962 it is estimated 400 will be carried over, 1,600 filed, a total of 2,000. Without more money, 475 statements may not be completed.

The securities industry has already felt the impact of receiving letters of comment within an average of 26 days and clearance within 41, rather than the 1958 averages of 14 and 24 days. To stem this tide, the SEC's

1961 budget requests 33 additional employees for the full disclosure program, which also includes proxy statements and annual reports.

CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS

I stress another Commission activity of concern to me. Preliminary and full investigations are necessary to discover civil or criminal violations of stock market laws. It is apparent that accompanying the 12½-million member family of shareholders are new parasitic swindlers who believe they have a right to live off this body. Not only have frauds become more insistent from overseas, but the sophistication of our domestic con men would surprise the most ardent fan of Ellery Queen. Warnings of the SEC and the New York Stock Exchange remind us that boiler rooms are volatile as never before.

Particularly disquieting to me is the charge that certain elements of the securities industry are being infiltrated by the organized underworld. In any case, the indictment for trial returned April 19 in Cleveland against Arthur Tortorello, Stanley Younger, Louis DeFilippo, "Vicky" Leinen alias Linda Lord, Lincoln Securities Corp., and others on charges of criminal violation of Federal securities laws will receive the close scrutiny of the Senate.

Under its enforcement program the SEC asks for 38 new employees to undertake the 990 investigations pending at the end of fiscal 1960 and hopes to close 580 during 1961.

The workload imposed by new investment companies staggers the imagination. Since 1940, 890 have been registered (378 being deregistered), and their increased worth has entranced their creators, as was Pygmalion, rising from $2.5 billion to $20 billion. At the present rate of inspection, the SEC will only be able to inspect 28 companies in 1960, placing the program on a 20-year cycle. Despite information submitted by these companies for other reasons, such rare inspections are absurdly small protection for the type of person who invests in mutual funds.

The total number of new positions requested in the Commission's budget for fiscal 1961 is 92.

INCREASED FEES

Though I am not on the Appropriations Committee my concern for SEC budget problems is directly related to the topic of this speech, "Securities Legislation—1960." That is, I believe in principle that a group which receives a special benefit or causes a special workload to a Government agency should pay as nearly as practical the cost of the service.

I am here referring to the workload imposed by registration statements. The total volume of 2,000 statements expected in 1961 may maintain or prolong the clearance period to 41 days. Last year, in addition to proxy statements, this work utilized about 80 percent of the time of the Division of Corporation Finance. Six years ago, after congressional request, the Commission attempted to estimate the cost of processing such statements under the Securities Act of 1933. If such an approximation can currently be made, it is my proposal to raise the fee under section 6(b) of the act to a point where it may more equitable pay for the cost of issuers' statements.

Likewise, it must be recognized that applications for registration and inspections of exchanges and broker-dealers cause a substantial workload to the Commission. Some years ago the SEC suggested that section 31 of the Exchange Act of 1934 have increased fees charged exchanges, from 2 to 5 cents. In practice these are passed on to the customer who benefits from the exchange's service and from SEC supervision. In addition, the resulting bill would impose for the first time the same fee for sales upon a group which has never directly paid a fee under the securities acts, the over-the-counter brokers and dealers.

The Commission has estimated that should the bill have been enacted in fiscal 1960, it would increase the receipt from exchanges by $1,600,000 and bring in $1 million from broker-dealers. This would have increased the percent of fees collected to total obligations from some 30 percent to 65 percent in fiscal 1960 and in fiscal 1961, 62 percent.

These estimates do not consider what would be collected if the fees for issuers under the 1933 act were raised. I hope that such an increase would more nearly approximate the operating cost of the Commission.

To impose higher fees upon the industry for the enlarged workload would be unfair without results on its behalf. Though the fees go into the general Treasury, I pledge myself to obtaining as much of these sums as possible returned to the Commission in appropriations.

The bill raising fees for exchanges and imposing them on broker-dealers was passed by the Senate in 1957. Similar bills have been introduced in the 86th Congress, H.R. 6294 and S. 737. Although the House has never voted on such a bill, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee announced hearings on H.R. 6294 for May 3, since postponed. To my knowledge, there has never been a bill introduced raising the fees under the 1933 act. Although the Senate Subcommittee on Securities did not have hearings last June on S. 737, the exchange and broker fee bill, it will be pending before us when the subcommittee holds its executive sessions.

It is my expectation, then, that from these varied proposals I will be able to confirm some legislation, "1960."

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand adjourned, under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to Monday, May 23, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1960:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Ray M. Sundean | Morton K. Meiers |
| Lawrence S. Brown | Robert M. Davidson |
| Karl R. Anderson | Ray E. Moses |
| George M. Poor | Pat T. Redden |
| James A. Ten Eyck | Douglas J. Wilcox |
| Gordon N. Orr | Frederick A. Ismond |
| Charles K. Townsend | Peter A. Martus |
| Ronald L. Newsom | Donald R. Tibbit |
| Donald W. Moncevicz | Charles G. Elliott |
| Doyle D. Harper | Gerald C. Saladin |
| Will Connell | Donald C. McIntosh |
| Richard L. Hess | Michael L. Olivier |

*To be ensigns*

| | |
|---|---|
| James Collins | William D. O'Neill |
| William A. Drohan | Archibald J. Patrick |
| Douglas O. Farrand | William G. Proffitt, Jr. |
| Richard Hull | E. Douglas Schwantes, Jr. |
| Bernard F. Karwisch | Robert H. Seay |
| Thomas E. Krakowski | Charles D. Strawman |
| Henry A. Mathis, Jr. | R. Lawrence Swanson |
| George A. Maul | |
| Park A. Nelson | |

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Carl E. Burrows, Trinity Methodist Church, Fort Ashby, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

*The Lord is faithful in all His words, and gracious in all His deeds.* (Psalm 145: 13.)

Almighty God, who art wondrous in power and glory, who stretched forth Thy hand and shaped the heavens and the earth: We are not worthy of the least of Thy blessings. Forgive us for sinning against Thee and grieving Thy spirit. Save us, O Lord, from selfishness and pride, that we will be enabled to serve our fellow man and give glory to Thee.

We give thanks to Thee for the beauty of another day, for the blessings of life, and for Thy kind providence to the children of men. Help us to be more aware of Thy revelations to us and lead us to glorify Thee in Christian living.

We pray this in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H.R. 12261.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the public works appropriation bill for 1961.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 12261

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow to file minority views on H.R. 12261.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## RURAL LIFE SUNDAY

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House a very significant observance next Sunday, May 22, which has been designated as Rural Life Sunday. This fifth Sunday after Easter has traditionally been set aside to emphasize spiritual values in rural living. Not only churches but other rural institutions, organizations, and agencies concerned with the improvement of rural life participate in this observance.

It is fitting that the people of the Nation should set aside this day to ask God's blessing on rural life, its resources, its land, and its people. Rapid changes are taking place in the rural community, and Rural Life Sunday should be a day of reflection and inventory of our basic values leading to better understanding of the present day community and closer relationships and coordination among organizations serving our rural community. It is always easy in a period of rapid change to lose sight of these basic values, and the observance of Rural Life Sunday on May 22 should be a reminder of our past heritage and future understanding of both the benefits and problems of rural living.

## NECESSITY FOR MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if there is still one who doubts the necessity for a mutual security program, let him reflect on the events of the last few days at Paris.

After months of preparation, in the expectation that the two Presidents and the two Premiers would at least come to grips with the causes of the world's tensions, the meeting broke up without a glance at the agenda.

To all intents and purposes, the meeting was over 3 hours after it started.

The only subject of discussion was a demand that the President of the United States apologize to the Russian people for authorizing an act of unarmed reconnaissance against a regime which believes that war is necessary to revolution, and that revolution is necessary to the ultimate Communist victory.

I am glad that our President did not apologize for an act necessary to free world safety, and that he displayed—not wrath—but forbearance.

I am proud also to note that our country has closed ranks behind the President to support him in his actions and utterances.

It is to be hoped that this whole disappointing affair—if it served no other purpose—proved the ability of the free world to stand resolute and unafraid against yet another attempt to bully it into submission.

This solidarity is essential to our U.S. defense posture, to our whole strategy. The key to our containment of communism is mutuality of effort; we act in concert with our allies, and we complement each other.

The mutual security program, in its many facets, permits us to project our force nearer to the borders of the Communist bloc.

The military assistance program provides our allies with modern weapons and the skills to operate and maintain them. It enables them to behave with an assurance not otherwise possible, for the cost of modern arms is simply beyond the means of some countries.

Those countries which can support modern-day forces do so; those which cannot, and which also value human freedom and dignity, require assistance from us.

It is money well spent. Proportionally, we get more defense per dollar because of lower costs and pay scales, among other things. The alternative is to maintain more U.S. forces abroad at higher cost and with a greater drain on our dollar reserves.

But the more important consideration is how our allies will view any curtailment at this time. The most compelling reason is the requirement to show our allies, some under the very shadow of the Russian bear, that we value their friendship, and it is our intention to make every reasonable and honorable effort to maintain it.

## LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no person who plays a more important part in the consideration and deliberations of this body than our distinguished Parliamentarian who is highly respected by all Members and whose service to the House of Representatives has been a dedicated service throughout the years and has been outstanding in its nature. We were all grieved a few weeks ago when we heard of his sudden illness, and I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I say we are so thankful and so happy that he is back with us again, our friend, Lew Deschler.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, FISCAL YEAR 1961

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H.R. 12232) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer their names:

[Roll No. 98]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Albert | Durham | Miller, George P. |
| Alexander | Edmondson | Mitchell |
| Bailey | Elliott, Ala. | Morris, Okla. |
| Baring | Fogarty | Powell |
| Barry | Forand | Preston |
| Blitch | Fountain | Rains |
| Bonner | Gavin | Rooney |
| Brewster | Green, Oreg. | Santangelo |
| Brown, Mo. | Gubser | Scott |
| Buckley | Hébert | Short |
| Burdick | Johnson, Colo. | Taylor |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kasem | Udall |
| Carnahan | Kilburn | Walter |
| Celler | Kitchin | Williams |
| Chelf | Laird | Wolf |
| Cooley | Landrum | Wright |
| Davis, Tenn. | McMillan | |
| Dawson | Martin | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill, H.R. 12232.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

## CHESAPEAKE & OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MD.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 488 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2331) to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

the bill shall be read for amendments under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MATS VERSUS COMMERCIAL AIRLINES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, various committees of the Congress have been concerning themselves in recent weeks with the problems being faced by the Military Air Transport Service. Judging from some of the things I have been hearing lately I think these committees might well concern themselves with our privately owned, certificated, and scheduled international airlines who find that MATS has become their biggest competitor, notwithstanding the rapid strides being made by Government-owned and wholly subsidized foreign-flag carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a recent book written by Mr. Temple Fielding, entitled "Fielding's Travel Guide to Europe." Mr. Fielding is to travel what the late Duncan Hines was to food and this book which is selling for $5.95 is certain to be high on the priority list of Americans who will be traveling abroad this year.

Of particular note, Mr. Speaker, is this paragraph contained in the Fielding book:

> Tip: If everything is sold out and your mission is very urgent, ask the American consulate or Embassy about getting in touch with MATS (Military Air Transport Service). This successor to the Air Transport Command, like so many Government bureaucracies, has expanded unchecked to the point where it is now the world's largest airline—bigger than Pan American and TWA put together. Since you've long been paying your share of this monstrous taxpayers' burden which steals such a colossal amount of traffic from the legitimate commercial carriers, you might as well try to cash in on its extremely low fares if the excuse comes up. Nonofficial civilians accepted on emergency basis only; U.S. military planes and pilots, with daily schedules to almost every corner of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt that the Military Air Transport Service has become the Frankensteinian monster of the Department of Defense, Mr. Fielding's article removes it.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 488 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2331, to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2331 would establish the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland. The park will comprise about 15,000 acres, of which about 4,800 acres are now in Federal ownership; hence, the bill would authorize the purchasing of some 10,000 additional acres extending some 165 miles along the Potomac River from just above Great Falls to Cumberland. It will also include a 25-mile scenic parkway from Maryland's Route 51 near Paw Paw, W. Va., to the existing Long Ridge Road near Woodmont, Md.

The park is to be so administered, under the laws generally applicable to the national park system, as to preserve its historic, scenic, and recreational values and features. However, under an amendment recommended by the committee, lands within the park are to be available for public nonpark uses when such uses are found, in consideration of the public interest, to be of greater public necessity than park or parkway uses and are authorized under an act of Congress.

The park and parkway, if developed and administered as contemplated by the committee, promises to realize more enduring human values and serve far more people than would ever have been possible when the canal was used as a commercial waterway or than is possible under existing law.

About 18.5 million people live within 150 miles of the canal area. These include the people of Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, seven-eighths of the population of Pennsylvania, two-fifths of that in West Virginia, and smaller percentages of the populations of New Jersey and Ohio.

The old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal affords a glimpse into history. It is also an important recreational site for tens of thousands of persons yearly from all the States of the Union. Its place in national history, its location close to the Nation's Capital, and its unique character clearly give it a national significance.

Situated along the banks of the Potomac, for a distance of some 185 miles from Washington to Cumberland, Md., the canal and towpath form one of the most scenic and picturesque riverside trails in the country. The canal itself is generally in a better state of preservation than the other large canals of the era during which they were built and used commercially.

The National Park Service is now in the process of formulating a master plan for the area that would be included within the park and parkway contemplated by H.R. 2331. Generally the plan will provide for facilities to interpret the historic features and natural history of the area, a museum, and trailside exhibits. Provision will be made for access and parking, camping, picnicking, hiking, boating, and fishing.

Land acquisitions will be required in accordance with the master plan and within the limitations of the act, to provide access routes and sites for facilities. Where the canal right-of-way is narrow, there is a need for scenic buffer areas. Such acquisitions are not possible under existing authorizations for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of the canal.

Estimates submitted by the Department of the Interior indicate that the costs of establishing, administering, maintaining, and protecting the park and parkway during the first 5 years of its existence would total $8,550,000. The aggregate costs of the additional land acquisition and development are estimated at $12 million.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is controversy over this proposed legislation, but I urge the adoption of the rule; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri has explained, this rule makes in order, under 2 hours of general debate, consideration of the bill, H.R. 2331, which, to say the least, is a very, very, very controversial measure. I opposed, as did some others, the granting of a rule by the Committee on Rules on this bill because, in my opinion, it is one of the most wasteful and unneeded proposals that has been brought before the Committee on Rules in the many years I have been a member of it. And I say that without any animosity toward the author of the legislation for whom I have a great personal affection and whom, of course, I cannot blame for wanting this bill which would provide a park anywhere—I do not know—from 50 to 100 feet wide and from 165 to 185 miles long through the very heart or center of his district.

This bill, as I recall it, and I am speaking a great deal from memory—for we have had some other problems in the Committee on Rules in the last few days, which have occupied my time—this bill provides not only for the use of some 4,800 acres of land the Government already owns between Washington and Point of Rocks in Maryland, which should be sufficiently large to give a proper recreational area for use of the people of Washington, and especially the younger folks who may want to drive out into that park for different and various reasons. But in addition to the use of that 4,800 acres of land, and I have no objection to the use of that particular land for park purposes, this bill would provide that the Government shall purchase over 10,000 additional acres to add to this proposed new park. The first cost would be anywhere—as they estimate the figures—from $8 million to $12 million. But if you will read the bill carefully, or study the report, you will note it also provides for the construction of a scenic highway of some 25 or 30 miles in length, out in the mountains where I am told by people who reside in that area, you could not possibly build that sort of parkway or special highway, double lane or triple lane or quadruple lane, I suppose, with a median strip in the center, for anything less than $1 million a mile. Of course, I am also informed, and I have the letters from people in the area who are protesting against it and people who know that country and live in it, where they have all sorts of mountain wilderness, if you please, to seek recreation, and a river in which to go fishing, that the real purpose behind this bill, once it is passed, to

not only add all this 10,000 acres additional land, and, build these access highways from Federal Route 40, and other public roads, but to also build a complete new highway, a new boulevard, or a new parkway, perhaps by extension of the George Washington Parkway we now have running as far as Great Falls or approximately so clear through to Cumberland, Md. Now I drive Federal Route No. 40 to Ohio along the old canal which is empty in many spots, and filled with water in some places, and lies between the Western Maryland Railroad tracks and Route 40—the old National Road. The canal is very narrow and of not much use for parkway construction.

I know some of our friends on the Supreme Court love to walk up and down that old towpath along the canal. But in my opinion, when you take into consideration the serious situation throughout the world, and the fiscal situation here at home; and when we have all sorts of appeals to expend public moneys on every kind of program the mind of man can conceive, to go ahead and do this thing now along this canal which has been there, and available for hikes, for the people who wish to go along it, for more than 125 years and will be there for a long, long time to come, it is simply wrong to even consider legislation of this type at this time. After all, unless conditions change a great deal, we will have to go out and borrow the money to meet the cost of acquiring this land and building these access roads and the other roads which will be needed if we establish this new national park. In my opinion, this is not a piece of legislation we should deal with. I have no objection, if we want to designate as a national park the 4,800 acres of land the Government now owns. That is in itself a large amount of land. That is nearly 8 square miles of land that can be used for recreational purposes. But to go out and buy 10,000 more acres of land, and then take over the canal area for some 165 miles beyond the end of the present Washington Parkway, so we will have, as I said a moment ago, a public park 50 or 100 feet wide in many instances, 165 miles long, and to say it is needed for recreation, when the people—and I have the letters here to show it—who live out there say they do not want it and do not need it, and that they have all the recreational areas they want, I think this is simply a waste of public money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the rule goes through and we appropriate the money, are we likely to be prepared to vote for raises for postal employees and for Federal education and for foreign aid?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that I have consistently voted for economy and efficiency in the conduct of our public business, but in my opinion there are a great many places where we can spend this amount of money more wisely than we can through the passage of a bill such as this for a narrow parkway 165 or 185 miles long, one just as narrow as it can be, and then buy extra land to add to it. Then, of course, later on, if this legislation is approved and becomes law, they will be back here soon asking for multiple millions of dollars to build a gigantic parkway, and multiple roads, through that area, and through those mountains.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a very distinct recollection that when we had WPA along all the streams they built pathways, stone-lined, some with cobblestones along the outside so as to make it easy for the fishermen. Is there anything in this bill to protect the rights and interests of fishermen along the Potomac?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You already have those along the river and the canal, to be enjoyed by you, by the people of the country, and some Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not together, not together.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If this bill is enacted into law you can still go for strolls along the canal. The spenders are only asking for $8,500,000 now, but nobody knows how many millions they will ultimately ask.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Down along the Rappahannock we cannot even get to the water because the people have acquired the land there in such a way as to make it almost impossible from Fredericksburg down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is nothing to keep you from now walking along the C. & O. Canal right-of-way or towpaths, if you want to, except the many gaps you may find in it.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I hope this rule is not adopted, and certainly I hope this bill is never approved by the House or enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been here 24 years but I seldom take the floor of the House unless it is something I have to appropriate for. If this bill ever passes, the Appropriations Committee will be called upon to appropriate money for it. That is why I take the floor at this time.

The title of the bill reads "To establish the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park," and the bill states it is for the "purpose of preserving and interpreting certain property in the State of Maryland for the benefit and inspiration of the people" of the other 49 States. What generosity on the part of the State of Maryland. She wants to share this with the other 49 States. Usually when a State has something of interest within its borders it sets up its own park to exploit it for its own purposes.

They talk of this being an historic canal. Let me tell you what an historic canal really is. In the district I represent we had a canal 125 or 130 years ago before the day of the railroads. It served Youngstown, Canton, Akron, and Cleveland along the Mahoning River that curved around into the Cuyahoga River. Two youngsters drove a mule along that canal. Those two youngsters went into the Civil War and afterward became famous. One became a general and the other a major. They both rose high enough to serve in the National Congress and were elected to the district I represent. Time passed, and they went even higher, being elected to the Presidency: Cleveland and Garfield. If you want a canal park for purely historical reasons go down there and build something in Ohio where there is a canal with a real historical significance. But I would not presume to ask this Congress to build such a memorial to these two great men in Ohio.

Just in Washington, D.C., and nearby Virginia and Maryland, the Federal Government already owns 42,000 acres of parks. It takes over 1,000 employees and over $2 million a year just to manage the national parks in this area.

The Park Service already has expenditures planned totaling over $160 million on over 50 projects in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland. Suppose the folks back home knew that. They would certainly call us to account.

Now we are being asked to authorize an expenditure of another $12 million for Maryland. Why this request is being brought up now I do not know. We say that this is the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Yet 3 years ago we authorized a study of the Potomac River at a cost of $1.5 million, and we have appropriated $790,000 to date for that study, and another $400,000 is budgeted for next fiscal year. The Corps of Engineers has filed its review report with the Appropriations Committee indicating that 12 reservoirs will be needed in this area, involving 57,400 acres, to meet the estimated minimum water supply and pollution-abatement requirements. If we build these 12 dams and reservoirs in this area, it will be the most scenic place in all of the United States. We should not be authorizing the purchase of another 10,000 acres of parkland in this area at the same time we are appropriating funds to survey the need for these reservoirs. The Corps of Engineers is spending $1.5 million to make this study, and yet this bill would give the go-ahead to buy and develop 10,000 additional acres of parks that will stand in the way of necessary development of the reservoirs for water storage. There has never been a major dam or reservoir built within a national park since the Park Service was created, in 1916.

Mr. Speaker, there are billions of dollars' worth of projects which we have authorized throughout the Nation, including parks, reclamation, flood control, and so forth, that we will never be able to afford to appropriate for in the foreseeable future, and maybe never. Certainly we should, at the most, add only the most urgent projects to this staggering group of authorizations.

I inserted in yesterday's RECORD a report from the Wall Street Journal. In the steel industry in my district there

are some 66,000 employees. It is the fourth largest steel center in the world. But the Youngstown mills are only at 45 percent capacity this week. So you can imagine there are thousands idle throughout the district. Steel mills for the Nation as a whole are only operating at 71.7 percent of capacity, so the whole Nation is down to the slowest pace in a non-strike-affected period since December 1958. I am not blaming anybody. What the trouble is I do not know.

We were told that in 1929 we were headed for the poor house. But there is one thing about that today: We are headed in the same direction, but we are going there in Cadillacs. We are already spending over $100 million a year for recreation, including appropriations to the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, et cetera. We are spending millions of dollars just for recreational planning and I have supported these programs, but there is a limit as to what we can afford. We had better stop, look and listen, because as steel goes, so goes the Nation's economy. When you see the fourth largest steel center in the world working only 45 percent of capacity, you had better stop, look and listen before we authorize nonessential projects like this which will cost the taxpayers $12 million.

The Youngstown Sheet and Tube is on a short week. It has laid off several hundred workers in recent weeks. That is one of the biggest fabricating plants in the country. And yet we are in here today talking about buying 10,000 more acres of park land for the State of Maryland.

I am for the canal. We already have a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park covering 4,800 acres along the canal from here to Cumberland. We are now appropriating money annually to manage, maintain, and improve this area. I am for it. But to go up in the hills and buy 10,000 more acres at this time when we are studying the area for water storage and when our Federal budget is one of the highest in peacetime history, is just not justified in my opinion.

Maryland is a State that has much pride. Our Lord created some points of scenic beauty, and I cannot see why it should not have enough pride to issue bonds and buy this land and develop the area. But instead here in Maryland, and I repeat—it is a nice gesture—trying to share with the other 49 States and let them all participate in the payment. I do not know whether you will defeat the rule or defeat the bill, but I would like to see something done, because I do not want to be turning it down next year in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in support of my bill. I do not propose to take too much time, but I urge upon the Members of the House that the statements made by the previous speakers, in my humble judgment, indicate there is genuine merit in the bill and thus full consideration of the proposals contained in H.R. 2331 is amply justified.

As a starting point, I respectfully call your attention to certain statements made in the report filed by the Committee on Interior, on page 2 thereof.

> The Chesapeake and Ohio Park and Parkway, if developed and administered as contemplated by the committee, promises to realize more enduring human values and serve far more people than would ever have been possible when the canal was used as a commercial waterway or than is possible under existing law. No other proposal—

And I emphasize this—

> No other proposal that has been before the committee in recent years for the establishment of a new unit of the national park system has offered more people of the country such promise of an opportunity to appreciate a historical scene and at the same time to enjoy a natural setting of singular beauty.

I am urging that this rule be granted. You have heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] say that he is not against the park. I do not believe I am amiss if I interpret that as meaning that he is not against making this a national historical park, which does not cost 1 cent of money. I urge upon you that statement as an argument for the rule. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] stated that he is not against the canal. In that connection, I want to emphasize, that we are talking now about, and this bill pertains solely to, Federal property, property that has been owned by our Federal Government since 1938. We are not considering property owned by the State of Maryland.

I wish to present to the Members the fact that this is the last and only continuous canal surviving from the 1820's and 1830's. We are not talking about a strip of land. We are talking about a very famous historical relic going back some 130 years. We are seeking to preserve by my bill, basically without any cost of money, this canal as a national historical relic, as a source, may I say to you, of inspiration to future generations.

These are some of the things we propose to present to you upon consideration of the merits after approval of the rule.

Twelve years ago this Congress authorized a study of the use of the C. & O. Canal, and the results of this study are contained in House Document 687, 81st Congress, 2d session, filed on August 16, 1950; and in 1956, 1957, and again in 1958 the Congress, both the House and the Senate, considered proposals for the development of the C. & O. Canal as a national historical park. I wish to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in July of 1957, just about 3 years ago, this particular measure now before the House for consideration passed the Senate. I emphasize that this bill passed the other body in July of 1957 without a dissenting vote.

H.R. 2331 provides for the establishment of a national historical park. There are now eight historical parks. They are Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va.; Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park, Appomattox, Va.; Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, border of Virginia and Kentucky; Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; Morristown National Historical Park, Morristown, Pa.; Chalmette National Historical Park, New Orleans, La.; Saratoga National Historical Park, Saratoga, N.Y.; Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Harrodsburg, Ky.

The C. & O. Canal is steeped in the history of the westward development of our country. To appreciate its historical status, one should recall that only the Erie Canal in New York State, connecting Lake Erie with the Hudson River, was on the same grand construction scale. The historic purpose of the C. & O. Canal can only properly be determined by reviewing the expressed thoughts of the dreamers, designers, and developers of the canal.

In 1770 Benjamin Franklin was one of the promoters of a new settlement in the area beyond the Ohio River. He advertised in London for colonizers and pointed out the access way through the mountains by way of the Potomac River.

In 1784 Gen. George Washington was the founder of a canal corporation to build a canal along the Virginia Potomac River banks. The canal was built to the vicinity of Great Falls by 1802. In over 36 years the Potomac Co. expended $725,000 on canal construction.

President Washington wrote to Thomas Jefferson the following:

> All the world is becoming commercial * * *. Nature has declared in favor of the Potomac and through the channel offers into our lap the whole commerce of the Western World * * * the ways are preparing and the roads will be made easy through the channels of the Potomac.

By 1820 George Washington's original corporation had become exhausted and ended operations. But his westward dream remained fresh and vital. On Washington's birthday, February 22, 1823, the Potomac Canal Co. was chartered by the Virginia General Assembly, as a successor of the original corporation to continue building the canal westward.

The need and importance of the canal project was emphasized by President James Monroe in his message to Congress on December 3, 1823.

> Many patriotic and enlightened citizens, who have made the subject an object of particular investigation, have suggested an improvement of still greater importance. They are of the opinion that the waters of the Chesapeake and Ohio may be connected together by one continuous canal, and at an expense far short of the value and importance of the object to be attained. If this could be accomplished, it is impossible to calculate the beneficial consequences which would result from it. A great portion of the produce of the very fertile country through which it would pass, would find a market through that channel. Troops might be moved with great facility in war, with cannon, and every munition, and in either direction. Connecting the Atlantic with the western country, in a line passing through the seat of the National Government it would contribute essentially to strengthen the bond of union itself.

A few weeks following President Monroe's declaration of support for the canal, the Virginia General Assembly on January 27, 1824, adopted an act incorporating the Chesapeake & Ohio

Canal Co., as a successor to the Potomac Canal Co. The enabling act was in the nature of an interstate compact with Maryland. The Maryland General Assembly on January 31, 1825, approved the compact to build the C. & O. Canal. Within weeks the Congress gave its consent to the compact by an act approved by President Monroe on March 3, 1825. The Federal act of consent appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 11, 1960.

The Potomac Canal Co., original successor of George Washington's canal corporation, assented to the interstate compact on May 16, 1825. It thereby surrendered all its rights to build the canal and transferred its property to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co.

The basic plan of the new canal company was to connect by one continued canal the tidewater of the Potomac River with the steamboat navigation of the Ohio River and the southern shore of Lake Erie. The canal was to be in two divisions, the eastern section from the District of Columbia to Cumberland, Md., and western section from that terminal point to Pittsburgh.

When the Pennsylvania Legislature affirmed the interstate compact in 1826, it did so only on the condition that the canal "shall be extended to and terminate at Pittsburgh." This plan was approved by President John Quincy Adams in his message to Congress on December 7, 1826.

As soon as the Congress consented to the compact in early 1825, the Select Committee on Roads and Canals of the House of Representatives began an exhaustive study of the feasibility of the canal, the need and practical use for same, as well as the estimated cost of the facility. On January 30, 1827, the 2d session of the 19th Congress, the committee filed its report, No. 90, a 122-page document with exhibits and appendix.

The report is a major source of historical data on the C. & O. Canal. Throughout the report, the committee repeatedly refers to the project as, "this great work," "this great undertaking," "this great national work of unrivaled local as well as national utility," and constructing the canal would be to the "permanent advantage, security and honor of the entire Union."

The committee was seeking House approval of its recommendation that the Federal Government subscribe to 25,000 shares of canal company stock. Such subscription was to be made in five annual installments of $500,000 each for a total investment of $2,500,000. The Federal funds were to be limited for use only on the eastern section of the canal. Furthermore, the Congress required that the canal be constructed to "dimensions adapted to future and permanent national use, to make it subserve purposes of great and lasting public utility rather than of immediate profit."

The important national purpose of the C. & O. Canal is described by the committee at page 7 of Report 90 as follows:

> The subscription here invited and which the committee recommended, is to a work yet to be begun, but which, if successful, and of that no rational doubt any longer exists, if adequate funds for its execution be supplied, will supersede a navigation not only obstructed, but at all times dangerous, and a portage of many miles, over numerous rugged and lofty mountains, separating a population of two million souls from the residue of the same people, who are destined to multiply with a rapidity unexampled but among themselves, on both sides of the great barrier to their friendly intercourse which this canal is designed to surmount.
>
> The committee did not unanimously concur in recommending this subscription, without duly considering every other mode of accomplishing a work, as essential, in peace, to the permanent Union and commercial prosperity of the Eastern and Western States, as in war, to their common defense and safety.

At the time of the committee's report, there were 24 States in the Union. The 1820 population of the continental United States was 9,638,453. This increased to 12,866,020 in 1830, of which the rural population was 11,738,773. In that same year of 1830 there were 23 miles of railroad track in the United States. Sailing merchant vessels, including canal boats and barges, in 1830, amounted to total documented gross tons of 1,127,304. In 1828 when the C. & O. Canal construction started, sailing vessels were of 1,701,474 gross tons.

By 1924, when the C. & O. Canal closed operation, railroad trackage in the United States had reached 415,028 miles. Sailing vessels in the U.S. merchant marine in 1924 were of 1,184,867 gross tons. However, canal boats and barges in 1924 separately had a gross tonnage of 1,240,347. By 1945 sailing vessels were only of 114,725 tons but canal boats and barges had grown to 2,451,566 tons.

These facts are of historic and timely interest since the use of canalboats has steadily increased in commercial transportation since 1876. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park is a fitting monument as the last survivor of the grand scale canal building era of our history.

The members of the Select Committee on Roads and Canals in 1827 proved themselves men of vision. In pages 11 and 12 of Report No. 90, they stated:

> In founding a durable work, its remote as well as proximate benefits are to be regarded, and what scale of measurement can determine the future extent of the population, wealth, and consequent consumption of the District of Columbia, if it shall become, as its great founders confidently anticipated, the emporium of the West.
>
> A work calculated to perpetuate to the American people, and their latest posterity, the blessings of peace, freedom, and independence; objects which in themselves, can have no limit to their values; because, without them all other advantages, public or private, national or individual, are precarious and fleeting: The expediency of providing for objects of such magnitude can be bounded only by the extent of the public resources.
>
> And no provision, among the many internal improvements which solicit the favorable counterance and pecuniary aid of the Federal Government can surpass, in this tendency, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal.

It is clear that in the minds of committee members the construction of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal was of historic, in fact heroic stature in dimension and importance. It was infused throughout with promoting the national interest. The committee report, however, is specific in defining the advantages of the canal to State and local interests. At page 13, the following highly descriptive language is used in this regard:

> No State of this Union; not one of its many markets; no branch of its industry, whether it speed the plough or spread the sail, or ply, at home, the shuttle or the hammer; whether its activity be exerted on land or the sea, to the North or South, the East or West, is without an interest in the accomplishment of this national work.

The Congress has been vitally interested in the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal since that first comprehensive report of January 30, 1827, 133 years ago. Between the 18th and 25th Congresses, a period of 16 years, a total of 52 committee reports and Executive communications specifically pertaining to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal were filed.

On December 16, 1913, a report by the district engineer to the Secretary of War—House Document No. 893, 63d Congress, 2d session—estimated the total indebtedness of the canal at $27,166,604.69. The bonded indebtedness was $1,959,500 and State liens made up the balance. The cost of initial construction, major repairs, improvements, and interest on the company's indebtedness, thus totaled about $27 million. Of this amount, the United States and the District of Columbia provided $2 million.

The historic economic difficulties of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. have filled the records of law courts and newspaper files. For on July 4, 1828, when the first spade was turned on the canal by President John Quincy Adams, the first spike on the B. & O. Railroad track was driven at Baltimore by Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence. A marathon economic conflict between the canal and the railroad had started. By February 19, 1830, the House Committee on Internal Improvements reported that it was a quandary as to which means of transportation, the canal or the railroad should cross the mountain at Cumberland, Md. Its historic hesitation and wonder are expressed as follows:

> The committee have had their attention drawn to the conflict which exists between the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co.; the course, however, which they have adopted, supersedes the necessity of explaining this disagreement. It is the opinion of the committee, that the contemplated highway over the Allegany mountains will need the assistance of the National Government; but they cannot perceive any public inducements to aid both a canal and a railroad. The committee have reflected much on the interesting question, now in agitation in England and this country, namely, whether railroads are to be preferred to canals in ordinary cases, and on routes where there are no intermediate water communications, and they rejoice that the experiment is now about to be fairly made.

The race between the C. & O. and the B. & O. began on the same day, July 4, 1828. The railroad reached Cumberland in 1842. The canal was completed and opened to Cumberland on October 10, 1850, 110 years ago. In the early

1900's, the railroad bought the canal. On August 6, 1938, the B. & O. Railroad sold the canal to the U.S. Government for $2 million in settlement of a Reconstruction Finance Corp. loan. Since 1938 the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has had the canal within its jurisdiction.

From 1938 through the 1959 fiscal year, expenditures by the Federal Government for restoration and improvement of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal properties have been in the amount of $1,512,961.

As previous speakers have described in full, H.R. 2331 creates a National Historical Park of that 165-mile portion of the canal from Great Falls to Cumberland. The acreage requested to enlarge the park area, mathematically is equivalent to a 500-foot additional additional strip of land area for the full 165 miles. The profile of the adjacent land is such that for 40 of the total miles, the adjacent 500 feet is of the same level as the canal. The remaining 125 miles has, within 500 feet of the canal, elevations from about 25 feet to 200 feet in the mountainous areas.

The bill also authorizes in section 2, for the establishment of a scenic parkway of approximately 25 miles in the mountainous western part of the canal area. The parkway would run for its whole course through the Maryland Green Ridge State Forest, adjacent to the Potomac River gorge. Construction of the parkway would not begin until Maryland had donated the 100 acres per mile required by Federal law.

Careful consideration must at all times be given to the judicious use and development of federally owned lands. This principle applies equally to consideration of Federal funds on the federally owned C. & O. Canal. A wise and prudent investment of such funds pursuant to the authorization contained in H.R. 2331 would freely promote the public interest in my judgment.

If doubts as to this exist among the Members, it would seem proper to hearken back to Report No. 90 of the House Select Committee on Roads and Canals. On January 30, 1827, at page 17, our predecessors there stated in recommending Federal subscription to C. & O. Canal Co. stock:

> Subscriptions to the structure of canals may be founded on loans, therefore, without affording to posterity cause to complain; since their benefit descends unimpaired with the debt they control, the cheap price of the countless blessings which they diffuse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying there are three aspects contained in the bill H.R. 2331. One aspect costs nothing and would take the 165 miles of a national historic relic and make such property a national historical park. That costs nothing. If I understand both of the gentlemen from Ohio, they are not against that principle. We are seeking in another section of the bill to increase the present canal land area by 10,000 acres. We are anxious to debate the need and justification of this proposed enlargement and accordingly are requesting a rule. Finally, there is a third proposal to create a scenic parkway for 23 miles. We would like to present to the Members of the House the justification for that proposal. In light of the fact that thousands of dollars have been spent in studies of the use of this particular canal during the past 12 years, and since $1,500,000 has been authorized and spent since 1938 for the development and maintenance of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, we are seeking to have this wonderful relic preserved for all time by passage of H.R. 2331.

I urge upon you the granting of the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has spoken of the low production rate in steel. In 1957 we imported 1.1 million tons of steel mill products. Last year, 1959, we imported 4.4 million tons. In 1957 we exported 5.2 million tons of steel mill products. Last year our exports dropped to 1.5 million tons, a decline of 3.7 million tons in 2 years.

Combined, these factors indicate that 7 million tons of finished steel products were not produced in American mills, or by American labor. This is the equivalent of 10 million tons of steel ingots, or about 11 percent of our 1959 production.

Had this steel been produced in this Nation, it would have provided employment for 56,000 more people in the steel industry.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to expedite the situation and to save time, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—ayes 34, noes 62.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 227, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—134

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aspinall | Church | Gallagher |
| Ayres | Coad | Garmatz |
| Baldwin | Coffin | Gathings |
| Barr | Cohelan | George |
| Barrett | Collier | Giaimo |
| Bass, N.H. | Curtis, Mo. | Gilbert |
| Bass, Tenn. | Daddario | Granahan |
| Bennett, Fla. | Dent | Gray |
| Bentley | Derwinski | Green, Pa. |
| Berry | Diggs | Gubser |
| Blatnik | Dingell | Hagen |
| Bolling | Doyle | Harmon |
| Bowles | Dulski | Healey |
| Brademas | Evins | Hechler |
| Brooks, Tex. | Fallon | Hogan |
| Broyhill | Farbstein | Holland |
| Burke, Mass. | Flynn | Ikard |
| Byrne, Pa. | Foley | Jarman |
| Casey | Friedel | Johnson, Calif. |
| Chenoweth | Fulton | Johnson, Md. |
| Johnson, Wis. | Morris, N. Mex. | Roush |
| Karsten | Moulder | Rutherford |
| Karth | Multer | Saund |
| Keith | Murphy | Saylor |
| King, Calif. | Nix | Shelley |
| King, Utah | O'Brien, N.Y. | Shipley |
| Kowalski | O'Hara, Ill. | Sisk |
| Lesinski | O'Hara, Mich. | Slack |
| Libonati | O'Neill | Smith, Iowa |
| McCormack | Oliver | Smith, Miss. |
| McDowell | Pfost | Sullivan |
| McFall | Poage | Teague, Tex. |
| McGinley | Porter | Teller |
| McSween | Powell | Thompson, N.J. |
| Madden | Price | Thompson, Tex. |
| Mahon | Prokop | Thornberry |
| Matthews | Quie | Toll |
| Merrow | Quigley | Ullman |
| Meyer | Randall | Vanik |
| Miller, Clem | Reuss | Wampler |
| Miller, George P. | Rhodes, Pa. | Watts |
| Montoya | Rivers, Alaska | Wier |
| Moorhead | Rogers, Colo. | Wilson |
| Morgan | Rogers, Mass. | Wolf |
| | Roosevelt | Zablocki |

NAYS—227

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Flood | Moore |
| Abernethy | Flynt | Moss |
| Adair | Ford | Mumma |
| Addonizio | Forrester | Murray |
| Alford | Frazier | Natcher |
| Alger | Frelinghuysen | Nelsen |
| Allen | Gary | Norblad |
| Andersen, Minn. | Gavin | Norrell |
| Anderson, Mont. | Glenn | O'Konski |
| Andrews | Goodell | Osmers |
| Arends | Grant | Ostertag |
| Ashley | Griffin | Passman |
| Ashmore | Griffiths | Patman |
| Auchincloss | Gross | Pelly |
| Avery | Haley | Perkins |
| Barden | Halleck | Philbin |
| Bates | Halpern | Pilcher |
| Baumhart | Hardy | Pillion |
| Becker | Harris | Pirnie |
| Beckworth | Harrison | Poff |
| Belcher | Hays | Pucinski |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hemphill | Rabaut |
| Betts | Henderson | Rains |
| Boland | Herlong | Ray |
| Bolton | Hess | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bosch | Hiestand | Rees, Kans. |
| Bow | Hoeven | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Boykin | Hoffman, Ill. | Riehlman |
| Bray | Hoffman, Mich. | Riley |
| Breeding | Holt | Rivers, S.C. |
| Brock | Holtzman | Roberts |
| Brooks, La. | Horan | Robison |
| Broomfield | Hosmer | Rodino |
| Brown, Ga. | Huddleston | Rogers, Fla. |
| Brown, Ohio | Irwin | Rogers, Tex. |
| Budge | Jackson | Rostenkowski |
| Burke, Ky. | Jennings | St. George |
| Burleson | Jensen | Schenck |
| Cahill | Johansen | Scherer |
| Canfield | Jonas | Schneebeli |
| Cannon | Jones, Ala. | Schwengel |
| Cederberg | Jones, Mo. | Selden |
| Chamberlain | Kearns | Sikes |
| Chiperfield | Keogh | Siler |
| Clark | Kilday | Simpson |
| Colmer | Kilgore | Smith, Calif. |
| Conte | Kirwan | Spence |
| Cook | Kluczynski | Springer |
| Corbett | Knox | Steed |
| Cramer | Kyl | Stratton |
| Cunningham | Lafore | Stubblefield |
| Curtin | Lane | Taber |
| Curtis, Mass. | Langen | Teague, Calif. |
| Dague | Latta | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Daniels | Levering | Tollefson |
| Davis, Ga. | Lindsay | Trimble |
| Delaney | Lipscomb | Tuck |
| Denton | Loser | Utt |
| Derounian | McCulloch | Van Pelt |
| Devine | McDonough | Van Zandt |
| Dixon | McIntire | Vinson |
| Donohue | McMillan | Wainwright |
| Dooley | Macdonald | Wallhauser |
| Dorn, N.Y. | Machrowicz | Weaver |
| Dorn, S.C. | Mack | Weis |
| Dowdy | Magnuson | Westland |
| Downing | Mailliard | Wharton |
| Dwyer | Marshall | Whitten |
| Elliott, Pa. | Mason | Widnall |
| Everett | May | Willis |
| Fascell | Michel | Winstead |
| Feighan | Miller, N.Y. | Withrow |
| Fenton | Milliken | Yates |
| Fino | Mills | Young |
| Fisher | Minshall | Younger |
| | Moeller | |
| | Monagan | |

NOT VOTING—71

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Albert | Fogarty | Metcalf |
| Alexander | Forand | Mitchell |
| Anfuso | Fountain | Morris, Okla. |
| Bailey | Green, Oreg. | Morrison |
| Baker | Hargis | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Baring | Hébert | Preston |
| Barry | Holifield | Rooney |
| Blitch | Hull | Santangelo |
| Boggs | Inouye | Scott |
| Bonner | Johnson, Colo. | Sheppard |
| Brewster | Judd | Short |
| Brown, Mo. | Kasem | Smith, Kans. |
| Buckley | Kastenmeier | Smith, Va. |
| Burdick | Kee | Staggers |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kelly | Taylor |
| Carnahan | Kilburn | Thomas |
| Celler | Kitchin | Thompson, La. |
| Chelf | Laird | Udall |
| Cooley | Landrum | Walter |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lankford | Whitener |
| Dawson | Lennon | Williams |
| Durham | McGovern | Wright |
| Edmondson | Martin | Zelenko |
| Elliott, Ala. | Meader | |

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Judd.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Short.
Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. FALLON, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GAVIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

## PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 23

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the rest of the day, the balance of this week, and the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two bills I should like to dispose of today; H.R. 6851, authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort in Colorado which I understand the gentleman from Colorado will call up as the next order of business or after the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has disposed of some matters. The other bill is H.R. 8226, to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

If those two bills are disposed of as intended, we shall go over until Monday. It looks as though we ought to be able to dispose of those two bills today, as contemplated.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say that so far as I know they can be disposed of today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Notice I say, as contemplated.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day, but I understand there is no business from the District of Columbia Committee.

Then there is the public works appropriation bill for 1961.

On Tuesday, Kentucky and Florida have primaries. There will be two bills taken up on that day, H.R. 10572 pertaining to Agriculture, Forests, National Administration; and H.R. 11761, Farmer's Home Administration.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. Unless a rule is reported out, I understand Calendar Wednesday will be exercised in connection with the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960, H.R. 10128.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I inquire of the majority leader on that point, whether or not he intends to ask at this time to dispense with Calendar Wednesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. As I have said heretofore, if any Member, no matter on what side, tells me that he would object to the request, I would not put that Member in the position to have to object. If any Member tells me they would like to exercise Calendar Wednesday and would not want me to make a unanimous consent to dispense with that, I feel I owe it to that Member in view of the relationship of the majority leader with each and every Member of the House, always endeavoring to cooperate as much as possible, I would not make such a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, as it is listed here, if a rule is not granted and if Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, it is the purpose to call up the School Construction Assistance Act on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is in the discretion of the proponents of the legislation to do so. If a rule is reported out, I will program it for Wednesday. Again, in that connection, I would want to discuss that further, but I will program it for Wednesday if a rule is reported out, so far as the legislative program for next week is concerned.

The program for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday is as follows:

S. 2130, the bill relating to the payment to the Government of Japan. I understand that relates to the Bonin Islands.

H.R. 1157, relating to the development of the Ryukyu Islands.

There are primaries in North Carolina on Saturday next, and I might say there is a State convention in North Carolina today.

The reason I use the words "intended" or "contemplated" is I had that in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Memorial Day comes along on the following Monday, can the majority leader give us any information as to what the situation might be here at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the Members that with their cooperation, there will be no rollcalls on that day. I do not want to commit myself as to adjourning over now, but my mind is open in that respect.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is very fair as he always is.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is always my purpose to give Members their day in court and if some of the minor bills could be brought up and gotten out of the way, it will be very helpful to the Members because, as we all know, at the tail end of the session some of the bills are going to be lost. Yet, these bills are important to individual Members and I like to give all Members their day in court. Perhaps I may be overemphasizing this, but to me it is a question of a very solemn trust and that is why Members can make their appointments and we will protect them on May 30. As I said, my mind is open about adjourning over, yet if there are some bills that we might dispose of by taking advantage of that legislative day, that might be done, but as I say, I do not commit myself to that at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Subsequent to the above announcements, I have received the request to reassign the public works appropriation bill for 1961 from Monday to Tuesday, which I have done. After consultation with the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and other interested Members, the program for the week of May 23, 1960, is as follows:

Monday: District Day—No business; S. 2130, payment to Japan; H.R. 1157, development of Ryukyu Islands; H.R. 6851, Colorado, Bent's Old Fort Historic Site; H.R. 8226, Florida, Castillo De San Marcos National Park.

Tuesday: Kentucky and Florida have primaries; public works appropriation bill for 1961.

Any rollcall votes on Monday or Tuesday will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: H.R. 10128, School Construction Assistance Act of 1960; H.R. 10572, Agriculture, Forests, National Administration; H.R. 11761, Farmer's Home Administration.

North Carolina primary on Saturday.

Any further program will be announced later. Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

## AMENDING SECTION 170 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6779) to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals—with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all after "following:" over to and including "years." in line 9 on page 2 and insert: " 'For purposes of this

subparagraph, in the case of taxable years ending before January 1, 1961, within such 10 preceding taxable years, if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income taxes paid during the taxable years in any period of two consecutive taxable years exceeds 90 percent of the sum of the taxpayer's taxable incomes (as so computed) for such two consecutive taxable years, and if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income tax so paid during each such consecutive taxable year exceeds 75 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income (as so computed) for such year, the 90 percent test shall be considered satisfied with respect to both such consecutive taxable years; but no taxable year shall be included in more than one period of two consecutive taxable years and not more than two periods of two consecutive taxable years within such 10 preceding taxable years shall be taken into account.'"

Page 2, line 18, strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this bill unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. MILLS. This bill was unanimously reported by the committee. It was passed last year. What we are considering now are some amendments of the other body, which I must frankly admit tighten up the bill, as it passed the House, and tighten the application of it. They are entirely acceptable to those who are in favor of the bill and to the Treasury and to our staff insofar as the technicalities are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under present law, an individual is entitled to an unlimited deduction for charitable contributions if, in the current year and in 8 out of the 10 preceding years, he has given 90 percent of his income to charity or to the Federal Government in the form of income taxes. However, in certain cases, taxpayers did not qualify for this unlimited charitable contributions deduction even though in 8 out of the last 10 years more than 75 percent of their income went to charities or for taxes and even though the 90-percent test would have been met if it had been computed on the basis of the average charitable contributions and taxes paid in 2-year periods during the last 10 years.

The House bill provided that the 90-percent test was to be considered as having been met for any 2 consecutive years in the 10-year period preceding the current year if the total of the charitable contributions and taxes for such 2-year period met the 90-percent test. However, in order to qualify under the House bill, the individual's charitable contributions and taxes in each of the 2 years had to represent 75 percent of his taxable income and no one year could be included in more than one 2-year period.

As amended by the Senate, no more than two periods of 2 consecutive years may be taken into account in determining whether the 90-percent test has been satisfied in 8 out of the 10 preceding years. The Senate also amended the House bill to provide that the period to which the bill applies and within which the averaging device may be employed is limited to the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961. Accordingly, under the bill as amended by the Senate, this averaging device will not become a permanent feature of the tax law. However, it is permissible for taxpayers to qualify for the unlimited charitable contribution deduction in the current and future years by averaging income and contributions and taxes in years prior to January 1, 1961. Furthermore, although the bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, a taxpayer will be permitted to average two periods of 2 consecutive years whether such 2-year period occurred prior to or after December 31, 1956, so long as those years come within the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961. Finally, because of the passage of time since the bill was acted upon by the House, the Senate amended the effective date provision to provide that although the bill will continue to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, no credit or refunds are to be paid as a result of this bill for any years beginning before January 1, 1960.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, existing law permits a charitable contribution deduction to an individual up to 20 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. The limitation is 30 percent in the case of contributions to churches, schools, colleges, and hospitals. Existing law contains a provision for the deduction of unlimited charitable contributions under certain circumstances. In general, to be eligible for the unlimited deduction, a taxpayer must be able to establish that in the current taxable year and in 8 out of 10 preceding years he has given 90 percent of his taxable income to charity or to the Federal Government in the form of income taxes.

The bill before us today, H.R. 6779, pertains to this requirement involving a pattern of giving in 8 out of 10 years.

The House bill provided that the 90-percent test was to be considered as met for any 2 consecutive years in the 10-year period preceding the taxable year if the total of the charitable contributions and taxes for the 2-year period met the 90-percent test. The House bill contained a further safeguard by requiring that in each of the 2 consecutive years the charitable contributions and taxes had to represent 75 percent of the taxable income and no one year could be included in more than one 2-year period.

The Senate in acting on this legislation amended the bill as follows: First, only two periods of 2 consecutive years may be taken into account in qualifying; second, the applicable period in which the averaging device is available is limited to the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961; third, a clerical amendment clarifying the definition "taxable income"; and fourth, amendment to the effective date provision so that no refunds or credits are to be paid as a result of enactment of the bill for any years beginning before January 1, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment these amendments approved by the Senate should be accepted by the House.

---

## AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO CERTAIN WEAPONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4029) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupation and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 2, strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, this bill amends the special excise tax provisions in the Internal Revenue Code relating to short-barreled firearms, machineguns and the so-called any other weapon category.

The Senate amendment merely changes the effective date with respect to the changes in the occupational tax rates from June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1960, so as to make the application prospective. The bill passed the House unanimously last year, and the Senate amendment was necessitated simply by the passage of time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed version of H.R. 4029 amended the sections of the Internal Revenue Code which were developed from the National Firearms Act so as to facilitate control of weapons used for illegal purposes. In essence, the legislation seeks to make it more difficult for criminal elements in our society to obtain weapons. The Senate in acting on this bill included an amendment having to do with the effective date of changes in the occupational tax rates applicable to certain types of weapons covered in the bill. This is a technical amendment made necessary by the passage of time since the bill was approved in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the House has acted to approve the Senate amendment.

## CREDITS AGAINST THE UNEMPLOYMENT TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6482) relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 14 on page 2 and insert:

"(d) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYER.—Subject to the limits provided by subsection (c), if—

"(1) an employer acquires during any calendar year substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another person, or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of such other person, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business one or more individuals who immediately prior to the acquisition were employed in the trade or business of such other person, and

"(2) such other person is not an employer for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place,

then, for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place, in addition to the credits allowed under subsection (a) and (b), such employer may credit against the tax imposed by section 3301 for such year an amount equal to the credits which (without regard to subsection (c)) would have been allowable to such other person under subsections (a) and (b) and this subsection for such year, if such other person had been an employer, with respect to remuneration subject to contributions under the unemployment compensation law of a State paid by such other person to the individual or individuals described in paragraph (1)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, under present law contributions made by employers to State unemployment funds may be claimed as a credit against the 3-percent Federal unemployment tax. Ordinarily, since wages paid by a predecessor employer are deemed to be paid by a successor with respect to the calendar year in which the successor succeeded to the business, the successor employer is entitled to a credit against its Federal unemployment tax for State unemployment taxes paid by its predecessor. However, in some situations, although a predecessor has been considered an employer for State unemployment tax purposes, it has not been considered an employer for Federal unemployment tax purposes. In these situations, the successor has been denied a credit against its Federal unemployment tax for the State unemployment taxes paid by its predecessor and has been unjustly taxed by the Federal Government.

As passed by the House, H.R. 6482 corrected this situation where there has been a statutory merger or consolidation of corporations. However, the House bill did not take care of similar situations involving unincorporated businesses.

As amended by the Senate, the relief provided under the House bill would be extended to situations in which any employer acquires substantially all the property used in the trade or business, or in a separate unit of a trade or business, of another person and continues to employ some or all of the employees of the other person. In such a situation, the successor will be entitled to a credit for State unemployment taxes paid by the predecessor employer notwithstanding the fact that the predecessor is not considered to be an employer for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax.

The amendments contained in H.R. 6482 will apply to calendar years beginning after 1950. Since the effective date provision does not refer to a period of limitations for claiming credit or refund, no refunds or credits will be allowed where the calendar year involved is closed by the running of the statute of limitations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6482 pertains to the unemployment tax imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. The legislation would remove an inequity involved in the availability of the credit against the Federal unemployment tax for contributions to State unemployment funds.

The legislation as it passed the House was specifically applicable to incorporated taxpayers. The Senate has amended the bill to make the provisions applicable to unincorporated businesses as well as corporations. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in supporting the House approval of this Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## TEMPORARY TARIFF TREATMENT OF CHICORY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9308) to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That sections 1 and 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act to suspend for two years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory', approved April 16, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 1001, par. 776 and note; Public Law 86-441), are each amended by striking out 'July 16, 1960' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1963.' "

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, as it passed the House of Representatives H.R. 9308 provided for the continuation for a period of 3 years of the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory—except endive—and for the continuation for the same period of the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents per pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared. Under the House bill the termination date of April 16, 1963, was provided.

The Members will further recall that, since the original passage of this bill, a Senate amendment to another bill—H.R. 9307—was accepted by the House, providing a 90-day continuation, from April 18, 1960, to July 16, 1960, of the existing duty treatment on chicory, in order to give the Senate adequate time for further study of the situation before acting on the 3-year extension.

The Senate amendment to the pending bill, which provides for a termination date of June 30, 1963, instead of April 16, 1963, takes into account the previously enacted 90-day extension and makes the termination date coincide with the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9308 pertains to the tariff status applicable to crude and ground chicory. The House-passed version of this legislation would have continued until the close of April 16, 1963, the suspension of duty on crude chicory—not including endive—and would have continued for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents per pound on ground chicory or chicory that is otherwise prepared. The Senate has amended the House-passed bill so that the suspension and reduction with respect to the duty would continue until the close of June 30, 1963.

The membership of the House will recall that the Congress has recently approved a continuation of the existing tariff treatment through June 16, 1960. It is appropriate that the House should concur in this Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTIES ON CERTAIN SHOE LATHES AND CASEIN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreed votes of the two Houses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

## INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCHARGES OF INDEBTEDNESS OF RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11405) to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205), commenced before January 1, 1960, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 108(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) RAILROAD CORPORATIONS.—No amount shall be included in gross income by reason of the discharge, cancellation, or modification, in whole or in part, within the taxable year, of any indebtedness of a railroad corporation, as defined in section 77(m) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205(m)), if such discharge, cancellation, or modification is effected pursuant to an order of a court—

"(A) in a receivership proceeding, or

"(B) in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act,

commenced before January 1, 1960. In such cases, the amount of any income of the taxpayer attributable to any unamortized premium (computed as of the first day of the taxable year in which such discharge occurred with respect to such indebtedness shall not be included in gross income, and the amount of the deduction attributable to any unamortized discount (computed as of the first day of the taxable year in which such discharge occurred) with respect to such indebtedness shall not be allowed as a deduction. Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to any discharge of indebtedness to which this subsection applies."

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1959, but only with respect to discharges occurring after such date.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That" insert: "(a)".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "occurred" and insert: "occurred)".

Page 2, strike out lines 20 through 23, and insert:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1959, but only with respect to discharges occurring after such date.

"SEC. 2. Section 97 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 (26 U.S.C., sec. 162 note; 72 Stat. 1672), relating to deductibility of accrued vacation pay, is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1961,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963,'."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 11405 makes two changes in existing law. Both of these changes relate to the continuation of provisions which previously have been in effect.

First, present law provides that the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1958, is not to result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurred as the result of a court order in a receivership proceeding, or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. The bill continues the application of this provision to discharges after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

Second, Congress in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 provided that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1961, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees. The bill extends this same treatment to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to the provisions of this bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 11405, makes two changes in existing law, both of which relate to the continuation of provisions which previously have been in effect.

The first of these changes pertains to the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation and would provide that such a discharge will not result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurs after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

The second change pertains to the allowed deduction for accrued vacation pay and extends the present treatment to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this legislation to the House and it is appropriate that the House should have given the bill its approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11748) to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961": *Provided,* That this Act shall not apply to lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap, or to any form of tungsten scrap, tungsten carbide scrap, or tungsten alloy scrap; or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, or to articles of tungsten, tungsten carbide, or tungsten alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting.

SEC. 2. This Act shall not apply to any article provided for in section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11748, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, is to continue for 1 year, from the close of June 30, 1960, to the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap. Under the bill, the proviso of existing law that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap, or to any form of tungsten scrap, tungsten carbide scrap, or tungsten alloy scrap, or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, or to articles of tungsten, tungsten carbide, or tungsten alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting, would be retained. The bill also continues the existing provision that the suspension shall not apply to any article provided for in section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles of which copper is a component material.

Favorable reports were received on this legislation from the Departments of the Treasury, State, Interior, Defense, Commerce, and Labor, and from the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11748, which was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, provides for the continuation to July 1, 1961, of the suspension of duties on certain metal scrap. During its consideration of this legislation the committee received no indication of any opposition to the bill. Favorable departmental re-

ports were received from Treasury, State, Interior, Defense, Commerce, and Labor. A favorable report was also received from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and an informative report was received from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the committee chairman in urging the House approval of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the authors of the various bills, if they so desire, and I, have permission to extend our remarks in connection with the Senate amendments and also the bills that were passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## BENT'S OLD FORT NEAR LA JUNTA, COLO.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6851, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a comparatively small bill. It is true that it does have for its purpose the authorizing of a small historical site in the southeastern part of Colorado. I shall ask my colleague, the gentleman from the southeastern district of Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], to explain the bill in detail.

Mr. Chairman, Bent's Old Fort, which is the subject matter of this legislation, was one of the great centers of fur trading during the height of its activity in the Rocky Mountains. It played a unique part in pioneer settlement of the Southwest. The Board, established by act of Congress, to advise on national parks, historic sites, buildings, and monuments, has stated that Bent's Old Fort has exceptional value to commemorate and illustrate the history of the country.

The State of Colorado at present owns 5 acres of land containing the actual site of the fort. This land is administered by the State Historical Society. This small area, however, is inadequate to conserve the historic setting and allow proper interpretation of the fort to the visiting public.

H.R. 6851 directs the Department of the Interior to establish Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site. This is not an expensive project. Land acquisition cost is estimated at $46,240. The 5-acre tract owned by the State, it is understood, will be donated.

An excellent report of the National Park Service demonstrating the suitability of this site for addition to the national park system is in the committee file and I welcome any of my colleagues to examine it.

A brief history of Bent's Old Fort starts with the year 1821, the year in which Mexico became independent from Spain. American merchants opened trade relations at Santa Fe in what is now New Mexico. In 1829, Charles and William Bent, fur traders, entered business at Santa Fe. In 1833–34, the St. Vrain Co. completed Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River as a center of operations for both the business of the Santa Fe Trail and the Indian trade. In 1836, the fort served as the base of operations for John Fremont's third expedition and the fort became headquarters for the Upper Platte and Arkansas Indian Agency. After serving as a depot for U.S. Army supplies during the Mexican War, the old fort was abandoned in 1849. Reopened in 1861, it served as a stage station for the Barlow-Sanderson Overland Stage, Mail, & Express Co.

In 1926, a 5-acre site was acquired by the Daughters of the American Revolution of La Junta, Colo. Then in 1924, the State historical society acquired the site and subsequently partially excavated the remains of the old buildings.

Located on State Highway 194, just off U.S. Highway 50, I am sure that the old fort, as it is proposed to be restored, will be a very popular and instructive attraction. I urge adoption of the bill with the committee amendments.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his very fine presentation and excellent statement on this bill, which authorizes the establishment of Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site. I am happy to be the author of this bill and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the House.

This site at Bent's Old Fort is located, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] mentioned, in the southeastern part of Colorado, in Otero County, on the Arkansas River between La Junta and Las Animas.

I feel that Bent's Fort has national significance and should be designated as a national historic site. This fort was located on the old Santa Fe Trail which extended from St. Joseph, Mo., to Santa Fe, N. Mex., and played such an important part in the development of our great Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, there is a favorable report on this bill from the Department of the Interior. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments has approved Bent's Old Fort for designation as a national historic site and has indicated that it has "exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States."

I would like to state to the committee that there has been a great deal of interest in the preservation of Bent's Old Fort which played such a prominent part in the development of Colorado and the entire Southwest. Several books have been written about the fort, as well as numerous articles, reports, and accounts.

In 1953 the Daughters of the American Revolution presented a deed to this property to the State Historical Society of Colorado. This site comprises 5.07 acres. The State historical society has been most diligent in its efforts to obtain recognition of Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site.

The schoolchildren of Bent and Otero Counties helped raise funds to restore the fort, as did chambers of commerce and other organizations. Some restoration work has been done under the direction of Dr. Herbert W. Dick, archeologist of the Trinidad State Junior College, at Trinidad, Colo. A plan was worked out by Dr. Dick under which certain excavations of the fort's foundations were made, and some of the walls restored to a small extent.

Bent's Fort was truly a most important landmark of the old West. It served the hardy pioneers who blazed the trail and settled southern Colorado and New Mexico.

The fort was first constructed by Charles and William Bent, and Ceran St. Vrain about 1833. The dimensions were 100 by 150 feet. The walls were 17 feet high, 2 feet or more thick, and constructed of adobe bricks. The fort contained a corral for cattle, sheep, and horses, and there was room for the large freight wagons which transported supplies over the Santa Fe Trail.

The fort became the center of the fur trade in the Southwest. It served as protection from the different Indian tribes, some of whom were hostile and unfriendly, and who presented a constant threat to the safety of the traveler.

This trading post served as the principal outpost of civilization of the Southwest. It was the rendezvous of famous scouts, trappers, and traders, such as Kit Carson, Thomas Boggs, James Beckwourth, John Smith, Bill Williams, Lucien Maxwell, and "Uncle Dick" Wootton. It was the principal point of contact in the region for the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Comanche, Kiowa, Prairie Apache, Ute, and other Indian tribes, who came to the fort to trade. Both the Army and the Indian Service used this fort in dealing with the different tribes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation. It so happens that I started the practice of law near Bent's Old Fort, and have

been at the site on many, many occasions. Southeastern Colorado at one time was all Bent County, named after the people who came as traders with the Indians on the Santa Fe Trail. The fort was near the Arkansas River and at the point the trail turned off across the mountains to Santa Fe, N. Mex. These traders and the Indians were together for many years. This fort was the meeting place for all southeast Colorado. The fort itself was destroyed by the progress of civilization, but the people there recognized that this historical site should be preserved.

I commend the gentleman for introducing the legislation, and I am hopeful we can adopt it here this afternoon.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. The first time I ever met the gentleman was in Las Animas where he was a prominent lawyer. Las Animas is the county seat of Bent County, which was named for William Bent, who along with his brother, Charles, and Ceran St. Vrain, constructed and operated Bent's Fort.

Mr. Chairman, mention was made by Mr. ASPINALL that some additional land must be acquired in order to properly protect this site. The Park Service has indicated that additional land will be necessary in order to develop and preserve this site. I hasten to state that I know of no one who is interested in this project for the purpose of making any profit out of the same. The land which is under question is owned by a Mr. Baldridge, who operates a farm and lives close to the site. He has been acting as caretaker for the fort property for the State Historical Society. This 5 acres of land includes a road from the highway to the site which passes through his land. It is important to obtain this additional land in order that the site may be properly protected and preserved. Part of the land surrounding this site is irrigated land. Some of it is pasture land and some is submarginal. I have not talked to Mr. Baldridge, the owner of the land. I do not know that the land has even been appraised. However, I am informed by the Colorado State Historical Society that Mr. Baldridge has no desire or intention of trying to profit from the sale of this land. He is interested in Bent's Old Fort, and I am sure that a satisfactory price can be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $46,200 has been mentioned as the maximum amount that might be spent for additional land as recommended by the Park Service. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have reason to believe that it may be possible that this land may be made available to the Federal Government without any cost to the Park Service. After this bill is passed—and I sincerely hope it will be approved, I can assure the committee that I shall personally make every effort to get this land donated. I have been reliably informed there are those who are interested in the development of our national park system who may be willing to make this land available without cost to the Federal Government. I want to make it absolutely clear that this is not a situation where the owner of the land is trying to dispose of his land at a big profit. I can assure the committee that I shall do everything within my power to cooperate in getting this land without any cost to the Government. I have good reason to believe that this may be possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman support an amendment to strike section 3, which authorizes Federal funds, from the bill?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will state to my friend from Iowa, that I cannot support an amendment. Some money will have to be spent in developing and operating this site. I am trying to make it clear that I shall do what I can to have the additional land made available to the Federal Government without cost. But, we must pass this bill and get the fort designated as a national historic site before anything can be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, section 3 applies only to the authorization of funds. It does not have anything to do with the rest of the bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. We will need some funds, as I have mentioned. We may not be able to get all of this land without cost, although I hope we can, The Park Service would have to do what is ordinarily done in connection with historic sites. There will be some buildings, some markers, and other necessary expenses, I will say to the gentleman. I am talking about the acquisition of this additional land which the Park Service will need. I do not know how much they will require. Perhaps they will not need as much as they have indicated, but in any event, as the author of this bill, and one very much interested in preserving Bent's Old Fort as an historic site, I am just as much interested in saving money for the Federal Government as is the gentleman from Iowa or any other Member of the House. I am certainly going to use every influence I have to make certain that this land will be made available without expense to the Government. I am encouraged to believe this can be done. There will be some expense of operation and maintenance which is true of any historic site.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take more time of the committee. I hope I have made it crystal clear that this is a project which is of great importance to us in southeast Colorado. For the 15 years of its active existence Bent's Old Fort stood alone in the vast southwestern plains as the center of a fur and Indian trading empire, as a vital factor in the relations between the red man and the white man, as the only reliable way station on the long Santa Fe Trail. It was a symbol of the great influence of William and Charles Bent and Ceran St. Vrain in promoting good relations and trade with New Mexico, and a rendezvous point for explorers and military expeditions in the Southwest.

I might state that the wagon trains from Bent's Fort made trips to the Texas Panhandle, and up into Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, and the Black Hills of South Dakota. This gives some idea of the vast area served by Bent's Fort and the influence exerted by the Bents and St. Vrain, as well as the importance of Bent's Old Fort.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be passed. There is no controversy in Colorado over this proposed legislation, but on the contrary a great deal of interest in this project.

I will greatly appreciate your support of this bill and I urge the Members of the House to vote for this measure.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this legislation was carefully considered in hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of which I am chairman.

The distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], the author of the bill, who just preceded me, has explained the bill in his usual able manner. He has conscientiously worked for passage of this measure since May of last year when he introduced the bill. The gentleman presented a very strong case in favor of the adoption of his bill when he appeared before the subcommittee to explain the merits of the legislation. I wish to commend the gentleman for his persistence and for the excellent presentation he made to the subcommittee, as well as the thorough explanation he gave for the benefit of Members on the floor today.

Establishment of this historic site has been requested by the Colorado Historical Society and other groups in the State of Colorado. There is no known opposition.

The Department of the Interior recommends enactment of this bill, based upon a thorough study by its experts, and the favorable recommendation from the advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

This site is of special importance in portraying the story of the Santa Fe Trail, the administration of Indian matters, and the events as the civilian population traveled back and forth from middle western settlements to Rocky Mountain areas. Bent's Old Fort stands out above all other spots in southwestern history during this period.

The site of Bent's Old Fort is on the banks of the Arkansas River each of La Junta, Colo. At present, almost all of the historic remains of the old fort are underground. The lands in the vicinity of the site, except for the 5 acres owned by the State of Colorado, are included in what is now farm property. The property owner has expressed no opposition to the purchase of some 165 acres of land as proposed by the bill.

The committee has a copy of the account of the excavation at Bent's Fort in 1954. This project, under the volunteer labor of students at Trinidad State Junior College, of Trinidad, Colo., was fully successful in outlining the foundations of the old fort building. The excavation has confirmed the many available eyewitness accounts of the build-

ing and its use as the principal outpost in the Southwestern Plains and the only one on the famous Santa Fe Trail.

The land proposed for acquisition is believed to be the minimum necessary to provide a setting for the site and take care of access, parking, and administrative facilities.

I hope the House will act favorably on the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the gentle lady, who is the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, for her diligence in bringing this matter before the House and for her consideration of many other similar matters that are so vital to the preservation of the great history of this Nation of ours.

Mrs. PFOST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some questions about what is going to happen if we pass this bill. I address these questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, some member of the subcommittee, or, perhaps, the author of the bill. What is this going to cost if the Federal Government makes this a national site? What will be the cost in the future?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that there will have to be a building erected, as the Park Service always does on these historic sites. I cannot tell the gentleman the exact amount. I think it will be a very nominal sum.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea how many thousand dollars a year it will take to manage this place?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It will be a very small amount, but I would just be speculating if I mentioned any specific amount. I should say perhaps $10,000 a year, but that is just pure speculation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what is meant by a small amount.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I have mentioned $10,000 a year. I do not think the cost of operation would vary too much from this figure.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any other member of the committee who can shed any light on that? Let us assume we make a national site out of this. The Federal Government takes it over and then in perpetuity the taxpayers' money is going to be spent on this enterprise, to manage it. I would like to have some idea what this sort of thing costs.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This is no different than any other historic sites which we have authorized in the Congress, and which are now being enjoyed by the American people. I can assure the gentleman this historic site will be an attraction to the many tourists and to all who visit this area. I am sure they will be happy that this historic landmark has been preserved.

Mr. GROSS. But it is still going to be a burden upon the taxpayers of the entire country; is that not correct? I am not trying to single out this particular project, but I am thinking in terms of the other projects that we have and those that are yet to come. I think the House of Representatives ought to stop, look, and listen when it comes to taking over these so-called historic sites and putting the management of these sites in the hands of the Federal Government. I would like to have some idea of what a thing like this is going to cost in perpetuity, or even some idea what it is going to cost for a year or 5 years. Another question: Will this necessitate the building of a road or is there a road there already? What is this going to require?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. There is no highway contemplated. There might be a little lane from the highway into the old fort.

Mr. GROSS. There is a lane there now?

Mr. ASPINALL. A little lane in but no road as such.

Mr. GROSS. Then a road will have to be built.

Mr. ASPINALL. As far as the expenditures are concerned, if my friend will permit me to say, the way this bill is worded and the way the legislation is worded, the Committee on Appropriations of the House will have absolute control over any road improvements. It so happens that we are spending throughout the United States Federal moneys to go ahead and develop like areas. We are charging admission fees to get into most of those areas. Moneys collected as admission fees come back to the Treasury of the United States. The Congress has already gone along with what is known as Mission 66 of the Park Service, and many of the areas of importance to the traveling and visiting public have been improved. I would say that never in the history of any country, and especially so in our history, has the public ever demanded, as they are demanding today, the improvement and development of historic sites and recreation areas, areas with natural phenomena and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and the House only a few moments ago spoke very decisively, did it not, by refusing to even consider legislation dealing with the expansion of a national park.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, and I think if the gentleman will permit me to continue further, I understand what happened to the bill this afternoon. There is much more to the history of that bill than came out on the floor today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, go ahead, but just do not take all of my time to make a speech in favor of this bill because I want some time to oppose it.

Mr. ASPINALL. My colleague did not ask me about this bill. My colleague asked me if I knew what took place this afternoon, and I was trying to answer him. The legislation on which we worked this afternoon has a long history.

Mr. GROSS. And so does Bent's Old Fort have a long history.

Mr. ASPINALL. And if I were to say what took place this afternoon, I would say that a part of our trouble arose because of the manner in which a part of our local treated the matter.

Mr. GROSS. I recall that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN, the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that provides money for these projects, came into the well of the House and vigorously and effectively opposed that project earlier this afternoon saying he would be confronted, as with this project, appropriating money from now to doomsday. But let me ask this question: Why does not the State of Colorado operate this?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The State is not in a position to operate such a project.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the State of Colorado go ahead and operate Bent's Old Fort?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is felt that this site is of such historic value that it should be designated a national historic site. I personally feel it deserves this recognition.

Mr. GROSS. I am asking why the State of Colorado does not go ahead and operate Bent's Old Fort, charge admission fees and administer this project?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know if there will be any admission fees charged in the future, but this may be possible. But the State of Colorado does not operate historic sites like this. This site belongs in the National Park Service.

Mr. GROSS. The State historical society is presently managing this old fort, is it not?

Mr. CHENOWETH. They own it, yes; and employ a caretaker.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the State of Colorado go ahead and operate this site?

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to answer the question. The gentleman was a Member of the House when we passed an act which called for acquiring national historical sites and buildings. As a result of the findings of that group, authorized by this Congress, they reported that Bent's Old Fort was one that should be a national historical site. As a result of that, this legislation was introduced. So it is here because the national agency which Congress created has recommended that it be made a national historical monument.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman favor all recommendations that are made in every survey that is authorized by Congress?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not. The people who represent the State of Colorado first introduced this bill to carry out the recommendation. After full and complete hearings before our committee, this bill is before the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not want the gentleman to get the impression that the Colorado State Historical Society is going to give up all interest in Bent's Fort, because it is not. The society will continue to cooperate in every way possible.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but the real cooperation will come from the taxpayers all over the country if this bill is passed.

May I ask the gentleman this question: You want 170 acres of additional land and you are asking $46,240 for land acquisition?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I mentioned three types of land. Some irrigated land, some pastureland, and some submarginal land.

Mr. GROSS. How much is irrigated?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think about 54 acres; 48 acres are pastureland and about 48 acres are submarginal land. It is pretty well divided.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think $290 an acre is a pretty good price for that type of land?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Three hundred dollars an acre for irrigated land in this area is not an excessive amount.

Mr. GROSS. This is not all irrigated land.

Mr. CHENOWETH. No. I can assure the gentleman that regular prices will be paid for this land. This site is located just off of State Highway No. 194. The access road is there, but will of course have to be improved. The building of a new road is not involved.

Mr. GROSS. Who owns the 5.8 acres?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The Colorado State Historical Society.

Mr. GROSS. Is that society an official part of the State of Colorado?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The State historical society is by statute an educational institution of the State of Colorado.

Mr. GROSS. Is that the State?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It could be considered a part of the State of Colorado. It solicits members who pay annual dues, and reports are made to the Governor.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not the State of Colorado acquire this land?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That might be possible. The State might be able to help in the purchase of this land, if that should become necessary. However, I have information, as I said a moment ago, that leads me to believe that we can get this land donated and without any expense to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not want support from the Government? I will agree to support his bill if he will take out section 3.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman knows Federal funds will be necessary in the operation and maintenance of this site.

Mr. GROSS. That is why you want this bill. You want the Federal Government to take this deal over.

Mr. CHENOWETH. We want to preserve this national historic site.

Mr. GROSS. You want the Federal Government to take over the financial responsibility and I am opposed to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new fight. I have some bruises as the result of an earlier fight, which was the same fight as this. If the Congress has come to the conclusion that the national park system is against the national interest, and the saving of money is more important than having a system of parks and monuments that commemorate the history of our country, then I have a proposition for the House. Perhaps the greatest wonder of this country is the Grand Canyon. If it is the taxpayers that we are so completely concerned about, I am sure that if we put this park on the open market we could get half a billion, or a billion dollars for it. This seems to be the direction we are sliding in.

I think we ought to look it squarely in the face. This is a little bill; it is not going to involve any great expenditure. I support it. I think it is soundly conceived. I think the park system itself is one of the glories of our country. I think if we ever reach the day when we cannot lend support to our national park system, when we are not willing to expand it, or to spend a little money on it, it will be a shame. I am a spender when it comes to parks; I am a spender when it comes to schools, and I am very shameless about it, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa. I will go along with the bill because I think this is the kind of thing that makes America glorious.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national historic site at the site of Bent's Old Fort on the Old Santa Fe Trail, located in Otero County, Colorado, approximately seven miles east of La Junta, north of the Arkansas River.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any", and insert in lieu thereof "such lands, interests therein and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by such fort in the opening of the West. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill H.R. 6851 and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo., had come to no resolution thereon.

---

## ADDING CERTAIN LANDS TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8226, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is limited to 1 hour. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, which is the subject of this legislation, was established in 1924. Two small tracts of land, proposed to be acquired, will enhance the setting of the monument and will provide parking for visitors. It will also make possible the relocation of an inadequate existing street and permit restoration of part of the grounds.

In 1958 the Department of the Interior entered into an arrangement with Florida State officials and officials of the county and the city of St. Augustine to overcome traffic problems at the site. The arrangement makes it possible for the State and local agencies to proceed with an improvement program for the streets and for part of the bayfront property. Enactment of H.R. 8226 will permit acquisition of property standing in the way of this commendable development.

This small acreage of land—less than 3 acres—unfortunately is quite expensive. This land is in the heart of the city of St. Augustine, part of which is occupied by an old hotel and other buildings. The cost of acquiring the parcels of land is estimated at $606,000. The alternatives have been explored and no other feasible alternative has been offered.

Enactment of H.R. 8226 will allow the Government to carry out its obligation, as owner of the monument grounds, in achieving a solution to the present highway bottleneck. At the same time, the usefulness of the monument will be increased and the attractiveness to tourists will be improved.

We are dealing here with one of the most important historic sites in southeastern United States. It attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors from all parts of the country. The visitations in 1959 exceeded 450,000 persons. The admittance fees to the monument, together with income to the Treasury from concessions, in 1959 exceeded $66,000.

Enactment of this measure has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and amendments have been suggested. These amendments have been adopted by the committee. I recommend favorable consideration of the measure.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, many of you who have visited St. Augustine recently will realize that traffic congestion, in the area of our historic monument in that city, is probably as bad as anywhere in the State of Florida. To relieve the traffic congestion, it has been suggested by our Park Service that a tract of land in the immediate vicinity of the monument be acquired, in order to make it possible for the tremendous number of visitors who are coming to that area to find places to park and to visit our national monument.

Now, as is always customary when the Federal Government or any State or local agency acquires a tract of land in a concentrated metropolitan area, the price is high. The owners do not like to part with their property, but in the service to many the rights of a few must be subjugated, and that is the situation that the committee finds itself in today.

There are several owners of the tract of land which is involved, and it is necessary for the Federal Government, if they expect to continue to have adequate use of our facilities at St. Augustine, to acquire the additional tract of land.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, following the statement of our chairman, that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs differs a great deal from some of the other standing committees of the House in that they meet and have sessions 5 days a week, every week that the House is in session. It is necessary, because over the years the history of this Congress and other Congresses will show that this commiteee turns out between 20 and 25 percent of all of the legislation that is passed by any Congress—with the exception of private bills coming from the Committee on the Judiciary—handling such myriad of phases as Indian affairs, territories, and insular possessions, mines and mining, public domain—which includes all of our national parks which were created out of the public domain—and irrigation and reclamation. The work of this committee is tremendous. And, I want to say that in the years that I have been a member of this committee, all of the chairmen from both parties are to be commended for the fact that if a member from any area of the country introduced a bill which affected his district, there has always been a conscientious effort by the chairman and the subchairmen, as well as the members of the committee, to see that the bills are given a hearing, that reports are received from the departments downtown, and that the matter is brought to the floor of the House. And, it is the purpose of this committee to see to it that legislation is presented and that the House work its will.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that every bill that our committee has reported to the House for consideration has met all of the criteria under which we operate?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. And when legislation is brought up here, if the Members of the House are not in accord, that is the time for them to express their position.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is the time. If it does not meet with their approval, that is the time for the House to work its will, and that is an example of the legislative process that our committee, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, gives to the House in order to prove that it is a real democratic organization and that it has a chance to work its will.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, this bill simply implements an agreement made by the city commissioners of the city of St. Augustine, the county commissioners of St. Johns County, and the Florida State Road Department, with the Department of the Interior. It covers the acquisition of slightly less than 3 acres of land adjacent to the fort which is the historical feature of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

The purpose of this agreement, and of the land acquisition, is to permit the restoration of certain historic areas of the fort grounds and to facilitate traffic and parking conditions for the people from all over the country who visit the fort each year.

In addition to furthering the Mission 66 program, these improvements will make an important contribution to a forthcoming event which is of the greatest historical significance to every American. In 1965 will be celebrated the 400th anniversary of the founding of beautiful St. Augustine, the oldest city in the United States. It is highly desirable that H.R. 8226 be enacted so that the restoration and improvements can be completed by that year, when it is estimated that many times the number of visitors to the Castillo de San Marcos, now running nearly half a million a year, will make the pilgrimage to the lovely and historic city of St. Augustine.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be approved.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members of the House that this is one of the very few bills where the State of Florida is asking that a historical monument and park be set aside. Usually the State has acquired these lands itself. For instance, with reference to the Everglades National Park, we acquired the land necessary to establish that park and turned it over free and clear to the Federal Government. This is one instance where the economic situation of the city itself does not permit that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should like to address a question to the gentleman in charge of the bill. Approximately how much longer will consideration be given to this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I should expect about 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat one thing that has been pointed out and that is that the income from this monument by way of admissions and concessions runs about $66,000 a year to the Federal Government. That is more money than it takes to operate the facility. So this is one national monument that pays a profit to the Federal Government.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this legislation—H.R. 8226—provides for the acquisition of two small parcels of land to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument at a cost of $606,000. The author of this bill, the gentleman from Florida, has been industrious in his efforts to get favorable consideration of this measure. He made a very able presentation before our subcommittee in explaining his bill.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Lands made it clear that there is at present no parking space of any kind at the fort, and heavy traffic is causing a serious problem.

One of the properties to be acquired is now occupied by an old hotel. This building, of frame construction, some 75 years old, is presently for sale and can be acquired at this time with the consent of the owner. It is the site value of the real estate, rather than the value added by the building itself, that gives this property a rather high value.

The highway that runs past the monument is U.S. Highway No. 1. There is a highway bypass to avoid traffic

congestion in the city of St. Augustine, but there is still a great deal of heavy traffic going past the monument.

The Board of County Commissioners of St. Johns County and the City Commission of St. Augustine have adopted resolutions favoring the actions proposed to be taken through this legislation.

As a part of its obligation, as a landowner in the city of St. Augustine, the Federal Government, as recommended by the Department of the Interior, has an obligation to correct the situation, and I therefore recommend that the measure be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure in such manner as he may deem to be in the public interest, including procurement with funds which may be appropriated therefor, the following described lands, or interests therein, situated in the city of Saint Augustine, Saint Johns County, Florida, for addition to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument:

AREA A

Starting at a point in the seawall of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, which is the southeast corner of the present Federal reservation; thence westerly 81.86 feet, more or less, along the existing boundary of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument to the intersection of said line with the west right-of-way line of Bay Street, the point of beginning;

Thence southerly along the west right-of-way line of Bay Street 143.5 feet, more or less, to the intersection of said right-of-way line with the north right-of-way line of Cuna Street which is the southeast corner of block 1; thence westerly 194.0 feet, more or less, along the north right-of-way line of Cuna Street to the intersection of said right-of-way line with the easterly right-of-way line of Charlotte Street, which is the southwest corner of block 1;

Thence northerly along the east right-of-way line of Herrea Way 25.0 feet, more or less, to a point where said right-of-way line is intersected by a prolongation of the northerly right-of-way line of Cuna Street;

Thence westerly across Charlotte Street to the northwest corner of Charlotte and Cuna Streets, which is the southeast corner of block 7;

Thence northerly along the west right-of-way line of Charlotte Street 57.0 feet; more or less, to a point;

Thence northwesterly 28.3 feet, more or less, to a point located 20 feet west from the west right-of-way line of Charlotte Street on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mrs. J. C. Windsor, being lots 13 and 14, block 7;

Thence westerly along the said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mrs. J. C. Windsor 149.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Blanche L. Serveau, being lot 10, block 7;

Thence northerly 88.5 feet, more or less, along said easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Blanche L. Serveau to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck, being lot 18, block 7;

Thence westerly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck 125.5 feet, more or less, to the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Colonial St. Augustine, Inc., being lot 5, block 7;

Thence northerly along said property line of land now or formerly owned by Colonial St. Augustine, Inc., 42.0 feet, more or less, to the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Frank Upchurch, being lot 4, block 7;

Thence easterly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Frank Upchurch, 50.0 feet, more or less, to the westerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck;

Thence northerly along said property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck and along said property line prolonged 149.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by F. Victor Rahner, fragment of lot 1, block 7;

Thence westerly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by F. Victor Rahner 40.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by the R. L. Parks estate, portion of lot 1, block 7;

Thence northerly along said easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by the R. L. Parks estate 95.0 feet, more or less, to the intersection of said property line with the southerly right-of-way line of Fort Alley which point is the northeast corner of lot 1, block 7, and the northwest corner of lot 21, block 7;

Thence northerly on a prolongation of said right-of-way line 14.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the north right-of-way line of Fort Alley;

Thence westerly 5.0 feet, more or less, to the point on said right-of-way line which is the southwest corner of lot 5, block 6, and the southeast corner of lot 4, block 6;

Thence northerly 148.0 feet, more or less, along the lot line which is common to lot 5, block 6, and lots 2 and 4, block 6, and said line prolonged to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by the Gulf Oil Company;

Thence westerly along the southerly line of said land now or formerly owned by the Gulf Oil Company and its prolongation to a point 60 feet eastward of the easterly right-of-way line of Saint George Street;

Thence northerly along a line parallel to and 60 feet eastward of the said easterly right-of-way line of Saint George Street a distance of 95.0 feet, more or less, to a point in the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument;

Thence easterly along the said present boundary of the monument a distance of 107.98 feet to a marble cornerstone, being the northeast corner of said block 6; thence continuing along the said present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in a general easterly and southeasterly direction to the point of beginning, containing in all about 2.45 acres of land.

AREA B

Beginning at a corner in the existing boundary of the present Castillo de San Marcos National Monument which is the northeasterly corner of Orange Street located about 20.0 feet west of the city gates;

Thence westerly along the northerly right-of-way line of Orange Street, which also is the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, a distance of about 180.0 feet to a point 2.0 feet east of the east wall of the school dental clinic building;

Thence in a northerly direction on a line parallel to and 2.0 feet east of said building wall a distance of 75.0 feet, more or less, to a point in the north boundary of the historic "Lines";

Thence easterly 180.0 feet, more or less, to a westerly corner of the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument lying northwest of the city gates;

Thence southerly along the present boundary of the national monument 75.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning; containing in all an area of about 0.31 acre of land.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 25, strike out the words "feet, more or less, to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "feet to".

Page 3, line 9, strike out the word "Serveau," and insert in lieu thereof "Cerveau,".

Page 3, line 13, strike out the word "Serveau" and insert in lieu thereof "Cerveau".

Page 4, line 21, strike out the word "right-of-way" and insert in lieu thereof "property".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wish, if it is possible, to impart a little information to the gentleman that I just acquired which is to the effect, coming from those in charge of the bill, that the passage of this bill would bring into the Government and not take out certain moneys; did you hear that?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I heard it. But I wonder, if the return is going to be six hundred and some odd thousand dollars? Does the gentleman know that? That is what intrigues me at the moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, as always, I was relying on the gentleman's statement and I will have to continue to do so as much as I dislike to question.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether we are going to recover the $606,000 in Federal funds that the bill provides and as stated in the report is being requested? How long will it take to recapture that—does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I have not. As I said, I was relying on the statement from the other side, and if the gentleman contradicts it, I will have to reserve my opinion, of course.

Mr. GROSS. Let us wait until we get the answer from the gentleman on the other side who, I am sure, knows.

Mr. HERLONG. I will say to the gentleman, I cannot say exactly how long it will take to get the $600,000 back, but this will take in more money than the cost of operation involved. More money will come in by reason of the fact that more people can get there and see this facility, if this other area is taken care of. I will say to the gentleman, if he does not think that the preservation of this monument, the oldest of its kind and the best example of a medevial fort in the United States in the oldest city in the United States, is not worth something, then I recommend that the gentleman vote against the bill and do so enthusiastically. On the other hand, I believe that it is worth something and that is why I am in favor of it.

Mr. GROSS. There is no danger of losing this historic site at St. Augustine. If this bill is not enacted, it will still be there; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. St. Augustine will still be there, but in not nearly as good shape as it would be if this is taken care of.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; this adds to, but it does not take from; is that not correct? The failure to enact this bill would not destroy the historic site that is presently there. It would still be there. In other words, this would add to it and, perhaps, a little more; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HERLONG. What we are trying to do is to fix it so that more people can see it and take advantage of it. That is exactly the purpose, and I think this bill would accomplish that purpose. I do not think there is any question about it. I do not believe the gentleman would deny that.

Mr. GROSS. No, I have been pondering this afternoon how I could promote some project out in my district and get some Federal money. Can the gentleman from Michigan suggest some way that I can get a historic site in my district?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am very happy indeed to know that the gentleman is consistent and that he is trying now to make an effort to save the country a little money. Yes; you can help me get a monument at St. Ignace. Father Marquette is buried there. If you want to go along with that, we can save there. Or you can get the lock at Sault Ste. Marie changed from Blatnik to Vic Knox. I do not know why they ever named the locks after Blatnik of Minnesota. He did not have anything to do with it. Or you could name the bridge across the straits Knox.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was recognized for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. To help the gentleman out, I understand Mr. Benson made a speech in Iowa one time.

Mr. GROSS. Please do not bring that up.

Mr. HAYS. That was a good thing for the Democratic Party. I would be glad to help build a monument to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) When title to the lands, or interests therein, described in the first section of this Act is acquired by the Secretary of the Interior, such lands or interests so acquired shall become a part of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

(b) All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument shall be applicable with respect to such lands or interests acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill H.R. 8226 and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

## FALSE CONFIDENCE IN FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must face the fact that the experiment of insuring the public's savings, through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, has proven a failure under the present management. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is riding on the coattail of Government to give the public confidence, a false confidence, under its present management.

Over its 25 years of operation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has only about $305 million reserves to insure over $50 billion of savings. Of this $305 million, the Insurance Corporation has committed over 25 percent to cover a false emergency created by its own unwarranted acts, leaving three-quarters of its assets to protect the remaining nearly 4,000 savings and loan associations. Its own reserves at the most are less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the amounts insured.

A select committee of Congress in a prior investigation of the Federal Insurance Corporation stated:

> The action here complained of was not only a disservice to the Government, but a greater disservice to the people for the protection of whose rights and affairs our Government exists. Should the time come when our Government is incapable of discharging that fundamental function, it must cease to exist in the form and for the purpose for which the Government is identified. The necessity for unquestioned rectitude of purpose, and sound, just, and impartial administration of governmental endeavor is paramount.

Over its years of operation, there has been a continuous pressure and grasping for more and more power from this agency. Its ultimate aim appears to be to seize and confiscate the peoples' wealth, under police powers, without the right of the aggrieved to redress. This bureaucratic insurance agency, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, claims it is above and beyond the courts, it is a law unto itself.

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], Republican, in the April 28, 1960, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reported there is "the invisible and faceless bureaucracy operating through boards, bureaus, and commissions, so that our citizens are governed by people they have never seen, never voted for, cannot recall through any process of law, and who administer more administrative law than statute law." Mr. UTT's statement seems to fit the operations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Two major congressional investigations have attempted to ferret out its fallacies. The Special Select Committee of the House of Representatives, headed by the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, found the acts of the Home Loan Bank Board, the alter ego of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, to be vindictive, capricious, and a disservice to the public because of its acts of seizing the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association in 1946, as a retaliatory plenary penalty.

The Long Beach Association shareholders sued for the recovery of their property. The Insurance Corporation evaded its liabilities by asserting it was beyond the law. It asserted that there was no designated agent upon whom valid service could be made, that it could pick and choose at its own whims which claims it would accept or reject.

By 1949 the shareholders were vigorously pressing to procure an accounting for multimillion dollars of property seized by this Government bureau and never returned. The Home Loan Bank Board and its alter ego, Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, responded by attempting to again reseize the Long Beach Association for liquidation. A special committee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives under the chairmanship of the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, commenced investigation of the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its various alter egos.

A Deputy Attorney General was placed on the witness stand before this second congressional committee in 1951, and admitted that the so-called charges against the association management upon which the attempted liquidation was to be based were for "horse-trading purposes." An admission that spurious charges were made against the association management to trade the association and its shareholders out of their claim against the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Spurious charges to blackmail our citizens out of multimillions of dollars of their wrongfully seized and confiscated property.

Congress, following such investigations, enacted laws to prevent ever again such disaster happening to our citizens. The Housing Act of 1954 was to be a bill of rights for savings and loan associations. Such 1954 act set up an orderly judicial procedure to settle bona fide disputes between supervisory authority

and the savings associations, and established strict procedure to force the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to designate an agent upon whom court process could be served. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation responded by first attempting to divorce itself from any supervisory control, but Congress refused.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation then responded by attempting to gain summary police powers over all insured associations, both State and Federal, including the rights to control who shall manage each association. Congress again refused.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, then responded by adopting rules and regulations giving itself exclusive police and seizure powers over all Federal savings and loan associations. These self-adopted, self-serving Federal regulations propose to deny the courts the right to intervene while the agents of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, seize, refuse receipts for negotiable assets, confiscate private property, misrepresent and deceive the public, and intimidate our citizens out of their savings.

Mr. Speaker, my investigation shows the latest seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association on April 22, 1960, has proven the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to be guilty of these vicious acts of dishonesty and misconduct.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board adopted a resolution declaring a so-called emergency. A self-declared emergency was necessary even under their own rules to justify summary seizure. An analysis of the resolution with the fact demonstrates it is fraudulent and adopted in language intended to conceal the facts and deceive the people.

For example, the resolution charged the Long Beach association did not pay the premium for insurance of accounts since 1948.

The Home Loan Bank Board had knowledge of and suppressed the evidence that such premiums were paid into the U.S. courts pursuant to law, and that such court payment was necessary, for to have done otherwise might have forfeited the just claims of the association and its shareholders against the Insurance Corporation.

The second charge asserted the association had not purchased stock in the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco as required by law.

Again the Federal Home Loan Bank Board had knowledge of and suppressed the fact that the $800,000 payment for such stock had been deposited in the U.S. court as a legal tender pursuant to law. Such bank board further suppressed the fact that the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco was the recipient of U.S. Government bonds confiscated from the Long Beach association during the first 1946 seizure, and that such bank held a rigged and collusive conversion of such bonds to its own use in violation of law. Litigation is pending for the recovery of nearly $10 million from such bank by the Long Beach association. The other charges specified by the Federal home loan bank to establish an emergency are equally without merit and just as deceiving and misleading to the innocent public.

Armed with a certified copy of a Federal Home Loan Bank Board order, 44 auditors, accountants, examiners, and assorted personnel moved in on the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association, Friday evening, April 22, 1960, with a seizure order. Despite the listing of false charges in the order, the avowed purpose for the seizure was to prevent the shareholders and management of the association from converting it into a State savings and loan association that would be free from the arbitrary and capricious abuse of authority and administration of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and its alter ego the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

In an apparent attempt to justify the seizure of the Long Beach Association, the Home Loan Bank Board sent their spokesman, J. Alston Adams, regional supervisor, to brainwash and mislead the public with statements to the newspapers. Such statements were issued and printed in the press that "we couldn't get an examination in his place—Long Beach Federal—for 6 years up to 1958."

This statement is a deliberate falsehood. Adams, in his official capacity, knew of the numerous and extensive examinations during the years 1953, 1956, and 1957. I have been informed that each of these examinations extended over many weeks or months, one of which lasted 5 months.

Again through the press, Adams in describing the seizure stated:

> It took from 5 minutes to 8 Friday night to 5 a.m. Saturday to issue receipts for everything.

The truth is that at the hearing in Federal court on May 15, 1960, to increase the bond of C. E. Ault, the Board's appointed supervisor, sworn testimony revealed that the association's officers were able to procure receipts numbering less than 10, which covered less than one-half of 1 percent of the assets seized.

I am of the opinion that the refusal of receipts was intentional and brutal, evidenced by the fact that there were eventually an admitted 74 bureaucratic agents swarming over the place, intimidating and hindering association employees from making an inventory by threats of criminal prosecution if they did not leave the premises.

The taking of property without giving a receipt is a violation of law, a violation for which each and every one of these agents should be prosecuted, together with their superiors.

Adams further stated through the press that the line of customers withdrawing their funds "was orderly—nobody got excited." Another falsehood by Adams. The fact is there were over 1,000 people milling about. Long Beach police rushed 15 extra policemen to help set up barricades and rope off a section to contain the crowd. Armed guards were at the doors, letting only two or three in at a time, behind closed doors with drawn blinds. Elderly people were forced to stand in line for 4 and 5 hours. Some fainted, some had heart attacks, ambulances were called.

Approximately $40 million has been withdrawn. Over $700,000 in earnings lost to these elderly people. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate when you consider Mr. Adams in his "other hat" is also president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco. The bank that converted to its own use over $5 million in U.S. Government bearer bonds, which in fact belonged to the Long Beach association.

Litigation for the 1946 seizure had progressed to the point that the San Francisco bank might have to pay some $10 million or more for its frauds. The Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco is an arm of the Home Loan Bank Board, the alter ego for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It seems when one agency cannot get by with illegally confiscating the people's savings, the others rush in to perpetrate the fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the flouting of a congressional subpena by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It was claimed a middle western association was insolvent, and it was seized. The Insurance Corporation admitted making a profit out of the liquidation but would not produce its records to show who did not get paid or the necessity for the liquidation. Congress to this day does not know.

Complaints of the abuse of this agency are mounting from all parts of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this all brings us to the point that Congress has authorized the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to call upon the U.S. Treasurer for $750 million in the event of an emergency. An emergency to be determined by this same group who have exhibited their dishonesty and incompetence and who have flouted Congress and the courts.

Mr. Speaker, Congress would be derelict in its duty if it sits idly by and exposes this huge sum of taxpayers' money to the same type of mishandling through a trumped-up emergency.

Congress appropriated the funds to protect the people. It is our obligation to do so. It is not our intention to be a part of a fraud upon the people.

Is it not possible that private insurers, who do not flout our courts, can do an able and honest job for the public?

Would not this emergency fund be better administered where court review is assured? The record is compelling that Congress withdraw its support from the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which has so flagrantly abused its fiduciary trust, and support private enterprise in the best interests of the public welfare.

## ALFRED H. KIRCHHOFER

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call the attention of the House to an award which has been made to one of Buffalo's distinguished citizens, Mr. Alfred H. Kirchhofer, editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

The board of regents of Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y., conferred its third annual distinguished citizen's achievement award upon Mr. Kirchhofer. The recipients of this award are leaders who, in addition to earning the respect and admiration of their colleagues in their profession or industry, have been outstanding for their personal contributions of time and effort toward the progress and enhancement of their community. They symbolize the vision, drive, comprehension, and resoluteness which have contributed greatly to the progress of America.

Mr. Kirchhofer became managing editor of the Buffalo Evening News in 1927 and editor in 1956. He is executive vice president and a director of the Buffalo Evening News, Inc., and president and a director of WBEN, Inc. In addition, he is a member of the advisory board of the American Press Institute, and also a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors which he headed in 1937. He was president of the American Council on Education for Journalism from 1950 to 1952.

In 1956, Mr. Kirchhofer received the University of Missouri School of Journalism medal for distinguished service in journalism and, 2 years later, a similar award from the Syracuse University School of Journalism. Last year he was elected to the National Journalism Hall of Honor at the University of Missouri.

Mr. Kirchhofer is a member of the State Society of Newspaper Editors and the Syracuse University School of Journalism council of editors and publishers.

Over the years Mr. Kirchhofer has been extremely active in the affairs of our community. He is a director of Crippled Children's Camps, Inc.; secretary of the board of visitors of Roswell Park Memorial Institute; and a director of Millard Fillmore Hospital. He is also a trustee of the Buffalo YMCA; a member of the State Defense Council; a director of the Buffalo and Erie County Tuberculosis Association; the Buffalo chapter, American Red Cross; the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society; and a member of the council of the University of Buffalo.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following commendation delivered by the Very Reverend James J. McGinley, S.J., president of Canisius College:

COMMENDATION

"The Canisius College board of regents with other eminent citizens honors Alfred H. Kirchhofer at dinner and awards to him the Distinguished Citizen's Achievement Plaque, May 9, 1960, the Buffalo Club."

There is a Jesuit university in the heart of a large metropolis whose exterior wall has an inscription:

> "St. Bernard loved the valleys,
> Benedict the hills;
> Francis loved the little towns—
> Ignatius sought great cities
> To house his caps and gowns."

Canisius College is in phase with this 400-year tradition followed by Ignatian institutions of higher learning. It therefore finds itself at the busy intersection of Main and Jefferson, Buffalo, N.Y. It is part of the very fabric of this community, in other words. It breathes the same air, rides the same buses, enjoys talking about the same weather, frets at the same problems, faces the same worries, enjoys the same triumphs, obeys the same traffic lights, and in general has the same hopes and fears as Buffalo. In fact, Canisius College has been doing all of this right here for 90 years—an independent institution for collegiate education.

It is, of course, a college. Education is its business, albeit nonprofit in fact and theory. This means its relation to its community is not that of a remote ivory tower, wherein learning is sought in cloistered and comfortable abstraction from the sounds and the sights of every day living. No; we are not a retreat from things Buffalo. In fact, we are not withdrawn at all—if I may borrow from the psychologists.

On the other hand, an educational institution cannot be a pollster's booth armed only with questionnaires and immersed only in current events, opinions, facts. Socially, intellectually, and ideologically, it cannot go in for that degree of "togetherness" which would efface its own distinct personality as a purveyor of real education. It has to hold for tradition, for the universals, for the timeless and even spaceless judgments and values. It has to preserve, add to and pass on to succeeding generations an intellectual heritage. That heritage, perforce, is an abiding and stable thing, which transcends the current scene in part.

Now somewhere between the ivory tower and the pollster's booth, somewhere between that withdrawal contemplation unreferred to life's framework and that overexhilarated "togetherness" wherein an educational institution loses its raison d'etre, somewhere between the two extremes, is the formula of Canisius College.

Our board of regents knows this philosophy well. They know how keen the college is for civic consciousness, awareness, being part of the community we all love. But they also know that we are awfully serious about right education for the right reasons and the consequent demands in time, energy, and principle.

Similarly, the selection committee of the board of regents of Canisius College is well groomed in this basic philosophy. This committee, in conjunction with the entire board, was commissioned to face up to the task of selecting a distinguished citizen to receive the annual achievement plaque. By mandate of the board of regents, March 24, 1958:

"The gentleman so designated shall have earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in his chosen profession or industry. He shall be accounted as preeminent in his personal contribution of time and effort toward the progress and enhancement of the community with which he is associated."

Now, Mr. Kirchhofer, this committee selected you, unanimoulsy and in the name of the entire board. I cannot pay higher tribute to you. Yet, I do wish to add that I approved their selection, immediately upon receipt of their decision.

The words inscribed on this plaque tell you why, partly but permanently.

Let me add only this. There is an affinity between a good newspaper and a good educational institution. Each must serve but also lead a community, voluntarily. Neither can be true to its commitment and also indulge in the quest for sheer popularity. Both must be open to frank evaluation and criticism daily. Neither can become complacent and stay alive. Each demands concentration by all coworkers and often requires a type of discipline and self-denial which borders on the ascetic. Each must blend the new and the old, the local and the distant. Each must make responsible decisions on what to feature and in what proportions. Above all, each in its area of responsibility must be consistent, truthful, and convinced.

Your achievement in your profession and in this community is very real. The regents of Canisius College tonight single out and award you for your record of achievement, very definitely. And I am pleased wholeheartedly to approve, to applaud, and also to accept an honor which thereby comes to Canisius College herself on this historic night. Since we try to produce excellence, we are surely glad to recognize it.

Thank you and God bless you.

## THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for I minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto on Friday, May 13, 1960, of the area redevelopment bill passed by both Houses of Congress repudiates the people's will for the second time and threatens the healthy adjustment of our community to the changing character of our economy. It represents a conservative position turned reactionary. The President denies American distressed communities in this country the benefits he has urged us to lavish bountifully on other countries. In the name of economy he exhibits callous disregard of the pleas of Americans for help to become self-supporting. The President says his heart bleeds for a point 4 program for the depressed areas of the world but he vetoes a point 4 program for America.

The veto message is a denial of an every claim to statesmanship. The rate of unemployment in this country continues to stand at 5 percent. In my district and many others it stands at 20 percent. This is an intolerably high rate, which the President wants us to accept as normal. We cannot and must not submit to this gloomy prospect and become inured to allow such human suffering.

Those of us who have promoted the area redevelopment legislation have sought to address ourselves to the basic difficulties causing the high volume of long-term unemployment and the great waste of human and capital resources of this country, by converting the specific distressed and underdeveloped areas from stagnant and declining regions into active centers of healthy economic

activity. We hoped to minimize the need for general measures of an emergency nature designed to change our national economic institutions. The constructive course of action is being denied by the President. He fears Federal aid, he insists that communities which are flat on their back should lift themselves by their own bootstraps at a time when they have exhausted their financial resources in the pursuit of local economic development.

This denial of the right to attack specific causes of difficulties will make it necessary for all of us to urge stronger and broader and national measures for the entire economy. We must lower the national level of unemployment and make the recovery movement strong enough to reach even the depressed areas.

The President's criticism of the qualifications for benefits and the funds in the bill are disingenuous. Those of us who have made efforts to negotiate an understanding with the administration know that opposition stems not from disapproval of specific provisions, but from rejection of the entire idea of area redevelopment legislation. Secretary of Commerce Mueller has made it clear to Republican Members of the House of Representatives that he is opposed to the legislation no matter what concessions we would make. Under Secretary of Commerce Ray and Under Secretary of Labor O'Connell, in meeting with Republican Congressmen, have made it clear that the administration would not compromise their own bill and have intimated that they were not even sold on their own proposal. Despite the informal encouragement from officials of the Department of Labor and the Secretary, they have repeatedly indicated their inability to convert the Secretary of Commerce and that Department.

Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has never endorsed action in this field nor taken the interest that his predecessor Arthur Burns had. The Secretary of Agriculture and his Under Secretary have been handing out news releases to reporters on the accomplishments of the rural redevelopment program repeating the same isolated illustrations of improvements, but have never told of the disillusionment of local committees. Their recommendations for action following their own extensive studies of local rural needs could not be implemented for lack of funds. They have been given advice and studies but not the means with which to implement their programs.

Instead of seeking a genuine program for economic rehabilitation of distressed areas, the administration has sought to enlarge on the letter-writing activities of the existing agencies, which have not met the needs of these areas. Economic distress has persisted both in urban and rural areas. "Jawboning" and "pen-pushing" do not rebuild communities or help economic distress.

While the President is boasting of the improvement in the conditions of employment between March and April 1960, reports from the Bureau of Employment Security show that in 28 of the major labor-market areas the total insured unemployed increased between these months. Four other labor markets showed no change in the number of insured unemployed, and the remaining 104 areas reported some decline. In a considerable number of instances the drop was due to the exhaustion of unemployment benefits.

Congress has just passed legislation for foreign aid to underdeveloped and distressed foreign nations at the request of the President. We have recognized that urban areas in Europe which are adversely affected by economic change and by loss of industries through the integration of the European market should be helped. We are giving money to agencies which finance unemployment insurance and resettlement and retraining allowances to Europeans displaced by the closing of mines, textile mills, and other industries. We have approved of area-redevelopment legislation in England, France, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, and Italy, but the administration refuses such action on behalf of American workers and communities. Our foreign aid bill will grant wheat to hungry India. It will furnish money to Pakistan to help their underdeveloped areas. We are financing the uplifting of Iran and their depressed people. We are providing schooling for Latin Americans who lack vocational training. We are helping other nations build public facilities, as they are prerequisites to industrial development. We boast of the factories we have financed in Latin America through the Import-Export Bank and the factories of Africa and Asia which are to be built by the International Development Corporation. Are not American underdeveloped areas, industrial and rural, equally entitled to aid from fellow Americans?

The President in his veto message on S. 722 seeks to absolve himself of the responsibility for our national failure to have area redevelopment legislation—the cause for this gap in our structure of law is the President himself. He has vetoed two bills passed by Congress. He has insisted on the letter of his own proposals. None of his spokesmen has shown any inclination to adjust the differences with the majority of the Congress.

In his new veto message, he remained adamant on excluding rural counties. The alternative he offers is the rural development program and the Small Business Administration. The first has depended solely on voluntary efforts in pilot counties—the second is designed to help small businesses with some local funds. But the problem of these communities is to build a new economic base for economic redevelopment so that they may become advantageous sites for industrial development. They require grants and loans for public facilities, for without them the most depressed will be unable to lift themselves from their desperate levels of poverty. They are in need of commercial and industrial buildings for economic expansion—these the President denies them.

The other stated objections in the message are conjuries of a man unfriendly to the entire idea, rather than one determined to perfect a piece of legislation. The President and every legislator knows that the Administrator appointed by the President will be able to exercise the judgment as to the communities which should enjoy priorities in receiving the aids provided by the act and the type of assistance which best fits the area. We presume the President will appoint a fairminded, responsible citizen dedicated to the realization of the purposes of the act. Moreover, he will be guided by an advisory citizen's committee fully conscious of its purposes. The objection that the truly desperate communities will not secure the assistance is one without foundation.

The President's fundamental lack of understanding of the needs of the depressed urban communities is revealed in the other objections. The communities "desperately" in need of a "full measure of assistance" do not have the financial resources to build local facilities essential in many instances to economic recovery. The citizenry and banks in these areas have drained their private funds through repeated efforts at local development. These communities have used funds from the State loan organization, even though they have received awards for outstanding effort and economic development. The results have not been sufficient to graduate them out of the depressed state. They now call for Federal aid and the President is telling them to go back and use their own resources which have been exhausted.

The President objects to some communities being on the eligible list though they may not need Federal assistance. The fact is, that only communities with 18 or more months of unemployment of 6 or more percent in the last 2 years, and currently suffering from 6 or more percent unemployment will be so eligible. In a number of instances this high level of unemployment has persisted for several years. As soon as the rate of unemployment falls below 6 percent they become ineligible for benefits. Should unemployment drop below this level while the applications are being considered the communities will become ineligible. None of these communities have suffered only temporary economic difficulties. The high level of unemployment has persisted for long periods and their economies are in permanent difficulties for which they must seek a solution. Federal assistance will not be "squandered" in the terms of the President's callous words, but become the base on which a constructive planning and redevelopment effort can be built.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has resisted and fought area redevelopment legislation for the last 6 years. Its Secretaries have been opponents and are out of sympathy with the provision of the bill. It is our conviction that the Department did frustrate the administration of the act and prevent its realization should the law be entrusted to it. Moreover, the Department, unfortunately, has no experience in this area and has no personnel qualified to administer such a law.

The administration is repudiating every promise the President made beginning with a speech he delivered in 1952 in which he promised aid to depressed areas. He is turning the back of the Federal Government on the people of the distressed communities of the United States.

In the election of 1958 the American people elected a host of new Democratic Congressmen from distressed communities, replacing former Republican Members who had fought this legislation. The American people will again define their attitude at the forthcoming election.

This administration has abandoned its slogan, "Progressive and Conservative," and turned reactionary.

I promise, Mr. Speaker, as I did 2 years ago when the President vetoed a similar bill, that I will introduce the depressed areas bill in the House on the 1st minute of the 1st day of the next session of Congress in January and I am sure Senator DOUGLAS will do the same in the Senate. There will be a different President in the White House and I am positive we will have our bill before next Easter.

## A PROPHETIC LETTER FROM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is dramatic timing indeed that a friend of mine should today receive a rather remarkable letter from a young engineer in East Germany. The letter, written just before the summit meeting, is not only prophetic; but there is a real lesson here for all of us. Indeed, this is not just a letter—it is a document of nourishing wisdom written by an articulate, idealistic young man living behind the Iron Curtain. I want to quote a few excerpts:

I am writing this to you the day before the summit meeting, but when you will have received this letter, the failure of the meeting will be an accomplished fact. The reason is, of course, that the conditions brought forth by Big Brother are quite unacceptable to the West, and Big Brother probably does not even want them accepted.

Everything that the Communists have done during the last few years with regard to Germany has tended to deepen the clash between East and West. The consciousness of the hopelessness of it all is continually with me, and all the time I think that life could be so wonderful if—well, I suppose it is rather selfish of me to keep talking of our own little worries, but then, you see, to us it is the most important thing in the world. As things look now, the final separation of this city will not be delayed very much longer. God knows what will happen then.

I am glad to see that people in the United States are slowly becoming aware of the fact that the East is making enormous and successful efforts to outrace you in all fields. The sputniks are not just a chance success in one field. They are symptomatic of what is going on in all fields of science and technology.

As long as the West and the United States keep playing and fooling around the way they have been doing and are still doing, they have not the slightest chance of survival. You must not be deceived by the apparent misery of everyday life in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. This does not count.

You will not win an inch of ground with fancy food, elaborate household gadgets, and streamlined private cars. I admire your country for these real achievements. I should like to share them. I should like everyone in the world to enjoy them, and I wish and trust you will go on having and developing the individual's maximum enjoyment of life. But do not think that because in this respect the other side is miles behind that they have a worse chance in the world contest. Their chance is better, because by economizing on their people's backs, they can afford to concentrate on national strength. The United States is developed enough to do both, if it would only will it.

## HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most important domestic issue facing this session of the Congress is the question of providing health care for the aged. The volume of mail coming into congressional offices on this subject is proof of the widespread concern among all our people over the lack of health protection for the aged.

The people want a broad and comprehensive program of social security as insurance against various economic hazards. This is particularly true of Federal employees and retired Federal workers because they have lagged behind other groups in acquiring such benefits. For instance, it was many years before Federal employees became entitled to unemployment compensation, even though workers in private industry had become eligible for such benefits long ago.

It is difficult for me to understand why the Government should be so neglectful of its own employees concerning wages and fringe benefits. Its shortsighted policy toward its employees and its annuitants contradicts the glowing picture it draws of the advantages enjoyed by those who work for the Federal Government. The predicament of those who have retired after a lifetime of service as civilian employees is particularly distressing to me.

It is inevitable that some form of health insurance will be provided for the aged in our population, as distinct from those who are pensioned off under the U.S. civil service retirement system.

It is to remedy this oversight that I ask favorable consideration before Congress adjourns of my bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

Medical benefits for those who have been employed in private industry is a logical extension of the social security system. Medical benefits for those who have worked for the Government should be, in the same manner, a development of the civil service retirement system.

Furthermore, the Government has a special obligation to contribute toward the health insurance of those who have served it so long and faithfully. Federal annuitants have two or three times as much chronic illness as those who are still working for the Government. These illnesses are frequently those of a long-term nature, requiring extended periods of care or hospitalization. It is an irrefutable fact that the cost of medical care has climbed far beyond their reach. With their fixed annuities that are so seldom upgraded to meet the cost of existence the predicament of these people becomes progressively worse. The erosion of the annuitants' pensions and of their morale is a fact that does not go unnoticed by younger people. As a result, the Government finds it increasingly difficult to recruit them for careers as civil servants.

Pending legislation covering active employees will become effective on July 1, 1960. It would be a cruel discrimination if we stopped there and failed to provide similar protection for the retired employees of the Federal Government.

Under H.R. 8835, the U.S. Civil Service Commission "is authorized and directed to establish a health benefits program for annuitants and members of their families who are not eligible for coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. If an annuitant enrolls in a health benefits plan under this act for himself only, there shall be withheld from his annuity, as his contribution, an amount not to exceed $3.80 monthly, and the Government shall contribute a like amount. Except as provided in paragraph (c), if an annuitant enrolls in a health benefits plan under this act for himself and members of his family—"family" meaning an annuitant's spouse, unmarried child under 19 years of age, or unmarried child regardless of age who is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that existed prior to his reaching the age of 19 years—there shall be withheld from his annuity, as his contribution, an amount not to exceed $9.20, and the Government shall contribute a like amount."

The Government's cost would, according to estimates of the Civil Service Commission, fall within the range of $15.5 million to $22 million in the first year. Even if it turned out to be somewhat higher, it would be a small price for the Government to pay in return for the solicitude and the help it would extend to those who have served it so well.

If it is not feasible for the Government's contribution to be financed from the proceeds of the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, then it can be financed through direct appropriation by the Congress. A decent respect for the faithful service performed by Government workers who are retired, will be expressed and appreciated through prompt enactment of the Federal Annuitants Health Benefits Act of 1960.

## NATIONAL PENSION POLICY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend a resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO GRANTS TO VETERANS OF AMERICAN WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I—CITY OF LYNN, MASS., IN THE YEAR 1960

Whereas the national policy of the United States, concerning veterans of the United States, has been to grant assistance to them in declining years by a pension, all in consideration of their military service in defense of our country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States; and

Whereas the United States has been and is aiding many foreign countries in restoring their economy; and

Where if our Government can afford to give away tens of billions of dollars for years to come, in addition to more than $70 billion in aid already given to foreign nations, then surely we can afford to give needed help to disabled and aging Veterans of World War I who have proved their loyalty to America by defending our Nation on the field of battle: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the honorable mayor and city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to Veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of wars prior to World War I; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the city clerk of the city of Lynn, Mass., to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives of the United States.

In city council, April 12, 1960.

Adopted:

———— ————, *City Clerk.*

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted a leave of absence for 10 days on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## THE HONORABLE LOUIS CONVERS CRAMTON

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, announcement was made a few weeks ago of the retirement of one of the most outstanding, distinguished, and well-beloved legislators in the State of Michigan's history. His name is Louis Convers Cramton, and he is presently State representative from Lapeer County, Mich. Representative Cramton, 84 years old, for half a century has served his beloved State as a U.S. Congressman, judge, and longtime member of the State legislature. As both a legislative and judicial official, he has displayed fearlessness in battling for what he believed to be right, the courage to oppose his own Republican Party when he believed it was wrong and strict adherence to conscience. Representative Cramton, long a champion of fair employment legislation and civil rights bills, while in Congress from 1913 to 1931 won the respect of Negro groups for his support of Howard University, a Negro college. He foresaw and understood the silent, bloodless social revolution and often stood alone on reforms which he regarded not only proper but inevitable.

Representative Cramton was born in Lapeer County and graduated from the University of Michigan law department in 1899. He served in the State house of representatives from 1909 to 1910; was elected to the 63d and to the eight succeeding Congresses—March 4, 1913–March 3, 1931; was special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior in 1931 and 1932; was circuit judge of the 40th judicial circuit from November 21, 1934, to December 31, 1941; resumed the practice of law; elected to the State house of representatives in November 1948, and has served continuously since that time.

Representative Cramton leaves the State legislature with an alert mind, a zest for the lawmaking process, and a sound heart that beats in a tempo responsive to the times and in tune with the people.

Let this Congress recognize our former colleague, Representative Louis Convers Cramton, for the outstanding public service he has rendered to the State of Michigan and to our Nation. Our best wishes go out to him for many pleasant years of well-deserved retirement.

## CORRECTION OF INADEQUACIES IN PAYMENTS FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to authorize the establishment of pay differentials for employees in the classified civil service for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazards. The purpose of this bill is to correct the inequity which has long existed with respect to the treatment of white collar employees as compared to blue collar employees who may be exposed to identical hardship hazards.

In perhaps a majority of the cases where a white collar employee is required to perform duties involving physical hardship or hazard, there is adequate recognition of the hardship or hazard in terms of the grade and rate of pay assigned to the position. For example, the position of an employee performing dangerous law-enforcement work or of an employee working regularly with radioactive material, is classified at a grade which takes into account the degree of risk involved in the work. My bill does not propose to provide a differential for employees in such positions.

On the other hand, there are many cases where a white collar employee whose job does not involve regular exposure to hazard or hardship and whose grade does not include recognition of inherent risk is required to perform duties on an occasional basis under circumstances involving physical hardship or hazard. For example, a civilian engineer engaged in the development of machinery or equipment may from time to time be required to perform duty aboard a submarine for the purpose of inspecting or testing the equipment on which he is working. Under present law such an employee is not entitled to receive any extra pay for these hazardous duties, although the Navy crew members and blue collar workers aboard the submarine do receive additional pay. It is this kind of inequity which my bill would propose to correct.

The matter of additional pay for hazardous duty has been recognized as a problem for many years. The Classification Act of 1949, as approved on October 28, 1949, contained a section which required the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the problem and to submit recommendations to the Congress "for a future policy and plan with respect to additional compensation for hazardous employments." The Commission's report, which was submitted in October 1950, included a recommendation that in regard to positions under the Classification Act, the effect of occupational hazards on duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements should be given due consideration in the allocations of positions to classes. However, no recommendation was made with respect to the treatment which should be given those cases where the assignment to hazardous duty is on an occasional basis and, for this reason, cannot be appropriately recognized in the classification grade of the position.

This problem has also been recognized in compensation studies which have been initiated in the executive branch. For example, the so-called Cordiner Committee, which was set up to study and advise the Secretary of Defense on needed adjustments in the provisions for compensating civilian personnel, submitted a report in May 1957. This report contained the finding that—

> There is no system of complete coverage either in terms of additional compensation or benefits for Classification Act employees performing hazardous work in the Federal Government. In contrast, there is complete coverage for defense blue-collar workers when the hazard is of sufficient dimension to warrant additional compensation.

No steps were taken to correct the inequity reflected by this finding.

My bill would propose to provide the clear and effective solution to this long-standing problem by providing authority for the establishment of pay differentials which would be paid to white-collar employees in those cases when they are assigned to hazardous or hardship duties.

The cost which would be involved in this bill would depend on the extent to which classified workers are assigned to hazardous or hardship duty, the length of such assignments, and the basic pay rates of the employee so assigned. In any event, the total cost would be negligible in terms of the total Federal payroll for classified employees and in terms of the increased effectiveness and morale which should result from the equitable treatment of the employees concerned.

## LET'S GREET IKE

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Daily News, the New York Times, and the Paterson Evening News:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 19, 1960]

LET'S GREET IKE

We suggest that as many of us as possible be on hand to give the President a cheer when he returns tomorrow. His plane is due to arrive at Andrews Field at 3 p.m. The President's route will be over the South Capitol Street bridge, Pennsylvania Avenue, 14th Street and New York Avenue to the White House. We think we all owe him a warm greeting for his performance in Paris.

Neither by temperament, training, nor experience—as soldier or statesman—is President Eisenhower a man to submit readily to contempt or denigration, let alone to turn the other cheek to insult.

His restraint in Paris in the face of Khrushchev's deliberate billingsgate, therefore, is evidence not only of his self-discipline and innate dignity but also of his selfless devotion to the cause of peace; the peace for which all humanity hopes, and which almost any sacrifice is worth making to attain.

Giving the soft though self-respecting answer to the synthetic and cynical wrath of the Russian Premier was, therefore, a gesture which—probably as much as anything Khrushchev himself did—swung free world opinion, which had been critical of the United States for the U–2 plane episode, around a full 180 degrees, so that it is today unanimous in denouncing Russia's behavior.

No amount of patching could put the summit conference back together now. It would be useless and foolish to try. However, whatever mistakes may have been made, groveling before a grotesquely insolent Khrushchev was not one of them. In the circumstances, such a futile gesture could only play into the hands of the Soviet boss.

But there is one thing can be done. And it is more important than any other choice we have.

That is to close ranks. And we can symbolize that by your welcome of the President tomorrow.

In the days ahead, let's show the whole world, including the Soviets, that the American people, the American political parties and the U.S. Government are solidly together on these things:

That there is no doubt of this country's eternal devotion to the principles of individual liberty and the sovereignty of free peoples.

That whatever other differences may divide our public opinion or our political parties there is no division on our determination to stay strong, to do whatever is necessary to maintain that strength, but to use it with wisdom and restraint.

Top leaders of the Democratic Party already have given the cue, as revealed in the Senate yesterday. Before the summit collapsed, four of them—Adlai Stevenson, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Speaker Rayburn—quietly had sent President Eisenhower a cablegram to demonstrate American unity.

This demonstration of agreement on purpose, as Senator JOHNSON later explained to the Senate, does not require any forfeit of the democratic right and duty realistically to assess the management of American policy by the Eisenhower administration. But such assessments can be made in a manner which will reinforce the national strength, rather than detract from it.

So, when Mr. Eisenhower returns to Washington tomorrow, we have an opportunity to represent our whole country and to show where it stands. We hope Washingtonians will turn out en masse to welcome the President home. And that all around the land, wherever possible, there will be similar demonstrations of loyalty and national unity.

In a showdown, we are one people. Let us make that clear to everybody, especially Khrushchev.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S ADIEU

At his final press conference in Paris yesterday Premier Khrushchev renewed his accusations against the United States. Essentially his argument fell into two parts: a complaint that President Eisenhower has promised the ending of the espionage flights only until the end of his own tenure in office next January, and a complaint that this country's promises cannot be respected since they can be changed from administration to administration.

On the first point it may be noted that neither Mr. Khrushchev nor any of his subordinates have even promised to halt for 1 day—let alone the remainder of Mr. Khrushchev's stay in office—the gigantic espionage effort his country maintains constantly against the free world. And Mr. Khrushchev surely knows that if he really wants the end of aerial espionage for all time he need only accept President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal and formalize that plan in an international treaty which would be binding upon all American administrations once it had been duly ratified.

On the second issue it may be suggested that Premier Khrushchev is the last man in the world who is entitled to raise questions about the value of the promises of others. Has he forgotten how many Soviet promises have been betrayed under his own and earlier Soviet administrations?

In Hungary in November 1956, for example, were not all kinds of promises and pledges made to the Hungarian people and their legal government and were not all betrayed? Premier Nagy and General Maleter have long since already paid with their lives for having believed Soviet promises. Has Premier Khrushchev forgotten Poland, where Stalin once promised that a representative democratic government would be installed? Has he forgotten Molotov's long-since violated pledge that the institutions of Rumania would be respected, a pledge made as Soviet troops entered that country during World War II? Has he forgotten Soviet promises about Western access to West Berlin, promises that Stalin broke in the era of the Berlin blockade and which Mr. Khrushchev himself now threatents almost daily to break again? We of the free world know that on the issue of broken promises Mr. Khrushchev lives in a very glassy house indeed.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, May 18, 1960]

WE ARE ONE—ALL AMERICA BACKS THE PRESIDENT IN THESE DARKEST HOURS

This is a time for all of us to keep our feet on the ground, our heads steady and clear, our hearts filled with prayer.

The world is on the brink of what could be Armageddon, because madmen are again loose and who can tell when they might unleash the terrible instruments of destruction which all mankind has devised in these recent years?

Nikita Khrushchev came to America last year ostensibly to learn all about us, to absorb some of the niceties of a land of liberty. He returned the compliment and invited our President, the man of peace coming down the end of the road with one ambition—to end wars and permit nations to dwell in amity.

Suddenly all this is destroyed by this same Khrushchev, stalking his bullheaded, chesty Communist front around Paris, where leaders had gathered for peace and now confer only on how to guard against a new and more terrible Pearl Harbor.

It is well indeed that all parties in America now join hands in a common unity.

President Eisenhower, with just a few brief months remaining of his final term of office, had gone to Paris to join his Western allies to work out a program of disarmament and permanent peace with the Soviet leader.

Instead, he ran into a raging bull, bellowing insults, cancelling Ike's visit to Russia, demanding abject apology from America.

Well, Mr. K., we don't like fights, and we abhor war.

But we don't bend before madmen, before dictators.

Our country was founded in the spirit of rebellion against oppression.

Was the spy flight over Russia a tactical blunder?

Well, maybe it was. But it was only an incident. And "Khrushie" blew it up into the propaganda blast he needed to prove to his real bosses behind the scenes that he can be a tough guy.

Mr. Khrushchev, literally spitting in the face of our President, is doing it to every man, woman, and child in America, whether we be Republicans or Democrats.

So we'll take it together in whatever spirit President Eisenhower accepts it.

Whatever the Lord decrees and our President tells us to do in this crisis, let's all remember:

We are one made up of 175 million strong.

## NASA PEACEFUL EXPLORATION AGENCY?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days we will have before this body a bill from my committee to revise the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

In the light of the U–2 experience, it becomes eminently clear to me that a very thorough understanding must be reached on exactly what the area of responsibility of NASA is to be. With this thought in mind, on May 13 I wrote to my distinguished chairman the following letter which I think speaks for itself on this point:

MAY 13, 1960.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
*Chairman, Science and Astronautics Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you because of my concern over the recent revelations that NASA is being used as a cover-up for spying activities by the Central Intelligence Agency.

As you are well aware, we have been under the impression that the activities of NASA were to be of a purely peaceful and nonmilitary nature. This has been what the heads of NASA have told us and this is the way the law is written. This law is being flouted. I do not believe the Nation can afford to let Congress follow the bumbling and irrational leadership given the country by this administration. It is our manifest duty to insist that the moneys appropriated for a specific purpose are used in strict compliance with the law as stated by Congress. Unless Congress intends to abdicate its responsibility in these areas, I strongly urge that a full-scale investigation be initiated in order to ascertain (1) whether there are other activities similar to these, which are hiding under the cloak of NASA; and (2) in what other instances NASA has given out information which is at variance with the facts.

The New York Post editorial of May 11 made the most profound observation on the execution of our foreign policy when it stated:

"We said the other day that there is no ground for partisan delight in the national humiliation. Neither, however, do we accept the view that this is an occasion for polite acquiescence in an inexcusable blunder that has shaken the world. * * *

"It is not an excess of debate that imperils the country. It is lack of debate, failure to explore great questions, refusal to challenge the tired premises of our foreign policy, bipartisan agreement to postpone all serious matters, that are undermining our world position. * * *

"Certainly Mr. Khrushchev should not be deluded into believing that any substantial number of Americans will accept his prescription for world order. But neither should there be any doubt about the extent to which millions of Americans are troubled and dismayed by the fabulous follies of recent days, and demanding better answers than we have received.

"In these last few fateful hours before the summit there should be full, free examination of all the positions we have taken, of all the imponderables in our world view, of all the sacred cows on our animal farm. The most tragic aspect of the plane episode is the evidence of abdication by the President of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, we have all been shaken badly by the facts which have recently come to light. We should not be so shocked and feckless as not to go forward and ascertain all the facts regarding the operations of NASA and the apparent interlocking operations of big airplane corporations in spying activities in conjunction with the CIA.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge that a full-scale investigation be initiated by our committee on the whole subject of the operation of NASA. Either that agency should be what we have been telling the world it is—an operation set up for the peaceful exploration of outer space—or it should be disbanded and its area of responsibility returned to the military.

Respectfully yours,

LEONARD G. WOLF,
*Representative in Congress.*

## SUBSIDY ELIGIBILITY OF DOMESTIC TRUNK AIRLINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BROCK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1960, I introduced H.R. 12234 which seeks the repeal of that portion of section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act that provides subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunk airlines. This bill is identical to that introduced by my distinguished colleague and fellow committee member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

I was impelled to introduce this measure for many of the same reasons Mr. MACK mentioned in his able remarks in the RECORD of April 5, 1960.

For example, I am convinced that both the trunkline industry and the Civil Aeronautics Board would be more economically realistic if subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunks ceased to exist.

I cannot believe that Capital Airlines would have pursued its reckless course of expansion and taken the gambles which have brought it to the brink of bankruptcy had it not been possible to apply for Federal subsidy to make up the losses when the gambles failed.

I cannot believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board would have authorized the multiple competition, often putting four or five more carriers in the same market, but they had not had the assurance that subsidy was available for any airline unable to survive in these competition-saturated markets. If subsidy eligibility is terminated, I share Mr. MACK'S confidence that the Civil Aeronautics Board will employ more careful analysis of the economic factors and give more weight to sound business principles in subsequent route cases.

Similarly, I share my colleague's concern about bailing out a carrier whose bad management and improvident gambling with expansion have gotten it into serious financial trouble. I agree that payment of Federal subsidy to a carrier competing with self-sufficient trunklines can lead to only one thing—industrywide subsidy.

But, Mr. Speaker, while all of these factors are very important and constitute valid reasons for passage of this legislation, it seems to me there is an even more important reason why Congress must act to eliminate this subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunkline carriers. Stated in its simplest form, we must disqualify the domestic trunks in order to prevent encroachment upon the funds which Congress has appropriated to support the local service industry and the other parts of the industry that are still in the developmental stage of their operations.

On May 16, 1960 the Civil Aeronautics Board held a prehearing conference in the Capital subsidy case which started in motion the administrative machinery to process Capital's claim. Had the Board not inaugurated the proceeding it is clear under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act and title 28, United States Code, section 1337, that Capital, or another subsidy claimant, can obtain a mandatory injunction in a U.S. district court compelling the Board to process the claim.

Once the claim is in process it is clear that the Civil Aeronautics Board can—by granting the request—create a valid legal obligation enforceable in the Federal courts which would be satisfied out of the appropriation Congress intended for carrier payments to the local service carriers and other developmental industries. Thus, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the money was appropriated for other and worthy purposes, under present law a valid legal claim can be created which encroaches upon and diverts these funds for other purposes. Thus it is completely possible that important activities such as the local service industry could be placed in jeopardy, or irreparably harmed, by trunkline subsidy claimants.

Nor is it any answer or comfort that the Civil Aeronautics Board might summarily turn down the claim of Capital Airlines. The Board is compelled to use the same standards and precedents it uses in other subsidy cases such as the local service cases. Should the Board arbitrarily or capriciouly depart from its standards or the statutory requirements, Capital could sue under section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act and get judicial review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Fortunately the Civil Aeronautics Board had the foresight to include in its investigation of the Capital subsidy claim the issues of merger or dismemberment which may well prove to be the answer in this case. However, the fact remains that until the law is changed and subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunklines discontinued, there is a continuing risk that encroachments will occur on the funds appropriated to develop the local service carriers which provide vital service in Nebraska and elsewhere in the Nation.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is essential to pass this legislation to protect both segments of the airline industry; first, to protect the self-sufficient trunklines from subsidized competition which can only result in industrywide economic deterioration; and, second, to protect the developmental portion of the industry—especially the local service carriers—from encroachment upon funds appropriated to foster their growth and progress.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of domestic trunkline subsidy is a unique opportunity. It not only provides us a chance to circumscribe and reduce the area of potential Government liability for subsidy expenditures but it actually pre-

sents us a challenge to do so or risk an enormous increase in transportation subsidies. I personally shudder to think of the possible consequences of our failure to act. If the relatively minute operations of the local service carriers can require a subsidy that has increased from $21 million in 1955 to $68 million in fiscal 1961, an economic chain reaction set off by federally subsidized domestic trunkline competition would inevitably result in hundreds of millions of dollars of subsidy requirements.

Mr. Speaker, we have already spent approximately $200 million to put this industry on its feet. It has been operating for nearly a decade on a self-sufficient basis which proves that the industry can be self-sustaining. Airline traffic continues to grow and new revenue sources such as increased airfreight and first class mail are supplementing airline revenues. I think we have come to the point when we must remove this subsidy eligibility before it corrupts a mature and self-reliant industry. I think we must remove this subsidy eligibility before it undoes the good work it accomplished during the developmental period.

This action cannot be postponed. This legislation should be given high priority and enacted this session of Congress.

## WARTIME EXCISE TAXES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, just as the cherry blossoms come to Washington every spring, so does the annual season for extending the wartime excise taxes imposed upon automobiles.

Because of my vocal opposition to this tax I have been dubbed by some as the automobile horn of Congress. This does not offend me. On the contrary, I am proud of this recognition because it refers to my persistent and insistent efforts to repeal the unfair 10-percent wartime excise tax on automobiles.

I again insist that in keeping such a tax, while enacting legislation for depressed areas, such as Detroit, and when American workers need to be fully employed, the Federal Government is cutting off its taxes to spite its revenue. This tax was levied for the specific purpose of decreasing automobile production in order to divert it to war production. The purpose for which this tax was imposed no longer exists, but we still permit this tax to retard sales, production, and employment.

During the past few days our press has joined in sounding the "automobile horn" to arouse the public about this tax. For this I am grateful.

The "ignition" for two recent articles in Detroit papers was provided by an editorial by Robert B. Powers, editor and publisher of Ward's Automotive Yearbook for 1960, and which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this past Tuesday.

On May 12, 1960, the automotive editor of the Detroit Free Press, Fred Olmsted, had this to say of Mr. Powers' editorial:

Immediate removal or reduction of the Federal excise tax on automobiles was urged by Ward's Automotive Yearbook for 1960, released Wednesday. "The dawn of the era of American compacts and the consequent arrival of direct competition with their European counterparts make this imperative," the 22d annual edition of the industry handbook said.

Ward's called the tax (10 percent on the manufacturer's price) "politically immoral, punitive and a wartime emergency measure."

The statistical reporting agency said action was vital "to forestall possible future injury to the industry."

The leading editorial of the Detroit News, of May 11, 1960, was devoted to the adverse effects of this discriminatory tax upon our economy. I agree so completely with the content of this editorial that I would like to take this occasion to read it to the Members of the House:

UNITED STATES IN COMPACT CAR RACE—THE EXCISE HANDICAP

For many years this newspaper has campaigned against the injustice of the automobile excise tax, a levy which costs motorists billions of dollars on the pretext that the utilitarian automobile, like a billiard table or mink stole, is a luxury item.

We now find a new and persuasive argument for abolishment of the tax. Robert B. Powers, editor and publisher of Ward's Automotive Reports, in his yearbook released today, sees the levy as a potential peril both to the industry and the Nation in the forthcoming struggle for the U.S. compact car market—a struggle between U.S. manufacturers and European exporters to this country.

In the yearbook editorial, these are some of the points made by Powers:

In 1959, Federal excise tax collections on motor vehicles totaled more than $3.6 billion, bringing to more than $14 billion the amount paid since the levy was decreed in 1917 as a wartime emergency measure.

Counting the tax on raw materials and components, the excise taxes now approximate 17.3 percent of the wholesale value of a motor vehicle—or $346 on a car valued at $2,000.

This politically immoral, punitive tax, if continued, will be a severe handicap to the automotive industry in competing with foreign-made compacts, only 253 of which were imported in 1940, but 668,070 of which were sold in the American market in 1959.

If Congress and the administration delay tax repeal or reduction until a faltering U.S. auto industry precipitates a crisis, Government action to discourage imports then will have to be drastic—and "it may cost us those friends throughout the world we have worked so diligently and expensively to win and influence."

One of the additional facts brought out by Powers is that the three European manufacturers with a lion's share of the American market are government owned or government controlled. This enables them to pretty much set their own sales prices, be in a position to influence internal taxes on their products, and if need be operate wholly without profit for the sake of employment and their nations' general economic health.

In the instance of Iron Curtain motor cars, sometimes priced at less in the United States than in the country of origin, cost figures and taxes can be juggled to get around the U.S. ban on dumping.

If there is statesmanship left in Washington, the time to act is now. The tax never was justified except as a wartime measure to discourage the demand for automobiles. It is less than ever defensible now when the very survival of a large segment of the industry is in danger of becoming an issue.

It will not be long before we will be asked to extend this tax. Between now and then, it is my hope that my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee will find time to ask themselves if it is not politically immoral to penalize an industry—which is the basis for one of every seven jobs—and one of every six businesses—by exacting a tax not levied on other manufacturing.

## KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, OHIO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram from President Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, May 19, 1910, Gov. Judson Harmon, of Ohio, signed the bill which established Kent State Normal School, the beginning of the great present day Kent State University, of Kent, Ohio.

The past 50 years have seen Kent State grow from an enrollment of 42 students in 1910 to a student body of 10,500 members today. During this same period of time, 100,000 students have registered at the university, 56,000 of them in the last 10 years. It is clearly one of the fastest growing universities in the United States. Although the university primarily serves the northeastern portion of Ohio, its student body also consists of many students from the other 49 States as well as students from foreign lands.

Not only has it grown population wise, but constant additions and improvements to the physical plant of the university, since its establishment, have made it into the 360 acres of beautiful grounds and 33 campus buildings of today. The present value is estimated to exceed $31 million.

Regardless of the financial amounts involved, the campus of Kent State University, sitting high upon a hill overlooking Kent, Ohio, is generally regarded to be one of the most beautiful university campuses in the United States.

The university educationally offers its students curriculums in five different colleges: Business, arts and sciences, fine arts, education, and graduate school. Each of these courses of study offers the best in education to those it serves.

In recognizing those who have contributed so much to the founding and growth of this great university, one cannot help but give much of the credit to Dr. George Bowman, present president

of Kent State. For the past 16 years he has lead the school during the years of its greatest growth. His leadership has been an inspiration to the students, faculty, and alumni of Kent State University. In this respect, he has been given the unqualified support of the board of trustees, presently consisting of John R. Williams, president of the board for 16 years and a former Ohio State legislator; Robert C. Dix, publisher of the Kent-Ravenna Record Courier; Dr. Otto Korb, former superintendent of schools of South Euclid-Lyndhurst and East Cleveland; Frederick M. Broda, president and treasurer of Webb-Broda & Co.; Robert H. Stopher, associate editor of the Akron Beacon Journal; Ray P. Dinsmore, vice president of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio; and the Honorable John McSweeney, a former distinguished Member of this House. All of them should be congratulated for their interest and effort in the future of Kent State University.

Certainly this opportunity should not pass without paying tribute to the efforts of those who preceded Dr. Bowman in the president's chair: Dr. John McGilvrey, Dr. James Engleman, and Dr. K. C. Leebrick. They have made this day possible by their work on this great campus.

As an alumnus of this great university, I am extremely proud to join today with the students, faculty, and my fellow alumni of Kent State University in celebrating the school's 50th birthday. I am doubly proud because today is also my own birthday. Although I am not as old as my alma mater, it is of great personal pride to me to look forward to celebrating our birthdays together in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to Kent State University on the occasion of its 50th anniversary:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D.C., May 13, 1960.*

GEORGE A. BOWMAN,
*President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio:*

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of the 50th anniversary of Kent State University.

Over the past 50 years this university has achieved a fine record of growth and service in the field of higher education. In this tradition I know it will continue to advance the welfare of its students and the national community.

Congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, today, June 19, 1960, marks the golden anniversary of Bowling Green State University at Bowling Green, Ohio. I would like, at this time, to enumerate some of the accomplishments of this outstanding institution of higher learning.

On May 19, 1910, Bowling Green Normal School was established. This school initially was designed to serve the northwestern part of Ohio. However, at this time its student body consists also of many people from the other 49 States as well as many foreign lands. When Bowling Green was founded it evidenced an amazing amount of vigor. This vigor lead to the establishment of the schools of business administration, liberal arts and the graduate school.

From a school consisting essentially of one building Bowling Green State University has become a huge, sprawling campus with some of the most modern and functional classrooms and dormitories in the United States. The building program during the past 10 years has been phenomenal. Many additional classrooms and dormitories plus one of the finest and largest student union buildings in the country have been built.

A special debt of gratitude must be extended to President Ralph W. McDonald who came to Bowling Green State University in 1951 and has since dedicated his life to its ever-changing needs. Dr. McDonald's forward look at the American educational system has immeasurably aided him in his constant efforts to improve the academic standards and the physical facilities of the university.

Another vote of thanks must go to Dr. McDonald's exceptional faculty, for without their help his task would have been virtually impossible. They are nationally recognized for their exceeding devotion to the advancement of higher learning. This is evidenced by the great number of fine scholars who have emerged from Bowling Green State University.

The president, Dr. McDonald, and the faculty have been blessed with a board of trustees who have done everything within their power for the advancement of the university. We are most grateful to them.

I am very proud to join with the students, faculty and alumni of Bowling Green State University in celebrating the school's 50th anniversary. I am informed that congratulations have been received on this occasion from President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It reads as follows:

Through Congressman DELBERT L. LATTA I have learned of the plans to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Bowling Green State University at a convocation this Thursday.

Before leaving for the summit conference in Paris I want to send my congratulations to your students, faculty, and friends. The American standards of character and intellect which are the strength of your university are also the strength of our country's dealings with neighbors around the world.

I am delighted to add my best wishes for the continuing growth of Bowling Green in honor and in service to the national community.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman. I am well aware of the fact that Bowling Green State University is a rival of Kent University and was also born 50 years ago.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on his birthday.

In the months that he has served in this body, he has richly earned the reputation of being one of the most effective first-term Members of Congress, and I have confidence that he will be returned by his constituents.

I am also glad that the gentleman from Ohio has called attention to Kent State University, a small, great university, on the 50th anniversary of its establishment.

Mr. Speaker, many students from my section of West Virginia are familiar with Kent State University. Kent State is a member of the Mid-America Conference, and Marshall College in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va. participates with Kent State in numerous athletic and other events. We in West Virginia have great respect for this institution, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing to the attention of the House the 50th birthday of this institution which we are today celebrating.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman, my colleague from Ohio, for the statement he is making today on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of one of our fine small American colleges, Kent State University. I offer heartiest felicitations on this occasion not only to Kent State University but to the gentleman who is also celebrating his anniversary on this occasion. Kent State University compares very favorably with the fine colleges in the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress: Denison University, at Granville, my alma mater; Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware; Ohio State University campuses at Mansfield and Newark; Kenyon, at Gambier, and Ashland College, at Ashland. Many fine people from my district have graduated from Kent State and many are currently enrolled there. I extend my congratulations to this great institution of learning and my distinguished colleague from Ohio one of its outstanding graduates.

Mr. COOK. I merely wish to say as an Ohioan that I am very proud of the fine schools located in my district, and I assure the gentleman, as an alumnus of Kent State University, I take particular pride in my alma mater on this occasion.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Armed Forces Day is the annual occasion when we take stock of the latest known developments in America's weapons of offense and defense, of the discipline and skill of the men of our Armed Forces, and of the spirit of patriotism that inspires the Nation whose sword and shield they are. For it is in the spirit of men, more than in wealth or the steel and explosives that wealth can purchase, that the security of America lies. Most important, of all the qualities that can make for the preservation or the destruction, of a country, is that intangible but immediately identifiable quality known as morale. Though it is in the Armed Forces that morale is immediately evident, and overwhelmingly important, the morale of the Armed Forces must derive ultimately from the morale permeating the citizenship of the country. We could not expect to draw individuals from a discouraged, disaffected, lazy, and luxury-loving population, and so spur and train and indoctrinate them that they would become courageous, disciplined, and energetic fighters for home and fireside, still less for such intangibles as freedom and justice. Out of the observance of this day, out of the display of weapons and material, out of the speeches and the marching and singing, we must draw one all important lesson—that we are all involved in the enterprise of American security, of the promotion of peace and justice in the world. Each of us is essentially involved in the Armed Forces, whose service to America we celebrate on this day.

## PARIS CONFERENCE COLLAPSE: REALISTIC NATIONAL POLICY REQUIRED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the complete collapse of the Paris meeting of heads of governments is now a matter of history. Following as it did the sensational disclosures of the U–2 intelligence plane incident in the heart of the Soviet Union, the Paris failure has stirred the peoples of all countries to a degree not equaled since the world-shaking crises prior to World War II.

Featured by Premier Khrushchev's stern warnings against further intelligence flights by U.S. aircraft into Soviet territory and the President's suspension of them and promise not to resume such flights, without extracting a compensating concession from the Soviet leader, the situation is without parallel in American history. Yet, when examined closely, it is correlated to important political occurrences in other parts of the world, including the continental United States.

Among these have been agitations at Panama, fanned by Communist mentors, for what is described as reaffirmation of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone land grant. An unfortunate statement at Panama by one of our high ranking diplomatic officials to the effect that the United States had recognized the "titular sovereignty" of Panama over the Canal Zone, whatever that is, and that Panama should have "visual evidence" of such sovereignty in the formal display of its flag on the Canal Zone, played into the hands of the international conspiracy for wresting the exclusive sovereignty control of the zone from the United States.

In view of the obvious Soviet policy of aggressive subversion in strategic areas, such as Panama, Cuba, and Indonesia, it was not difficult to foresee and to state to the House on January 13, 1960, that the pattern at Panama would supply the precedent for similar agitations with respect to Alaska, purchased in 1867 by treaty from Russia. It is indeed a sterile satisfaction to say that my predictions with respect to a vitally important question have again been fulfilled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in Alaska? It is common talk among people there about frequent radio broadcasts from Siberian stations across the Bering Sea urging in clear English the resumption of Soviet sovereignty over that part of the United States. But even more ominous, are persistent intelligence flights of Soviet planes over Alaska, which U.S. forces are not permitted to stop.

In Alaska today, we have a situation that combines the pattern of Panama with that of the flight over Soviet territory of the U–2 intelligence plane, which was shot down. Moreover, there have been other U.S. planes shot down in other areas.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite the significance of the Alaska situation the press of our country, with some minor exceptions, has been strangely silent. What is the influence that leads to such suppression of vitally significant news?

The net result of this silence could well make the United States a province of the one world of universal communism. Our safety demands that the Congress find out and remove the controls that now approach the ultimate in tyranny by denying such crucial information to the Nation.

I think I reflect the views of all peoples and all races, including those of holy Russia, when saying that they do not wish war. But war will not be prevented by abject surrenders on the part of the United States, as some Communist leaders and their collaborators in our country appear to desire and to expect. It can be avoided only by standing up for our just rights and by effective precautions to prevent the tragedy of another Pearl Harbor.

To these ends, Mr. Speaker, our Government should call for the arrest and deportation of Soviet spies, who form a far larger fifth column here than exists in the Soviet Union. For such procedure we have as a precedent the recent firm aciton of little Switzerland.

Meanwhile, the people of the United States will expect the President to issue orders to our Alaska commands to protect our positions there in the same way Premier Khrushchev protects those of the Soviet Union. These orders would include instructions to challenge Soviet planes and to shoot down those that do not comply with orders to land.

## CANAL ZONE SECURITY: SIGNIFICANCE OF PANAMA FLAG

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the present session of the Congress the questions of the sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal have been extensively debated. There is little new of basic nature that could be added to what has already been presented. Yet, because of the failure of our Government, in both the legislative and executive branches, to take a firm, forthright position with respect to our just rights at Panama, the Isthmian canal policies of the United States are still uncertain. It is imperative that these policies be made definite by reaffirmation of the long-established policies under which the Panama Canal was constructed and has since been maintained and operated.

Many will recall the attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone on November 3 and 28, 1959, requiring the use of force by Canal Zone police and the U.S. Army to repel the invaders. Under radical leadership, some of it communistic, the prime purpose of these mobs was to plant the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as the symbol of Panamanian sovereignty over that vital strip of land. These two attempts of the invaders failed but their real objectives are still uppermost in their minds, and these are sovereignty over the Canal Zone and eventually nationalization of the Panama Canal.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that subsequent to these two abortive efforts of Panamanian mobs, the Foreign Minister of Panama, Miguel J. Moreno, Jr., made extensive foreign travels, including a visit in Egypt to present Panamanian viewpoints and to be briefed on Egyptian experience in regard to the Suez Canal.

While there, Foreign Minister Moreno had ample opportunity to discuss the problems of the Panama Canal with Egyptian officials who had succeeded in bringing about nationalization of the Suez Canal. It is significant too that Panama and the United Arab Republic recently established diplomatic relations with each other.

Meanwhile, what had happened at Panama? Following the attempted November 3, 1959, invasion, the Government of the United States, instead of a stern warning against such future attempts, sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble. This emissary, Hon. Livingston T. Merchant, with the approval of his superiors in the State Department, issued a public statement recognizing Panama as "titular sovereign" over the Canal Zone and, according to Panamanian sources, agreed that the flag of Panama

might be displayed in the Canal Zone to show such sovereignty.

In addition, the President of the United States himself, on December 2, 1959, following the return of Secretary Merchant, publicly expressed the belief that Panama should be allowed to fly her flag in the Canal Zone to show Panamanian "titular sovereignty."

These actions, Mr. Speaker, taken without the consent of either the Congress or the treatymaking power of our Goverment, reflects a credulity and naivete that are simply unbelievable on the part of high U.S. officials.

Moreover, these irresponsible declarations startled the people of our Nation, who have deluged the Congress with letters expressing strong opposition to what they consider a pending surrender of our treaty rights at Panama.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to find one U.S. citizen well informed on Isthmian problems who favors such surrender. I have never seen an experienced Panama Canal official, present or former, or any member of the Armed Forces who has served on the Isthmus who does not vigorously oppose such an ignominious retreat from our solemn treaty responsibilities.

In fact, many are demanding to know what are the influences in our Government that have permitted U.S.-Panama relations to degenerate to the degree they have. To them, I would add the question: What more could be accomplished by open, bold, and shameless treason than has been done at Panama through the processes of vacillation and appeasement?

The responsible officials of our Government who have talked in such loose terms about permitting the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone have never had any assurance from the Panamanian Government that such display would mean no more than a recognition of its "titular sovereignty," or more accurately, its mere reversionary interest in the sole event of the United States ceasing to operate the Panama Canal. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is certain that any Panamanian Government would never make such an agreement but would hold such display as our recognition of the complete sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone.

In view of the wide knowledge of the Isthmian question in the Congress, it is not strange, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives, after a notable debate on February 2, 1960, passed, by overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, House Concurrent Resolution 459. This resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation in the 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties between the United States and Panama involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty.

This action by the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, was not merely a routine vote of our membership, but a reflection of strong views of the American people on a matter in which they are vitally interested. As such, it served as a rebuke to those, in and out of Government service, who, by naive intentions or devious methods, would undermine our position of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, at the solicitation of the Secretary of State, House Concurrent Resolution 459, has not yet been passed by the Senate, his opposition being on the basis that such action might offend Panama. This, in effect, is the same as saying that its approval by the Senate would anger Panamanian mobs and the radical politicians who take their cues from them.

Returning now to the question of displaying the Panama flag over the Canal Zone to indicate what is loosely called "titular sovereignty," this is not a meaningless gesture of good will as some of our naive leaders would have us believe. The flag has but one meaning, and that is sovereignty.

For this reason, its display would be but the first step in the Panamanian program for eventual nationalization. The second step would be to secure its international recognition as evidence of full sovereignty. Then the way would be clear, in a legal sense, for the rest of their program through the most expedient means with the example of Suez before them.

The attitude of our Department of State touching these questions has undoubtedly given to our Latin American neighbors and the world at large the impression of weakness, timidity, and an excessive zeal for appeasement.

When considering this gravely important isthmian question, Mr. Speaker, we should never lose sight of the fact that the Panama Canal is a part of the coastline of the United States. The flag of our country there is the symbol of our status as a sovereign people over the constitutionally acquired domain of the Canal Zone. As long as our flag flies supreme there, it will fly over our territory here and elsewhere. The day another flag is raised over the Canal Zone will indeed be tragic and bode ill for the future of the United States.

It will not be long now before the Congress will adjourn. We should not leave this crucially vital issue in the hands of executive bureaucrats who have so long and so repeatedly demonstrated their inability to deal with it.

The time for action has long since passed. Because of the nonaction attitude of the Senate, the House of Representatives should now adopt its own independent resolutions on these questions. To this end I have introduced three House resolutions identical with the three concurrent resolutions previously introduced by me. Prompt consideration by the House is respectfully urged as an imperative necessity for the security of the United States.

The texts of the three indicated House resolutions follow:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 516

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the House of Representatives that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

---

HOUSE RESOLUTION 515

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free, and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly, or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American State, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such States and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas, such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* (1) That in any such subversive domination or threat, if it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles of above States, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

---

HOUSE RESOLUTION 517

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Buanau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 25, 1904; and

Whereas since the time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

## PANAMA CANAL: LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since 1949 I have been actively interested in the problems of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally. My first official assignment was as chairman of a special inquiry into the operations of the Panama Canal, which culminated in the reorganization of the enterprise under Public Law 841, 81st Congress. That law brought about the first major administrative change in the canal organization since April 1, 1914, and placed the enterprise on a self-sustaining basis.

Though reassigned to another committee in the Congress in 1951, my interest in the canal has never diminished. Instead, it has increased and I have been able to keep a close contact with developments, as well as to make contributions by means of inserting meritorious statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and participation in hearings.

Among the most gratifying features of this association has been the growing evidence of expanding public knowledge of important canal questions as evidenced by the publication of thoughtful and discriminating articles in the lay and professional press. So much has this interest grown that students of our colleges and universities, graduate and undergraduate, have undertaken to write these and papers on various phases of the canal question.

The latest contribution is a research paper on the long-range Panama Canal program by Midshipman Mark Melvyn Golden of the U.S. Naval Academy, class of 1960, prepared as part of his fourth year training.

Based upon an examination of evidence from many sources, independent as well as "official," Midshipman Golden's paper is a remarkably clear, logical, and concise statement of the major problems involved in the canal question. It shows up the pitfalls of extreme interpretation of any single factor as paramount in justifying predetermined objectives and presents conclusions that take into consideration all the main features involved in the economic operation of the Panama Canal as a great interocean link for the commerce of the world on terms of equality.

As such, Midshipman Golden's paper reflects high credit not only on himself but also on the great service Academy which encouraged him to undertake the arduous task of research which necessarily preceded its writing.

Particularly notable, Mr. Speaker, was Midshipman Golden's recognition of the fallacious premise of hypothetical security on which the 1947 drive for a vast sea-level undertaking at Panama was predicated. This, I wish to emphasize by repeating one of his quotable statements:

It is a matter of conjecture to say whether a sea-level or a lock canal could be more seriously damaged by an atomic bomb. It is a matter of fact to realize that either type would be so seriously damaged that defense should not be a factor in laying out long-range plans.

In order that the indicated paper may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus be made available as an inspiration for students in other educational institutions, as well as for the legislative and executive agencies of our Government concerned with canal questions, I quote the text, footnotes, and bibliography:

### LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENTS ON THE PANAMA CANAL

(A research paper submitted to the head of the Department of English, History, and Government, by Mark M. Golden, midshipman, first class, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., February 1960)

#### I. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this paper is to study the most feasible of the proposed long-range improvements on the transisthmian waterway across Central America. The plans presented will be analyzed from the mission point of view; to provide a shortcut for shipping with reasonable tolls, minimum navigational hazards, and few delays in transit. The alternate plans are for (1) conversion of the present Panama Canal to an enlarged, modernized, lock-terminal lake canal; (2) conversion of the present Panama Canal to sea level; and (3) construction of a completely new canal through Nicaragua.

Some of the major factors to be considered are future traffic trends, cost, marine operational feasibility, diplomatic implications, and military defense.

#### II. THE PRESENT PANAMA CANAL

The Panama Canal is a lock and lake-type canal which provides a waterway for oceangoing vessels to use as a shortcut between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Fresh water is used for lockages, and is taken principally from Gatun Lake. Madden Lake serves as a reservoir for use during the dry season.

The minimum dimensions of the channel are 300 feet wide in Gaillard Cut and 37 feet deep at low tide in Balboa Harbor. From the Cristobal breakwater at the Atlantic terminus to San Jose Rock at the Pacific terminus the channel has a length of 51.2 miles, measured along its 23 courses.[1]

Transiting from Balboa Harbor at the Pacific entrance to the Atlantic Ocean terminus, ships encounter several major features of the Panama Canal. First they are raised to the 54 feet of elevation of Miraflores Lake by two pairs of Miraflores locks.[2] About 1 mile further, the single pair of Pedro Miguel Locks raises ships to the level of Gatun Lake, which is regulated between 82 and 87 feet. Gaillard Cut is the channel extension of Gatun Lake through the Continental Divide. At the northern edge of Gatun Lake, three continuous pairs of Gatun Locks lower ships to the level of the Atlantic Ocean.[3]

The locks themselves are built in two parallel lanes in order to handle two-way traffic. The size of the lock chambers, 1,000 feet long by 110 feet wide, is the factor that limits the size of transiting ships.[4]

The Panama Canal is operated and maintained by the Panama Canal Company, a corporate agency and instrumentality of the U.S. Government. The Panama Canal Company is financially self-sufficient, and not only pays for its own operation and depreciation, but also produces a net income.[5]

#### III. THE NEED FOR A CANAL

The Panama Canal is vital to the defense of the United States and the commerce of the world. The extreme weakness of extending lines of communications around the Horn was first felt by the United States during the Spanish-American War. The cruiser *Oregon*, which was berthed in San Francisco Harbor, consumed 90 days before being able to take part in the Battle of Santiago de Cuba. Fueling and replenishing had to be done by putting into South American ports en route.[6] In the present era of long-range warships with high cruising speeds, the voyage around the Horn has been greatly

---

[1] Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Balboa Heights, 1947); 7. Hereafter cited as "Report of Government."

[2] All elevations given in this paper are above mean sea level.

[3] Panama Canal Company, "The Panama Canal" (n.p., n.d.), 16; and Report of Government, 7.

[4] Armed Forces Information and Education Division, "The Panama Canal—An Outpost of Hemisphere Defense," Armed Forces Talk 373 (May 18, 1951); 7.

[5] William G. Arey to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, July 17, 1959 (letter); 1–2.

[6] Andre Siegfried, Suez and Panama (New York, 1940); 285–286.

simplified. However, with the prospect of undeclared lightning warfare, time is so vital that the difference of even a few days could lose a war.

From the merchant marine point of view, the payment of tolls to go through the Panama Canal is cheaper than the delay that would result from an ideal, uneventful rounding of the Horn.[7] And the weather conditions in the Horn area are usually far from ideal. Also to be taken into consideration are the additional expenses of fuel and supplies for the longer trip. In fact, during the recent Suez crisis, some shipping found it more economical to use the Panama Canal than to steam around the Cape of Good Hope.[8]

During both World War II and the Korean conflict, the Panama Canal played a major part in transoceanic shipping. In World War II about 5,300 combat vessels and over 8,500 support vessels (transports, supply ships, et cetera made the transit through the Panama Canal. Throughout 1953, the last full year of the Korean conflict, 1,064 U.S. Government ships locked through the canal. Most of these vessels were carrying supplies and war materials to the Far East.[9]

As mentioned previously, a size limitation is imposed on ships by the dimensions of the lock chambers. The only merchant vessels that are too large to use the Canal are *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*.[10] *Midway* and *Forrestal* class aircraft carriers are the only American warships that cannot fit in the Canal.[11] A war would probably force the conversion of *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* from North Atlantic passenger ships to troop transports for use anywhere in the world. The flexibility of these ships and the supercarriers would be increased if they had the ability to transit the canal. Also, present trends in ship contruction, especially of tankers, are toward longer and wider vessels.

### IV. OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE CANAL

The Panama Canal today has two major flaws, other than dimensions of the locks, that were inherent in the original construction. First, the Pacific locks are in two separate groups; the Pedro Miguel locks and the Miraflores locks. They should have been built together in one continuous structure, as were the Atlantic locks. The second fault is the lack of a summit level anchorage between Gaillard Cut and the Pacific locks.[12]

As a ship makes the approach to the Miraflores locks from the Pacific Ocean, a small boat rows out from the central wall with leader lines. The ship is maneuvered until it is dead in the water, and lines are secured to electric locomotives that move the ship through the locks area. The entire procedure must be repeated to go through the nearby Pedro Miguel locks. At least an hour is lost and additional hazards are undergone as a result of the extra approach.[13]

The most dangerous area of the Panama Canal is just north of the Pedro Miguel locks. A tremendous volume of water is drawn from Gaillard Cut each time the Pedro Miguel locks are filled, causing a surge reaching speeds of 25 knots and having an amplitude up to 3 feet. At times the surge overpowers vessels, resulting in their grounding on the rocky banks of Gaillard Cut.[14] The accident statistics illustrate that the safety of ships depends too much on the exceptional skill of the pilot, rather than the operational characteristics built into the canal.

If passage through Gaillard Cut is dangerous in clear weather, it is more hazardous in fog. This section of the channel is frequently covered with a heavy fog at night after 2200 hours.[15] In fair weather or foul, the Pedro Miguel locks are a dangerous constriction to traffic in their present location. The resulting traffic delay would be eased by having a summit level anchorage between Gaillard Cut and the Pacific locks.

### V. THE TERMINAL LAKE—THIRD LOCKS PLAN

An obvious solution for the principal marine operational problems of the Panama Canal is that developed in the canal organization during World War II and presented by its author before the Panama Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers on May 20, 1943. Known as the Terminal Lake, third locks plan, it calls for the relocation of the Pacific locks in one continuous structure at Agua Dulce, an area near the present Miraflores locks. The level of Miraflores Lake would then be elevated from its present 54 feet to the height of Gatun Lake. The entire summit water level would be raised to 92 feet.[16]

Before work on the unsuccessful third locks project of World War II was halted, some $75 million was expended, for the most part on excavating.[17] The proposed modification includes construction of new and larger locks, using the excavations already started for the discontinued third locks project, but without sharp approach channel curves.[18]

In 1943 the cost of the Terminal Lake, third locks plan was estimated to be $283 million for all work except the widening of Gaillard Cut.[19] A more recent estimate, for the project with lock chambers 1,500 feet long and 200 feet wide, is $1,020,920,000. This proposed size would needlessly double the flooding volume of the lock chambers, which would double the consumption of fresh water.[20] Because of dry seasons in Panama, the additional water requirement would necessitate the construction of reservoirs in territory outside the 10 mile treaty width of the Canal Zone. This in turn would mean negotiating a new treaty with the Republic of Panama at a most inopportune time.[21] Locks with dimensions of 140 x 1,200 feet would be capable of handling modern aircraft carriers, and would be half the cost of the larger ones.[22]

This plan is unique in that it not only takes into consideration the engineering feasibility, but also is based on marine operating experience and painstaking studies of marine accidents throughout Panama Canal history. The completed project would eliminate the dangerous surge in Gaillard Cut, remove the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks, effectively widen constricted channel areas, provide the badly needed summit level anchorage, improve navigation, reduce the effect of fog on operations, save time now wasted on an additional approach to the Pacific locks, and increase the capacity of the canal.[23]

### VI. THE SEA LEVEL PLAN

In December of 1945, the Governor of the Panama Canal was authorized by Congress to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the transisthmian canal problem, with the proviso that the results of the studies be submitted by the end of 1947. The Canal Zone Government radically interpreted the phrase "capacity and security" from their authorization to mean making defense the main consideration for their recommendations.

Advocates of the sea level canal point out that a single atomic bomb or a well-directed attack with conventional explosives could put a lock canal out of commission for an extended period of time by either of the following means: (1) Seriously damaging the lock structures or (2) draining the water supply in the terminal lake by breaching one or more of its dams.[24] Actually, a sea level canal would be no better off than a lock type. A nuclear explosion would so severely damage even a sea level canal that prompt repairs would be impossible.[25] If an atomic or hydrogen bomb were detonated in the vicinity of Gaillard Cut, the blast would probably cause major landslides which could conceivably fill that portion of the channel. Using defense as a criterion for the long-range improvements on the Panama Canal is therefore unrealistic. There is no way any object can be made impervious by its construction features, as time will yield a means of destroying it.

The Governor's 1947 report recommended that "in order to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, the Panama Canal be converted to a canal at sea level."[26] The proposed plan calls for the draining of Gatun Lake to lower its surface to sea level. Some 1,069 million cubic yards of earth and rock would be excavated to construct a channel 60 feet deep at low tide and 600 feet wide at a depth of 40 feet below low tide.[27] Yet, wartime studies conclusively showed that the majority of marine accidents occurred in the restricted channel through Gaillard cut. Replacing the terminal lake with a restricted channel extending the entire length of the canal would increase navigational hazards.

There is also the possibility of slides occurring during excavation for a sea level canal. Geological studies made throughout the history of the Panama Canal have shown that the ground in Panama is not homogeneous. The earth on the Atlantic side is composed of tertiary sediments, while the Pacific side consists of tertiary volcanic rock. An instability results from the two types of ground not being capable of adhering to each other, which causes underground slides. Disintegration of rocks moistened by rain and humidity causes surface slides as the particles give way to gravity.[28] Both types of slides have plagued engineers from the time construction was begun on the Panama Canal.

The 1947 report points out that there is an inherent navigational difficulty in a sea level canal due to the different tides of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Tides at the Atlantic side generally do not vary more than 2 feet, and so are not a problem. The

---

[7] Interview with Col. William C. Golden, USA (St. Petersburg, Dec. 23, 1959).

[8] Idem.

[9] Panama Canal Company, 13.

[10] Armed Forces Information and Education Division, 7.

[11] There is also the possibility that the nuclear warships designed in the near future will be too large to use the Panama Canal.

[12] Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "And the Mountains Will Move" (Sanford University, 1947); 297. Hereafter cited as "Mts."

[13] Interview with Lt. R.R. Robertson, U.S. Navy (Annapolis, Jan. 22, 1960). Hereafter cited as "Robertson, 'Int.'"

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Jan. 5, 1959); 1.

[15] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Apr. 21, 1948); 2.

[16] DuVal, "Mts.", 342–343.

[17] Hon. Clark W. Thompson to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, Jan. 6, 1960 (letter on "The Isthmian Question"); 6. Hereafter cited as "Thompson, 'Isth. Question.'"

[18] The Third Locks project contained three sharp angles in by-pass channels of 28°59', 46°17', and 37°30'.

[19] Thompson, "Isth. Question," 6.

[20] M. R. McCann to Hon. Clark W. Thompson, 1959 (letter with comments on proposed Panama Canal improvement projects from a consulting engineer); 2. Hereafter cited as "McCann."

[21] See sec. VII of this paper.

[22] McCann, 2.

[23] Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings (March 1955); 270.

[24] Report of Government, 61.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Apr. 21, 1948); 3.

[26] Report of Government, 114.

[27] Ibid., 79.

[28] Siegfried, 210.

Pacific tides vary as much as 22 feet over a period of 12 hours from low to high tide. The tidal variations on the Pacific side of the present Panama Canal cause a 2- to 4-knot current in the vicinity of Rodman Naval Base, south of the Miraflores Locks.[29] The sea level channel would probably result in alternating currents up to 4.5 knots throughout the sea level canal. The solution in the 1947 report is to install a tidal regulating device near the Pacific terminus of the proposed canal, to be used twice daily, during the times of maximum currents. A barrier to an unrestricted bypass channel would be opened at all times the currents are below 2 knots. Since the tidal lock would function only to lift ships in or out of the canal, there would be no summit lake.[30]

The initial estimated cost in 1947 for conversion to sea level was $2,483 million, but this estimate did not include the costs involved in negotiating a new canal treaty with Panama. Since then construction costs have doubled. The present day costs of converting the Panama Canal to sea level would not be an appreciable savings over construction costs of a new canal through Nicaragua.[31]

VII. A CANAL THROUGH NICARAGUA

The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of 1914 between the United States and Nicaragua gives the United States the exclusive option to construct, maintain, operate, and protect a transisthmian canal through Nicaragua.[32] This route has been the major rival of the Panama route throughout canal history.

Although the Nicaraguan route is considerably longer, it is simplified by the many natural waterways present. Lake Nicaragua has an average elevation of 104 feet and has maximum dimensions of 45 by 100 miles. Lake Managua, with an average elevation of 127 feet, is 40 by 20 miles, and drains into Lake Nicaragua through the Tipitapa River. The proposed route features the use of the Deseado and San Juan Rivers to Lake Nicaragua. It would go across the southern end of Lake Nicaragua, then along a channel to be excavated through the Continental Divide. This takes advantage of the pass through the Continental Divide being at its most favorable ground profile at a relatively low elevation of 153 feet.[33]

The lakes provide the principal means of transportation and communications in Nicaragua. The construction of a sea level canal would entail the draining of at least one of the major lakes. Furthermore, excavation for such a canal would be prohibitively costly. Any canal through Nicaragua would have to be of the lock type.

A summit lake-lock canal similar to the Panama Canal, but enlarged and modernized, could be completed for $4,095 million. The use of the lakes would leave only a narrow part of the route to be excavated, and conditions along the route appear to be ideal for nuclear blasting.[34]

Some of the more important defects of the Nicaraguan route are as follows:[35]

1. Panama has good harbors on both terminal points of the Panama Canal. Nicaraguan harbors would have to be built with considerable difficulty.

2. One region along the Nicaraguan route has an annual rainfall of 256 inches, which would pose a real problem for excavation and construction.

3. The large amount of rainfall would mean poor marine operating weather.

4. There are active volcanoes and occasional earthquakes in the route area.

5. There is a complete lack of construction, not only for a canal, but of essential housing and facilities for workers.

Therefore, from the engineering point of view, it is obvious that Panama is the better route.

VIII. DIPLOMATIC IMPLICATIONS

It has become the vogue among some officials in the Government of Panama, as well as influential merchants and wealthy aristocrats, to divert the Panamanian working class from noticing their own pocket lining by making an international issue of Canal Zone sovereignty. The friction has been increased lately by having outside elements hop on the bandwagon. Nasser of Egypt was quick to offer lessons in canal management, although the original treaties with Panama were nothing like the Suez agreements. The Suez Canal was to have been built and controlled for 99 years after its opening by a private company formed under deLesseps—and would have been returned to the Government of Egypt within the next decade if Nasser had not abrogated the pledges.[36]

Nasser was not the only power to back Panama. In February, 1959, the 21st congress of the Communist Party, at their meeting in Moscow, stressed assigning agents for infiltration into Latin America to forment hatred toward the "arrogant Yankees" that might eventually lead toward internationalization of the Panama Canal.[37] This did not mark the first signs of Communist activities in Panama. To gain a foothold in a focal area of the Western Hemisphere is as old a concept for the Communists as the party itself. Their plans to take over the Panama Canal are a major steppingstone toward their goal of world domination.

Three times, Panamanian mobs marched on the Canal Zone to plant Panamanian flags there. The first time was on May 2, 1958, and the second was on November 3, 1959. The second invasion, led by Dr. Quilino Boyd, a candidate for the Presidency of Panama, resulted in 4 hours of violence. Known Communists and fellow travelers were spotted in the crowd. During the rioting, the U.S. Embassy in Panama overheard broadcasts instructing the Panamanian National Guard [38] not to intervene in any demonstrations against the United States. As a result, the mobs were able to surround the U.S. Embassy in Panama and leisurely desecrate the American flag.[39]

The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between Panama and the United States is in effect today. The key articles of the treaty grant exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity for the perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, and specifically, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. Thus the only interest that Panama can have in the Canal Zone is one of reversionary nature in the sole event the United States should discontinue its operation of the Panama Canal.[40]

The treaty of 1903 was a recognition of a fact admitted even by many leading Panamanians today—that the Republic of Panama is too politically and economically unstable to be able to handle a major project such as the Panama Canal. Rather than consider this a reflection on the good people of Panama, it should be an indication of their foresight. However, they seem to be losing their perspective lately.

Fortunately, the U.S. Congress has several well-informed spokesmen on the issue of sovereignty of the Canal Zone. Although the State Department of the United States wants to use a policy of concessions, the Congress is looking out for the United States, and will not tolerate the actions of Panama in trying to grab what they have no right to, either morally or by the supreme law of their land.

The United States made the Panama Canal. Not just with steamshovels and cement—but with blood and sweat; with victims of yellow fever and malaria; with people like the great Rear Adm. John G. Walker, Theodore Roosevelt, John F. Stevens, William C. Gorgas, George W. Goethals, William L. Sibert, and many others. The American people must guard their investment carefully.

IX. SUMMARY

The Panama Canal has safely and adequately served its purpose since its opening to traffic on August 15, 1914. The trend toward increasing traffic and the few flaws originally built into the Panama Canal require long-range improvements in the near future.

Recent political developments in the Republic of Panama indicate a desire to abrogate the grant in perpetuity of sovereign powers over the Canal Zone to the United States. Although the State Department of the United States has long been inclined to make concessions to Panama, the Congress is fighting the the rights of the United States according to treaty and law. If the Canal Zone should slip out of the hands of the United States, or if there is a probability that it will, the construction of a new transisthmian waterway through Nicaragua should be seriously considered.

Any extravagant and unnecessary expenditures on the Panama Canal would have to be reflected in considerably higher tolls, which would defeat the mission of the Panama Canal to commercial shipping. With this in mind, any routes other than Panama or Nicaragua must be ruled out. The stupidity of spending more for no special advantages, but rather several major disadvantages, also applies to the conversion of the present Panama Canal to sea level.

It is a matter of conjecture to say whether a sea level or a lock canal could be more seriously damaged by an atomic bomb. It is a matter of fact to realize that either type would be so seriously damaged that defense should not be a factor in laying out long-range plans.

From the marine operating point of view, the only plan that adequately provides for safe transit of ships and the anticipated increase in traffic at economic cost is the terminal lake-third locks plan. By replacing the heterogeneous Pacific locks with a continuous structure at Agua Dulce, the Pedro Miguel bottleneck is removed, dangerous lockage surges in Gaillard Cut are eliminated, and a terminal lake anchorage is provided—without interrupting the use of the Panama Canal for an extended period of time.

The 1947 report recommended that a sea level canal replace the present Panama Canal. The plan is unrealistic, as it would dangerously increase the probability of collisions and groundings by replacing the relatively wide lakes with a restricted channel. Possibly the recommendation was influenced by powerful companies interested

---

[29] Robertson, "Int."

[30] Report of Government, 73–74.

[31] McCann, 3.

[32] W. L. Bales, "The Nicaraguan Canal; a Study in American Diplomatic History From the Beginning of Trans-Isthmian Canal Discussions to 1926" (Quantico, 1930); 107.

[33] Report of Government, 28.

[34] McCann, 3.

[35] Willis John Abbott, "Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose" (New York, 1913); 23–38.

[36] William Storrs Lee, "The Strength To Move a Mountain" (New York, 1958).

[37] Dan Smoot, "Panama Canal—Part I, "The Dan Smoot Report (Dec. 21, 1959); 407.

[38] The Panamanian National Guard serves both as the army and as the police force.

[39] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Jan. 13, 1960); 423.

[40] Ibid., 357.

in the tremendous bulk of excavating the plan requires. Also, to convert to sea level might involve closing the Panama Canal for an extended period of time.

X. CONCLUSIONS

A firm political stand should be taken against the efforts of the Republic of Panama to acquire, bit by bit, sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Then the terminal lake-third locks project should be started to increase the capacity and safety of the Panama Canal. Should the United States lose control of the Canal Zone, the Nicaraguan lock canal plan could be made operational, although at a greatly increased cost.

REFERENCES CONSULTED

*I. Nonofficial publications, individual*

Willis John Abbot, "Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose"; New York: Syndicate Publishing Co., 1913.

W. L. Bates, "The Nicaraguan Canal; a Study in American Diplomatic History from the Beginning of Trans-Isthmian Canal Discussions to 1926"; Quantico: Marine Corps Schools Press, 1930.

Reuben E. Bakenhus; Capt. Harry S. Knapp, U.S. Navy; and Emory R. Johnson, "The Panama Canal"; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1915.

Samuel Flagg Bemis, "The Latin American Policy of the United States"; New York: Harcourt, Bruce & Co., 1943.

Ira E. Bennett, "History of the Panama Canal; Its Construction and Builders"; Washington: Historical Publishing Co., 1915.

Joseph Bucklin Bishop, "The Panama Gateway"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Philippe Bunsu-Varilla, "From Panama to Verdun"; Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co., 1940.

Floyd Cramer, "Our Neighbor Nicaragua"; New York: Stokes, 1929.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "And the Mountains Will Move"; Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1947.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Cadiz to Cathay"; Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1940–1947.

Esteben Escobar, "Biografia del General Dom Pedro Joaquin Chemorro, 1818–1890"; Managua: Tipografia la Prensa, 1935.

John Foster Fraser, "Panama and What It Means"; London: Cassell & Co., Ltd., 1913.

Willis Fletcher Johnson, "Four Centuries of the Panama Canal"; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1906.

J. H. Latane, "A History of American Foreign Policy"; New York: Doubleday, 1934.

William Storrs Lee, "The Strength To Move a Mountain"; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.

Norman Judson Padelford, "The Panama Canal in Peace and War"; New York: The MacMillan Co., 1942.

Luis Quintanilla, "A Latin American Speaks"; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943.

Andre Siegried, "Suez and Panama"; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1940.

Arthur P. Whitaker, "The United States and South America"; "The Northern Republics"; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

*II. Official and semiofficial publications*

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; Washington: Government Printing Office

January 6, 1948: "The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering?"

April 21, 1948: "What of the Panama Canal?"

May 21, 1948: "Tribute to the Late Sidney B. Williamson."

May 28, 1948: "Panama Canal Problem."

January 5, 1949: "Panama Boondoggling."

October 13, 1949: "Panama Canal—President Theodore Roosevelt's Decision."

January 15, 1952: "Interoceanic Canal Problems."

June 4, 1956: "Panama Canal Improvements: Views of Experienced Engineers."

May 24, 1957: "The Panama Canal."

May 29, 1957: "Panama Canal: U.S. Ownership and Control."

March 26, 1958: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States."

April 2, 1958: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States—Further Supplementary."

June 9, 1958: "Panama Canal—Latest Developments."

January 15, 1959: "Panama Canal: More on 'Digging the Ditch.' "

June 17, 1959: "The Untold Story of Panama."

August 26, 1959: "Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD awarded the certificate of merit of the Patriotic Order Sons of America."

September 7, 1959: "Birth Centennial of Theodore Roosevelt—Notable Canal Zone Celebration."

September 9, 1959: "Communist Triple Threat: CIA Findings."

January 13, 1960: "The Panama Canal: Symbol of a Fourth Front."

January 27, 1960: "Panama Canal Zone: 'Yankee Go Home.' "

Gov. J. C. Mchaffey, "Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal Under Public Law 280," 79th Congress, 1st session; Balboa Heights, 1947.

Sullivan and Cromwell, Comp., "Compilation of Executive Documents and Diplomatic Correspondence Relative to a Trans-Isthmian Canal in Central America"; New York: Job Printing House, 1955.

Toribio Tijerino, "El Tratado Chamorro-Bryant y Sus Proyecciones en la America Central"; Managua: Tipografia La Prensa, 1953.

*III. Periodicals and pamphlets*

Armed Forces Information and Education Division: "The Panama Canal—An Outpost of Hemisphere Defense," Armed Forces Talk 373, May 18, 1951, pages 1–15.

Mary Barclay, "Panama Canal—Lifeline of National Defense," Report to America, January 1960, pages 4–5.

Douglas B. Cornell, "Panama Canal More Important by the Minute," St. Petersburg Times, January 24, 1960.

Leon Debayle, "Historia del Canal de Nicaragua," Revista de la Academia de Geografia e Historia de Nicaragua, Diciembre 1947, pages 87–99.

Deslant Staff, "Destroyerman," November 1959, page 8.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1955, pages 262–331.

Earl Harding, Economic Council Letter 341, August 15, 1954.

John V. Horner, "Stakes in Row Over Panama's Sovereignty," the Washington Star, January 17, 1960.

Capt. William R. McDaniel, U.S. Army, "Nicaragua, Land of Lakes," June 1940, pages 17–19, 43–46.

Panama Canal Company, "The Panama Canal, Funnel for World Commerce" (not dated—estimated 1952).

Dan Smoot, "Panama Canal—Part I," The Dan Smoot Report, December 21, 1959.

D. I. Sultan, "An Army Engineer Explores Nicaragua," National Geographic, May 1932, pages 593–627.

Luis Marden, "Land of Lakes and Volcanoes," National Geographic, August 1944, pages 161–184.

Herbert D. Vogel, "Panama Canal Problem Calls for Action," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, December 1947, p. 1348.

*IV. Manuscripts*

William G. Arey, to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, U.S. Navy, letter with summary of recommendations made in 1947 by Canal Zone, Gov. J. E. Mehaffey, July 17, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, to the President of the United States, open letter on treaties with Panama, December 3, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, November 14, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, December 6, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, December 24, 1959.

M. R. McCann, to Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, letter with comments on proposed Panama Canal improvement projects from a consulting engineer, 1959.

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, U.S. Navy, letter on "The Isthmian Question," January 6, 1960.

*V. Interviews*

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy (retired); at Comos Club, Washington, January 3, 1960. Background: Captain of the Port, Balboa, Canal Zone, 1941–44, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific Sector of the Canal; Navy Department Liaison Officer and Coordinator of Isthmian Canal studies under the Chief of Naval Operations, 1946–49.

Col. William Charles Golden, U.S. Army (retired); at his home in St. Petersburg, December 23, 1959. Background: Staff officer at Headquarters, U.S. Army Caribbean, Fort Amador, Canal Zone, 1949–51; Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Forces Antilles, 1952–53.

Lt. R. R. Robertson, U.S. Navy; at Bancroft Hall, Annapolis, January 22, 1960. Background: Commanding officer, U.S.S. *Jasper*, PC486, immediately prior to reporting to the U.S. Naval Academy in June 1959.

## SOVIET ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during his barbaric performance in Paris Mr. Khrushchev made an interesting observation. He swore that before God his hands were clean and his heart was pure. I wonder just how clean they are. I wonder if they are any cleaner than they were the day he signed the order for the horror of Hungary. I wonder just how pure a heart can be that seeks to replace freedom with slavery, that substitutes falsehoods for truth, that corrupts words until they are meaningless. I wonder how pure a heart can be that calls upon God while the very system which he leads denies the existence of God. I remember when I was in Russia, a student at the university told me that he believed that there was a God but could never discuss it with anyone because if it were found out he would be considered unfit to attend Moscow University. He said the Communist teachings deny God and that the state was supreme, and that to believe in God was considered a weakness.

The Soviet Government seeks to keep recent events alive by today moving to have the U–2 incident taken up by the Security Council at the United Nations.

I thought perhaps it would be of interest to all who are interested to take a look at the bloody hands of Khrushchev and to peer into his black heart on the matter of espionage.

I thought perhaps this House would be interested in a bill of particulars on the espionage activities of the Soviet

Union and its Communist apparatus. These activities were carried on relentlessly, regardless of the temperature of the cold war. Of course this list cannot be complete. Many cases are classified, others for various security reasons have never been reported. These cases are documented and supported by evidence of which there is no reasonable doubt. Further, it does not take into consideration cases which could not be proven by the rules of American jurisprudence.

This present posture of American-Soviet relations emphasizes once again the great difficulties of dealing with the Communists. They who deny God call upon God to assist their case. They who invented and perfected international subversion and espionage find themselves able to condemn the U.S. activities which were undertaken not only for our own defense but on the defense of the entire free world.

It places us in a position where we must constantly justify our need to survive in the minds of our friends who themselves are the beneficiaries of our own survival.

I do hope that this information will, in some small way, contribute to a better understanding of the magnitude of the problem we face.

If it does nothing else I do hope that it will serve as one more indictment of communism and of Khrushchev. If Mr. Khrushchev insists in bringing the U–2 incident before the Security Council, let us bring his record of espionage before the Security Council and have a full disclosure of all the facts laid before the court of world opinion.

Let us also bring before the Security Council the entire record of Communist sabotage to peace, to progress, to understanding, to freedom, to governments, to nations, to the mind of man, and to the principles of God.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a bill of particulars on reported cases of Soviet espionage in the United States and other Western Allied nations that I hereby make part of this record:

(NOTE.—Those instances involving diplomatic personnel are indicated by the word "diplomatic.")

Vice President NIXON, in a speech in Syracuse, N.Y., said that two Soviet spies were arrested in Massachusetts while Premier Khrushchev was in the United States last fall.

May 18, 1960 (diplomatic): The State Department has just confirmed that one of them was a Soviet employee with the United Nations. His name was Vadin Alexandrovich Kirilyvk. He was here on a diplomatic passport. A request was made that his services to the United Nations be terminated. He was expelled from this country and returned to Russia. The name of the other is still classified.

May 11, 1960 (diplomatic): The Swiss Government arrested and expelled two Soviet Embassy officials for attempting to collect secret information on Swiss army installations and U.S. rocket bases in West Germany.

April 1, 1960: Anthony M. Wraight, a former Royal Air Force officer, was found guilty in London of having given military information to Russia and was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

January 30, 1960: Horst Ludwig and Fritz Briesemeister were sentenced by a West German court to 4 and 5 years at hard labor, respectively, for treason. Two other defendants, Werner Jaeger and his wife, Hanni, were sentenced to 3 years and 18 months.

February 21, 1959: Einar Bleckinberg, a former Danish diplomat, was sentenced in Copenhagen to 8 years in prison for spying on behalf of Communist Poland.

November 20, 1958: Lt. Hans Berli was sentenced by a Swiss military court to 4 years hard labor for giving classified military secrets to Czech agents.

November 20, 1958: Mark Zborowski was convicted of perjury in denying to a Federal grand jury investigating espionage that he had known Jack Soble. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

July 18, 1958: Brian Linney, an engineer, was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment by a British court for selling secret information to Col. Oldrich Pribyl, a former Czech military attaché in England.

June 7, 1958 (diplomatic): Nikolai I. Kurochkin, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for the improper procurement of U.S. Army manuals and other materials.

May 19, 1958 (diplomatic): Aleksandr Solovyev, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Rome, after being detained on charges of espionage was asked to leave Italy.

February 21, 1958: M. Sgt. Roy A. Rhodes was convicted by a U.S. Army court-martial of conspiring to deliver U.S. secrets to the Soviet Union and was sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment at hard labor and was dishonorably discharged.

November 15, 1957: Col. Rudolf I. Abel, a Soviet intelligence officer, was sentenced to 30 years in prison and fined $3,000 for passing U.S. defense and atomic secrets to Russia.

November 1957: German officials reveal that a former first lieutenant in the West German Air Force has been convicted of espionage.

October 8, 1957: Jack Soble was sentenced to 7 years in prison after pleading guilty to heading a spy ring for the Soviet Union.

September 25, 1957: An Austrian Customs Service official was arrested for espionage and confessed that he turned information over to Czech Communist agents.

September 20, 1957: U.S. Air Force Capt. George French was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment for attempting to sell military secrets to the Soviet Union.

September 5, 1957: A former Japanese Foreign Office official was fined and sentenced to prison for selling secrets to a Soviet agent.

August 9, 1957: Jacob Albam was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to espionage in behalf of the Soviet Union as a member of the Soble spy ring.

August 9, 1957: Myra Soble, wife of Jack Soble, was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to charges of espionage.

July 23, 1957: West German security officials broke a Communist spy ring headquartered in a Bonn hotel.

May 7, 1957: Three men were sentenced to death in Greece after being convicted of treason and espionage for the Soviet Union. Another man was given a life sentence and five other persons were given lesser terms.

April 24, 1957: Robert Folke Damstedt, assistant secretary of the Swedish Atomic Energy Commission, was convicted of stealing secret papers, and was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

March 16, 1957 (diplomatic): Jiri Stejskal, third secretary of the Czechoslovak Legation in Vienna, was expelled from Austria for attempting to bribe a police official to carry out espionage work.

March 12, 1957: A Swedish court sentenced Bedros Zartaryan, a Turkish engineer employed by a firm which was building Swedish naval and airbases, to 10 years at hard labor for grand espionage for the Soviet Union.

February 27, 1957 (diplomatic): The Danish Government expelled Soviet Lt. Comdr. Mikhail Ruditchev, assistance naval attaché of the Soviet Embassy, on the grounds that he was attempting to obtain secret military information.

January 28, 1957 (diplomatic): Vassili M. Molev, a clerk attached to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata by the State Department. He was later named as a coconspirator in the indictment of the Sobles' spy ring.

January 14, 1957 (diplomatic): Maj. Yuri P. Krylov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for purchasing classified electronic equipment and attempting to purchase secret military information.

December 18, 1956 (diplomatic): Mate Vegh, former Hungarian second secretary, was expelled from Switzerland for spying.

October 5, 1956: Jean Joseph Philip, a code clerk at the Budapest Legation in Paris, and Roger Dubois, legation press attaché, were convicted in France of spying for the Hungarian secret service and were sentenced to imprisonment.

October 5, 1956: Anatole Ericson, a radar instrument maker, was convicted of giving military secrets to Russia by a Swedish court and sentenced to 12 years at hard labor.

September 5, 1956 (diplomatic): Sweden expelled Peter Mirosnikov for receiving secret data from Anatole Ericson and sent a formal protest to Moscow about its spy activities in that country.

August 29, 1956 (diplomatic): Rostislav Shapovalov, second secretary of the Soviet mission to the U.N., was requested to leave the United States after it was discovered that he exerted pressure on a Russian refugee in the United States to become a Soviet agent.

August 24, 1956 (diplomatic): Victor I. Petrov, a translator in the languages section on the U.N. Secretariat, was discharged from the United Nations after the U.S. delegation issued a statement saying that Petrov had sought to get information vital to the security and defense of the United States.

July 13, 1956 (diplomatic): Gennadi Popov, the Soviet second secretary, was expelled from Canada for spying.

June 14, 1956 (diplomatic): Col. Ivan A. Bubchikov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for activities incompatible to his continued presence in this country.

March 1, 1956 (diplomatic): Maj. Anatoli Kuznetsov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Teheran, was expelled from Iran after being arrested with Iranian Air Force Warrant Officer Hussein Rejaei Tehrani who confessed to espionage.

September 14, 1955: An Australian Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage released its report. The Commission, created after Vladimir Petrov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, sought asylum from the Russians on April 13, 1954, declared that two Soviet spy apparatuses had been functioning in Australia since 1943. At least 120 Australians, all of whom were Communists, assisted the Soviet spy rings but because of the Australian law on espionage and the admissibility of evidence no prosecutions were undertaken.

December 22, 1954 (diplomatic): Maj. Ludvik Sochor, Czech military attaché in Geneva, and two of his assistants were expelled from Switzerland for espionage.

August 28, 1954: Nobunori Higurashi, a Japanese Foreign Office official, committed suicide after he had confessed to giving secret information to a Soviet spy ring. The central figure in the ring was Yuri A. Rastvorov, former member of the Soviet mission

to Tokyo, who has been granted political asylum in the United States. Two other Foreign Office officials have also been implicated.

May 29, 1954 (diplomatic): Leonid E. Pivnev, assistant air attaché in the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Alexander P. Kovalev, second secretary to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations was declared persona non grata and expelled for espionage activities.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Igor A. Amosov, assistant naval attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

October 31, 1953: Private Robert W. Dorey was sentenced to 15 years in prison after pleading guilty to fleeing to East Germany, then twice returning to the U.S. zone with Soviet agents whom he guided around U.S. military installations.

June 8, 1953 (diplomatic): Yuri Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy, was named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment. He was then declared persona non grata by the U.S. Government and returned to the Soviet Union.

June 8, 1953: Kurt Ponger and Otto Verber were convicted of conspiracy to procure and transmit Army, Air Force, and aircraft plant data to the Soviet Union. They were sentenced to 5 to 15 years and 3½ to 10 years in prison, respectively.

June 8, 1953: Air Force Staff Sergeant Giusseppe Cascio was convicted by court-martial in Taegu, Korea, of conspiracy to give jet plane secrets to the Communists. He was given a 20-year jail sentence and a dishonorable discharge.

June 5, 1953: William Perl was sentenced to 5 years in prison for perjury for having told a grand jury in 1950 that he did not know atom spies Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell.

May 30, 1953 (diplomatic): Christache Zambeti, first secretary of the Rumanian Legation in Washington, was declared persona non grata for attempting to blackmail a U.S. citizen into espionage acts.

February 25, 1953: Lev. C. Pissarev, Tass correspondent, was deported from the Netherlands for spying after being arrested on December 23 in the act of receiving secret documents from a Dutch official who was cooperating with the police.

February 4, 1953: William Remington was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951 when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Elizabeth Bentley, a self-styled Communist spy. He was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

October 1952: Nikolai Skvartsov, a political officer in the United Nations Department of Security Council Affairs, was discharged after the State Department notified the U.N. that he had "violated a U.S. law."

November 14, 1951: Ernest Hilding Andersson, a petty officer in the Swedish Navy, was sentenced to life imprisonment after being found guilty of "gross espionage" for the Soviet Union. Andersson admitted supplying Russians with secret data on the Swedish Navy, coastal defense installations, and suitable invasion areas along the coast of northern Sweden. He named N. P. Orlov, Konstantin Vinogradov, a Soviet Embassy secretary, and Tass correspondent Victor Anissimov as his accomplices.

September 26, 1951 (diplomatic): Nicholai P. Orlov, the assistant naval secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm, was ordered to leave Sweden immediately in connection with the Andersson espionage case.

April 6, 1951: David Greenglass admitted to giving atomic data to the Fuchs-Gold ring while working as an Army technician at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

April 5, 1951: Morton Sobell was sentenced to 30 years in prison for giving nonatomic secrets to the Fuchs-Gold spy ring.

April 5, 1951: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were sentenced to death for procuring and transmitting United States atom bomb secrets to Russia during and after the Second World War. They were both executed on June 19, 1953.

December 9, 1950: Harry Gold pleaded guilty to transmitting atomic secrets to the Russians and received a 30-year prison sentence.

November 22, 1950: Miriam Moskowitz was convicted (together with A. Brothman) of conspiring to mislead a grand jury and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10,000.

November 22, 1950: Abraham Brothman was convicted of conspiring to mislead a grand jury (which was investigating espionage) and of influencing Harry Gold to give false statements to the jury. He was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment and fined $15,000. In July 1951, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the 2-year sentence and $10,000 fine for misleading a grand jury, but reversed the 5-year sentence and $5,000 fine for influencing Gold.

September 22, 1950: Alfred D. Slack pleaded guilty to giving samples of a secret explosive to Harry Gold and was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

April 15, 1950: Air Force Corporal Gustav Mueller was convicted of attempting to give U.S. military secrets to Russia. He was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor.

March 9, 1950 (diplomatic): Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee, was found guilty as Judith Coplon's codefendant. He was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment but the sentence was suspended on condition he leave the United States. Gubitchev sailed for Poland on March 20.

March 9, 1950: Judith Coplon, in her second trial, was found guilty of conspiracy to commit espionage and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. On December 5, 1950, the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the conviction on the grounds of illegal arrest and use of illegal wiretap evidence. The Supreme Court refused to review the case on January 28, 1952.

March 1, 1950: Klaus Fuchs was sentenced by a British court to 14 years imprisonment after pleading guilty to giving atomic secrets to Russia.

January 25, 1950: Alger Hiss was found guilty of lying to a grand jury in 1948 when he declared that he had never given any secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers, who then passed them on to the Soviet Union. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

October 31, 1949 (diplomatic): Dr. Erwin Munk and a clerk named Horvat of the Czech Embassy in Washington were declared persona non grata.

June 30, 1949: Judith Coplon was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia. She was sentenced to from 40 months to 10 years in prison. On January 28, 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that she was entitled to a new trial because the Government used illegal wiretap evidence. She was never retried on this charge.

May 1, 1946: Allan Nunn May, a British scientist who worked on atomic energy in Canada, was sentenced to 10 years in prison by a British court. May was part of the Soviet espionage ring in Canada which was exposed by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, who broke with the Russians and sought political asylum. Seventeen Soviet Embassy officials charged with espionage have been expelled from Canada. Eight Canadian citizens, including a member of Parliament, were convicted of espionage and given various jail sentences.

May 23, 1960: U.S. News & World Report described Communist espionage in West Germany as follows:

"Last year, in West Germany alone, 2,787 Communist spies were caught. * * * East Germany sent most of them * * * but 264 were from Russia, 114 from Poland, 63 from Czechoslovakia, 11 from Rumania, 8 from Hungary, and 2 from Bulgaria.

"During the first 4 months of this year, 820 more Communist agents were arrested, including 691 from East Germany, 72 from Russia. Yet only a fraction of all spies sent from the Soviet bloc to West Germany are caught.

"The current estimate is that 17,000 Communist spies are operating in West Germany. * * * Red agents also make West Berlin the kidnaping center of the world. Since the war they have tried 340 kidnapings, succeeded in 255.

"West German estimates of 17,000 active agents do not include either the 'silent group' (Polish, Czech, and Rumanian spies posing as refugees) or the 35,000 members of the outlawed West German Communist Party.

"Over the years, more than 15,000 Red agents have been arrested in West Germany. Of these, fewer than 2,000 have been convicted. Many were let off because they confessed, voluntarily, not long after they entered West Germany. Others showed they were coerced into spying by Red threats to their families."

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted follow:

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for week of May 23, on account of appointment as Congressional Adviser to the Eighth Pan American Highway Conference of Bogota, Colombia.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today, May 19, and through June 5, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for Thursday, May 19, 1960, on account of illness in family.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. KITCHIN (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, today on two subjects and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for 10 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON and include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. DIGGS in two instances.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 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:

2167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of April relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2168. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the development and procurement of nine different series of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2169. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2170. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## 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. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee of Conference. H.R. 10809. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1629). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 225. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to official recognition by the United States of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 627. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 672. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 12049. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633). 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. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 12309. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12310. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12311. A bill to extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is deaf; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 12313. A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAFORE:

H.R. 12314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 12315. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $5,000 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 12316. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12317. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 12318. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Francis Bellamy, the author of the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROKOP:

H.R. 12319. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12320. A bill to equalize certain rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a), (b), (c), (d), (1), and (j) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12321. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 12322. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 12323. A bill for the relief of Yoshinori Yamai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 12324. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12325. A bill for the relief of Rosalinda Tacdol; 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:

468. By Mr. BARR: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America for a hearing on the right to elect its officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

469. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Lynn, Mass., relative to enacting legislation granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Descendants of Israel Surmount Overwhelming Odds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 12th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, May 2, recalls a saga of a suffering people as potent, fraught with drama as a movie spectacular, and as intensely histrionic as the journey of Moses and his followers to the Promised Land.

Fiction writers would not dare the literary license of depicting the trials and tribulations of the wandering tribes of Israel. It is unbelievable to conceive the perpetuity of the dream of independence for Israel as it has coursed through generations of exiles without loss of one spark of its original fire.

Descendants of Israel, surmounting overwhelming odds in pursuit of their dream of a homeland, have worked to build Jewish pride and world respect, and clung tenaciously to the idea of rebuilding a Jewish commonwealth in the face of international manifestations of anti-Semitism and Nazi cruelty. For 2,000 years the vision of a new Zion has spurred a decimated people, tottering under the yoke of bloodthirsty attacks, yet faithful to the vow that "their hands would lose their cunning and their tongues cleave to the roofs of their mouths" if they forgot Jerusalem.

In the pilgrimage to Israel exiles came from 4 continents and 70 countries—singly, in single family groups, and in patriarchal clans; from behind the Iron Curtain; from behind store counters in the United States and Canada; from the remote Atlas Mountains and the bazaars of Casablanca; from the foggy grotesquerie of England and the parched deserts of the east. They came to pool their skills, their knowledge, and their finances, to be the forerunners in the creation of a great country, culled out of barren, acrid land; the earth to be tilled and cajoled into verdancy with loving hands and willing, if not strong, backs.

Exiles seeking the promise of this new frontier taxed the sparse resources to the bursting point.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, on the 10th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, commended the jews of the world for embodying the sole ally of infant Israel, "when the United Nations and all the nations of the world failed to come to Israel's aid." They sent money, and arms, and fighters, from 60 different countries to suckle and nurture the nestling state.

Israel has met in 12 years every threat to national security and integrity—communism, economic struggle, domestic strife, and the necessity for living within its narrow borders and absorbing all who wanted to come to Israel.

The people of Israel and the Jews of the world have the right to flex their muscles with pride of accomplishment and tenacity of purpose.

It is our hope that Israel in its struggle will serve as a criterion for African nations, now straining at the leash of colonialism and near to breaking the yoke of servitude.

In a century when man has mastered his physical hospice, and his struggle is pointed toward the human barriers of prejudice, hatred and poverty, ignorance and intolerance, Israel represents a touchstone to the United States from which it may renew its standard of justice, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all its citizens.

## Annual Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WALTER NORBLAD**
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the results of my annual poll of my constituents.

The answers to questions 5—farm supports—and 11—Federal aid to teachers salaries—were broken down and tabulated as to those giving their occupation as farmers in the first instance and teachers in the second instance.

[In percent]

| | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Should labor unions be brought under antitrust laws? | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| 2. In an effort to combat juvenile delinquency, should the Federal Government at taxpayers' expense establish a Youth Conservation Corps for boys 16 to 21 to work on reforestation and other conservation projects on publicly owned lands? | 60 | 35 | 5 |
| 3. Do you favor diplomatic recognition of Communist China? | 20 | 69 | 11 |
| 4. At present, persons drawing social security benefits are penalized if they earn more than $1,200 a year. Do you believe they should be permitted to earn a greater amount without penalty? | 76 | 18 | 6 |
| 5. Do you favor continuing agriculture price supports? | 20 | 74 | 6 |
| Those giving their occupations as farmers on this voted as follows | 31 | 65 | 4 |
| 6. Do you believe the Federal Government should have more authority to regulate radio and TV programs? | 38 | 56 | 6 |
| 7. In some areas in the South, certain people because of their race are reportedly not permitted to register to vote. Where this happens should the Federal Government provide Federal registrars on a temporary basis? | 70 | 21 | 9 |
| 8. Do you favor legislation to provide Federal aid for school construction? | 41 | 50 | 9 |
| 9. Should we make an all-out effort to surpass Russia in the exploration of outer space, regardless of cost? | 26 | 69 | 5 |
| 10. Sould Congress increase postal rates to help meet postal deficits? | 50 | 47 | 3 |
| 11. Would you favor Federal aid to raise teachers salaries? | 21 | 74 | 5 |
| Those giving their occupation as teachers on this voted as follows | 23 | 74 | 3 |
| 12. Do you favor the proposed summit conference between the free world and the Soviets? | 84 | 10 | 6 |
| 13. Would you favor giving the Federal Government greater power to abritrate and enforce agreements between labor and management when disputes such as in the recent steel strike affect a major sector of the national economy and/or national defense? | 83 | 14 | 3 |
| 14. Do you believe merging our Army, Navy, and Air Force into a single military service would increase efficiency, reduce waste and duplication of effort and materiel, and remove interservice rivalry? | 77 | 18 | 5 |

## Preliminary Tabulation of Replies From Questionnaire in the 32d Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last month I sent out to some 55,000 residents of my congressional district, embracing five upstate counties in New York State, a questionnaire dealing with some of the major items of legislation pending before this 2d session of the 86th Congress. These questionnaires were sent out on a purely random basis to telephone subscribers within these five counties. By way of background in interpreting the results I might add that these five counties are traditionally recognized as a conservative area. Republican Party enrollment outnumbers Democratic enrollment by 3 to 1. President Eisenhower carried the district over Governor Stevenson in 1956 by 119,000 to 44,000; Governor Rockefeller carried the district in 1958 by 37,000. As Members are aware, I am the first member of my party to have the honor to serve this district in the House of Representatives in 42 years.

I mention these facts only by way of background for a tabulation of the answers I have received. Out of 55,000 questionnaires mailed out we have received 9,337 replies, or a return of 17 percent, which, I am told, is an amazingly high percentage. In addition I have also had the privilege of receiving a great number of letters and communications expanding on the yes-or-no replies provided by the tabulated questionnaire itself.

While a Congressman must, of course, make up his mind on legislation on the basis of many factors, certainly the desires and wishes of his constituents, expressed in many ways, particularly through the means of a questionnaire like this, should be a most important factor in his final decision.

I want to express to all of the people of my district who took the trouble to answer our questionnaire and particularly to those who went to the added trouble of sending me their amplified comments, my sincere appreciation for all the great help which they have given to me in my effort to be an effective and responsive representative of their wishes and interests in this body. I am hopeful that those who have written to me will forgive me, incidentally, for the delay that has been encountered in replying to their letters. So many individual letters have been received with these questionnaires that it has been physically impossible for my office staff to answer all of them as yet and still keep up with our other work. However, we do anticipate answering all of them soon, and in the meantime all are being read and pondered carefully.

In general, the replies we have received seem to indicate that our district overwhelmingly supports restrictions on foreign imports, Federal assistance for unemployment areas, elimination of the telephone tax, civil rights, the Forand approach to health insurance for retired citizens, a youth conservation corps, and a balanced budget. Aid to education and an increase in the minimum wage are also supported, though by less substantial majorities. Legislation to promote milk consumption loses by a small edge. The soil bank and a ban on nuclear weapons testing which does not include effective inspection and control procedures are opposed by substantial majorities.

The detailed results are summarized below:

[In percent]

| Question | Yes | No | No opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you favor legislation to protect American job opportunities by increased restrictions on foreign imports? | 74.6 | 19.3 | 6.1 |
| 2. Would you oppose President Eisenhower's proposal for a major increase in the soil bank program? | 52.3 | 25.1 | 22.6 |
| 3. Would you favor Federal legislation to promote the consumption of fluid milk? | 40.3 | 40.6 | 19.1 |
| 4. Do you favor some measure of Federal assistance to help local communities hard hit by unemployment in attracting new industry? | 76.2 | 18.1 | 5.7 |
| 5. Do you favor continuing the Federal telephone tax beyond June 30, 1960, the date on which it is now scheduled by law to expire? | 16.3 | 76.0 | 7.7 |
| 6. Do you favor some Federal tax concessions for industries which move into areas of serious unemployment or expand in such areas? | 66.1 | 25.0 | 8.9 |
| 7. Do you favor strengthening civil rights legislation to insure the right to vote regardless of race, creed, or color? | 88.6 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| 8. Would you oppose legislation to improve our educational program by extending Federal grants to States to help build new schools or classrooms? | 36.4 | 55.3 | 8.3 |
| 9. Do you favor an increase in the present $1 Federal minimum wage? | 57.3 | 36.5 | 6.2 |
| 10. Do you favor expanding the Federal social security program to include some form of health insurance for retired persons? | 72.4 | 19.8 | 7.8 |
| 11. Would you approve a ban on nuclear weapons tests before agreement is reached on effective inspection and control procedures? | 22.2 | 67.8 | 10.0 |
| 12. Do you favor promoting conservation and combating juvenile delinquency by establishing a voluntary Youth Conservation Corps? | 74.7 | 14.6 | 10.7 |
| 13. Do you support a balanced budget? | 80.9 | 6.6 | 12.5 |

14. Which of the following do you now favor for President in 1960:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Nixon | 39.9 |
| Kennedy | 35.4 |
| Stevenson | 9.7 |
| Rockefeller | 5.0 |
| Humphrey | 4.0 |
| Symington | 3.3 |
| Johnson | 1.7 |
| Stratton | [1] 1.2 |

[1] Write-in.

## Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an address I delivered at the Rumanian Independence Day rally in Cleveland, Sunday, May 15, under the auspices of the Carpatina Society and the American Legion, on "Rumanian Independence Day":

May 10 is a day of great importance to Rumanian people everywhere in the world because it is Rumanian Independence Day.

In these days it has special significance because the people of Rumania have been robbed of their national independence by the Russian imperialists.

It was 15 years last March 6 that the Russians destroyed the free government of that old and honored nation and imposed upon the Rumanian people a form of government which is completely alien to their rich culture, traditions, and love for human freedom.

In the darkness of those 15 years, the people of Rumania have never lost faith in the destiny of their nation.

They remain convinced that justice will triumph throughout the world—that the cause of free men will prevail in the affairs of nations and that Rumania will rise once again in all the splendor and beauty of her ancient civilization.

It is this dedication, this unwavering conviction, which holds the people of Rumania in an unbreakable alliance with the people of the United States and all other free countries.

The people of Rumania will be prohibited from celebrating this memorable day by the alien government which has been imposed upon them by the masters of the new imperialism in Moscow.

No public observance of this day will be allowed because the Russians are dedicated to destroying all hope for a return of national independence and because such public manifestations carry the possibility of getting out of hand so far as the occupiers are concerned.

However, the Rumanian people will find ways to observe this historic day, despite the efforts to prevent them from doing so.

What rests firmly in the hearts of men cannot be wiped out by the order of a dictator.

Rumanians in the free world will properly celebrate this day.

I am happy and proud that in my district one of the most significant of these celebrations is taking place today.

Free Rumanians will carry high the hopes of the captive people of Rumania.

They will, as in the past, remind all those who love freedom that these past 15 years of darkness have strengthened the determination of the Rumanian people to regain their national independence.

In this they will be performing a service for their adopted country, the United States, because the cause of peace with justice requires the dedication of all our citizens.

Tomorrow the second summit conference will open in Paris.

There a contest will take place between men who represent the cause of human freedom and those who lead the cause of slavery for all mankind.

This will be a test of justice as the foundation for a lasting peace, that is, justice for all nations and all people.

The one paramount issue, the issue which rises above all others at the Paris conference, is that of political status quo.

The spotlight of public attention has been focused upon such issues as disarmament, a ban on nuclear weapons, the future status of Berlin and a free and united Germany.

Important as these issues are, they avoid the critical question of human rights, the rights of nations and the unnatural division of humanity by the Russian Communists.

It is clear beyond any reasonable doubt that the Russians are going to Paris with but one objective in mind.

That objective is to force the free world leaders to accept a political status quo, that is, to put a stamp of finality upon their empire of captive nations.

Nor can there be any doubt that the Russian leaders desperately need this recognition.

A serious internal crisis grips the vast empire of the Russian Communists.

It is not an economic crisis, even though there is a critical shortage of food and consumer goods throughout the empire.

It is not a crisis at the top, resulting from the constant struggle for total power which is the common characteristic of the regime.

It is a political crisis brought on by the failure of the Communist regime to win the confidence and support of the people and the corresponding demand by the non-Russian peoples of the empire for a complete change in the order of things.

The old order of Russian imperial communism is bankrupt.

It is centuries behind the needs and aspirations of the common man.

Its failures are well known to those who are its captives.

The need for drastic change to avoid total collapse is evident to all who are confined behind the Iron Curtain, including Khrushchev and his crowd.

It is beyond the ability of Russian imperial communism to grant the changes necessary to avoid the great human explosion which is in the making.

If the Communist leaders grant the changes demanded by the realities of life they will open the floodgates to their own destruction.

They cannot possibly accommodate their system to the changes needed to preserve the empire.

The leaders in Moscow recognize these hard facts of life and are accordingly going to use the Paris conference as a temporary remedy for their internal crisis.

They seek to cause the nations of the free world to associate with them in efforts to preserve the empire.

The Russians insist that the captive peoples must be made to realize that there is a finality to their unhappy state of life, that there is no hope for their future, that they must make their peace with communism and adjust to the imposed peace of Moscow.

The Russian leaders also need a legal license to employ whatever methods become necessary to hold the empire together.

They feel they must neutralize the conscience of the West so that there can be no public protest or legal proceedings in the United Nations against such future actions as they may find necessary, including genocide and the other crimes against humanity.

This is the insurance policy they want the leaders of the free world to underwrite at Paris.

So, to secure these objectives, the Russians propose a status quo and Khrushchev has announced that this will be his goal at the Paris meeting.

Now the question is: How will the leaders of the free world meet this challenge?

Up to this moment there is no evidence available to the public which would indicate what we might do or not do to prevent a Russian victory on this critical issue.

However, it is clear to all that if President Eisenhower fails to raise in principle the right of all nations to self-determination, to self-government, in the context of the Captive Nations Week resolution as defined in Public Law 86-90, the Russians will win their point by default.

Khrushchev has made it clear in public statements that he considers the basic question of the Paris meeting to be status quo.

By so doing he has established the issue as pertinent to all the discussions which will take place.

If our leaders fail to raise the issue and state our position on it, silence will be taken as assent to the demands made by Khrushchev.

This is a fundamental law of international diplomacy.

It is entirely possible that the Russians can leave the Paris meeting with sound precedent to believe that the United States has accepted a status quo.

Nor is it necessary for the three Western Powers to have unanimity on this issue in order for our President to speak out. Rumors are rampant in Europe that the British are actively pushing for a status quo, even to the point of a permanently divided Germany.

It is unlikely that France could make herself party to such a deal.

In any case, it is imperative that the United States make its position clear on this issue regardless what Great Britain and France elect do do about it.

The future of Rumania and all the other captive non-Russian nations hangs in the balance at the Paris summit.

While Rumania as a nation will not be an agenda item, the future of Rumania is involved in the issue of status quo which has been created by Khrushchev.

Nor is status quo likely to become an agenda item, but it will hang over all the proceedings and discussions at Paris. It is the unavoidable issue.

It is, in fact, the reason why Khrushchev forced the leaders of the free world into a second summit meeting.

These are fitting thoughts for this Rumanian Independence Day commemoration.

Those of us who have fought for the rights of the Rumanian nation, for justice for all the nations of the world, do not give lipservice to this cause. More than words are needed.

Political action must be given to this cause.

I, therefore, have urged President Eisenhower to seize the initiative at Paris, to flush out into the open the issue of status quo, to disclaim any degree of acceptance of status quo for the American people, and to rekindle the hopes of suffering millions behind the Iron Curtain by a firm advocacy of the rights of all nations to self-government, to freedom, and to national independence.

Let us pray that President Eisenhower will lead all free nations of the world in a successful fight for the right of self-determination for all nations and people. Such positive, affirmative, political action will enable the great nation of Rumania to determine its own destiny and to take its proper place among the free nations of the world.

## A Compromise Area Redevelopment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 18, there was introduced in both Houses of Congress a compromise area redevelopment bill in an effort to meet the objections contained in President Eisenhower's veto message regarding S. 722.

In the Senate S. 3568 was introduced by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania while in the House companion measures were introduced by my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative IVOR D. FENTON, who introduced H.R. 12291, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative JOHN SAYLOR, who introduced H.R. 12298, and the number of my own bill is H.R. 12290. All of these bills have been referred to the committees having jurisdiction over this type of legislation and it is hoped that immediate action will be accorded them.

Following is a comparison of House area redevelopment bills including S. 722 vetoed by the President together with H.R. 4878 which I offered as a compromise measure at the first session of this Congress and H.R. 12290, 12291, and 12298 introduced yesterday as the revised version of H.R. 4878 and designed to meet the objections on which the President's veto of S. 722 was based.

*Comparison of area redevelopment bills*

| Subject | S. 722 as passed and vetoed | H.R. 4878, original form | H.R. 12290, H.R. 12291, and H.R. 12298 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Organization | Separate Area Redevelopment Administration. | Department of Commerce | Department of Commerce. |
| 2. Division of redevelopment areas | Administrator to designate industrial and rural areas. | Only industrial and public facility loans in areas of persistent and substantial unemployment. | Same; removed reference to rural. Note technical assistance can cover. |
| 3. Revolving fund loans | 75 | | |
| Industrial | $100,000,000 | $100,000,000 | $75,000,000. |
| Rural | $75,000,000 | None | None. |
| Public facilities | $50,000,000 | $25,000,000 | $25,000,000; reference to machinery removed. |
| 4. Federal participation in loans | 65 percent | 33⅓ percent class I areas, 50 percent class II areas, and 75 percent class III areas. | 35 percent; area classifications removed. |
| 5. Maximum loan period | 40 years; 10 percent State contribution | 25 years; not less than 15 percent State contribution. | Same. |
| 6. Grants for public facilities | $35,000,000 | $25,000,000; Federal participation 33⅓ percent class II areas, 75 percent class III areas. | None. |
| 7. Retraining subsistence payments | $10,000,000 | $5,000,000 | $5,000,000. |
| 8. Vocational training grants | $1,500,000 | Secretary of Labor to determine needs; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide through existing facilities. | Same. |
| 9. Technical assistance | $4,500,000 | $3,000,000 | $3,000,000. |
| 10. Criteria of unemployment | At least 6 percent at time of application and 12 percent for 12 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding. | An average of 6 percent, excluding seasonal, throughout qualifying period, and 50 percent above national average for 4 out of 5 years preceding in class I areas, or 75 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 years preceding in class II areas, or 100 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 years preceding in class III areas. | Same; area classifications removed. |
| 11. Interest on loans | Maximum permitted, 2 to 7 percent | To be determined by Secretary based on going rates. | Same. |
| 12. Cost | $251,000,000 | $158,000,000 | $108,000,000. |

## Polish Constitution Day Marks Thousand Years of Travail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, 1960, proffers an opportunity for introspective thinking as well as a chance to join other Members of Congress in giving accolades to the valiant, patiently courageous people of what might now well be called re-Stalinized Poland.

Some of us, who in dark moments of frustration decry the absence of light shining upon our own personal freedoms, civil rights and liberties, can then look to the bloody history of Poland for hope; and to its heroes for faith.

We can take heart in the dying words of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski, whose 100th anniversary of birth coincides with Poland's millennium, in 1966. His words, as life slipped away were: "Polska powstanie." Acclaimed by the American public as the "King of pianists," Paderewski's greatest happiness came in contributing his time, his talents, and his resources, to the needy of his own and other lands. He will take his place in history with all the heroic sons of Poland. Significant then were his dying words, translated: "Poland will rise again."

These words give solace to the people of Poland, though now compelled to endure Soviet oppression and to live in the vacuum of Eastern tyranny and the insecurity and uncertainty of moral and economic aid from the West. The situation in Poland today remains fluid only because of the vigorous anti-Communist resistance by intrepid Poles.

In keeping with a tradition of the past 20 years, the U.S. Congress has solemnized Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 with a twofold purpose: First, to remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations; second, to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

The 1960 convocation of Poland's Constitution is of special importance to the Polish people in my home State, Michigan, as well as to the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry and those still fighting communism in the homeland.

Bearing as it does an analogy to our own celebration of July 4, the date of May 3, means more than a calendar date to the people of Poland and others of the free world—it draws foci to the indomitable spirit of the people of Poland; underscores the travail of a near-thousand years of glorious, though sometimes bloody history; namely, the valorous but sanguine insurrections of 1830 and 1848, as well as the millennium of the founding of Christianity by the Polish State.

The Polish May Constitution convocation might well serve as a rededicatory process for these compatriots who through no fault of their own have been forced to endure Communist enslavement. It might also remind those of us in America, of the consequence of rededicating our own lives to the kind of freedoms engendered by the signing of that famous companion document—the American Constitution.

The Polish Constitution was patterned after our own American Constitution and its creators were motivated by the same principles that fired the fighters for the independence of the United States. Now in 1960, the people of Poland have placed their entire hope and sympathy with the United States again.

The Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaught of the barbarian East; in creating the first Commonwealth of Nations in Europe; in contributing to American freedom through the services of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, and other Polish immigrants.

To these dauntless people whose history has been stalked by tragedy due largely to geographic position, predatory and aggressive neighbors, we add our hope and our prayerful wish for full freedom in our time.

## Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS**
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ran across an article appearing in the newspaper Labor, dated May 14, 1960, headlined "Says United States Lags in Medical Care." This article purports to quote our colleague Congressman Moss as follows:

> The United States is the only large industrialized country in the world where the Government does not, in some form or other, provide medical care for most of its citizens.
>
> All European countries, with the exception of Finland, operate some type of government health and maternity program, and most of the 59 countries of the globe which have such programs provide medical care benefits under some sort of a social insurance program.

I think this article lets the cat out of the bag, just as similar statements made by other proponents of the Forand bill call attention to what these people really have in their bag of wonders.

Our society has the finest health program, and this includes health care for the aged, of any society in history. These other systems have the Government in some form or other provide medical care for most of its citizens. This results in a system of inferior health care for the citizens, as a study of the health programs of these other industrialized societies reveals.

Should that not suggest to these other societies that socialism is the wrong way to achieve success in this area, even if it does not convince some of our own political theorists?

I must add a further statement to try to forestall what the Forand bill proponents usually fall back on to answer their critics. Their critics, they say, are standpatters and want no progress. This is false. Any program, no matter how good it may be, can be improved. There is plenty of room for improvement in the health program our society has, even though it is the best program ever set up. However, to improve it and not damage it, we must first understand what it is. The Forand bill supporters imply that there is no program even though the Federal Government today is spending over $12 billion a year on care for the aged. Let us first lay the facts of our present program for health care out on the table, then debate the issue of how we can improve it. Is this such an illogical suggestion?

The article follows:

SAYS UNITED STATES LAGS IN MEDICAL CARE

"The United States is the only large industrialized country in the world where the Government does not, in some form or other, provide medical care for most of its citizens," Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, noted last week.

"All European countries, with the exception of Finland, operate some type of government health and maternity program," he said. "And most of the 59 countries of the globe which have such programs provide medical care benefits under some sort of a social insurance program."

Moss predicted that Congress this year will also enact medical insurance legislation for those over 65 years of age.

## Export Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal objectives of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, Public Law 480, was the creation and building of export markets for American agricultural commodities. From time to time I have been informed that an effective job was being done. Recently the administration announced an export promotion campaign and called on industry and agriculture for their complete cooperation. This, too, seemed like a good idea.

However, one of our Texas rice mills has anticipated the administration's program by at least 4 years. They produce and market a high-quality parboiled rice, which is not generally available in foreign markets. In one country, Greece—truly one of our real friends among nations—they had developed a business of

approximately 2,000 tons annually, or less than 5 percent of the Greek domestic production. In so doing they expended approximately $100,000 in advertising and promotion. Their sales do not interfere with sales of Greek rice, having been largely to hotels, tourist resorts, and the carriage trade. Greece does not produce a parboiled rice and their rice is hardly of comparable quality. Pricewise, U.S. rice in Greece sells far better than 50 percent more than Greek rice.

Last November all imports of rice were embargoed by the Greek Government. After a protest by our State Department, a clarifying regulation was promised. Late in February one was issued permiting imports on license where the importer could show he had exported twice the quantity of Greek rice for currency acceptable to the Greek Government. This tied things up tighter than ever.

Among such good friends as the Greeks and ourselves, such a situation will undoubtedly be straightened out without undue delay. The tonnage and exchange is small, but the impact can be great. I trust that the State Department, through the exercise of a high order of sound, practical diplomacy, will resolve the differences of opinion in ample time so that it will not sound a sour note just as the administration's export promotion program is about to get under way.

## The Nightly Radio Program: "Today in Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the nightly radio program "Today in Congress" for devoting the entire time segment last Friday night to the complete and unedited remarks made by President Eisenhower upon his arrival from Portugal.

This has always been a valuable and unique program; the only one aired which is devoted exclusively to the happenings here on Capitol Hill.

Its sponsors, the Independent Airlines Association, and its editor, Joseph McCaffrey, combine to give the listening public a "Congressional Record of the Air." This program not only has a great listening audience among Members of the House and Senate, but also among staff members on the Hill and administrators and key personnel in the executive branch.

Last Friday night, the entire format of the program was revamped so that Mr. Eisenhower's own personal report on the summit could be given wider coverage.

This, I think, is a tribute to the feeling of public responsibility of the association and of Mr. McCaffrey.

## Assistance for Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that the Committee on Education and Labor has reported favorably a bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel. The bill reported is similar to one I introduced.

Juvenile delinquency has reached terrifying proportions throughout our Nation. All communities are beset by the problem—urban and rural, in the higher social and economic levels as well as the lower. Our youth are the future of our Nation; they are our hope in the years ahead; on them will fall the burden of the preservation of our democracy. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to recognize its duty and obligation to our young people; investments of necessary funds and time and effort must be made now in assistance to our youth; there is a crying need for more research on causes and prevention of delinquency.

It was recently charged that we, as a Nation, have more information about pigs than we do about children. This is a startling accusation, but true, in my opinion. We recently heard the heartbreaking prophecy that between 4 and 5 million children will be referred to juvenile courts within the next decade. It is not enough to ask "Why?" and "Who is to blame for failing in its duty—the home, school, or community?" The problem must be attacked with vigor and vision; our children must have help.

The Federal Government should take positive steps to increase the ability to prevent delinquency and rehabilitate offenders. This requires support for research, field and pilot studies, and demonstration projects. The present acute shortage of adequately trained personnel to cope with delinquency must be relieved. The basic aim in combating juvenile delinquency must be to foster in the young a respect for the law—for its reasonableness and fairness and for the values of the community. This means that the community itself must set a good example and uphold those values which it expects its youth to respect, in an effort to prevent lawlessness among our youth. It is as important to try to understand our young people—their aims, beliefs, dreams, fears—and to help them in their struggle for security and happiness, as it is to try to rehabilitate them after crimes have been committed and their names have been besmirched and their futures blackened by the pall of misdeeds.

Because the assistance to our youth, as provided in the bill which has been reported, is so vitally necessary, and because time is of the essence in dealing with the increasing problems of juvenile delinquency, I urge that the bill be brought before the House for action, without delay. It is incumbent upon the 86th Congress to pass this proposed legislation before the close of the session.

## National Science Foundation: 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, the Congress took cognizance of the increasing importance of science and technology to the national interest and established the National Science Foundation as the successor to the emergency World War II Office of Scientific Research and Development. Seldom has there been a more important action taken by the Congress. In the intervening years, advances in science and technology have run the whole gamut of our national lives and throughout all this time, the National Science Foundation has played a fundamental role in our scientific effort. As the importance of the work increases year by year, the Foundation, in my opinion, merits the full cooperation of the Congress to the extent that when necessary, encouragement should be given by increases in needed funds.

The Foundation is meeting the challenge of the scientific and technologic revolution through which we are passing by supporting programs designed to stimulate improved scientific training and by encouraging young men and women to choose careers in science. It supports basic scientific research without which our country would soon reach an impasse in new scientific discoveries. The scholarship and fellowship grants each year to high school and college students promote interest in an area vital to our national security. Equally important are the institutes the Foundation sponsors for the training of teachers in science and mathematics. Under its jurisdiction, also, are made research grants in all the fields of science with which the Foundation deals—biology, medicine, physics, mathematics, and engineering, as well as the social sciences. Abroad, National Science Foundation activities are directed toward general purpose basic research and the support of those programs which strengthen the scientific effort of the United States.

Much of the credit for the magnificent work the Foundation is doing must go to Dr. Alan T. Waterman who has been its director since its establishment. Those who have followed the hearings of the Committee on Science and Astronautics have heard witnesses testify many times in praise of the competence, the vision and the high level of leadership displayed by Dr. Waterman and his staff.

In this age of space, we have become acutely aware of how important to our very existence are the developments in the field of science. To the National Science Foundation—one of the most important Federal agencies to contribute to our progress in this field—on its 10th birthday, I want to add my congratulations for a job well done and to voice my confidence that the accomplishments of the next 10 years will be equally praiseworthy.

## A Waste of White House Time and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, and me. It speaks for itself:

MAY 17, 1960.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PORTER: On Saturday last, as he completed preparations for the summit conference in Paris, President Eisenhower requested me to send to you, in his behalf, this note of gratification and appreciation for your support of the mutual security authorization bill. He stressed once again his profound conviction that this program is indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism, and indispensable also in encouraging struggling millions in less fortunate nations in their effort to live their lives in freedom. It is a program requiring, he said, unreserved support by all of our informed citizens and officials, and he feels it would be the height of folly to allow isolated administrative shortcomings and disappointments, or local considerations, political or otherwise, to tempt anyone to jettison or cripple the entire undertaking.

Especially the President voiced this hope, and asked that it be communicated to you in his behalf, that your responsible act of support for the mutual security authorization be matched by a determined resistance to any effort to effect massive reductions in the mutual security appropriations soon to be considered by the House. Massive reductions, he pointed out, can be accomplished only by undermining our own security, free world security, and the cause of human freedom everywhere in the world.

The President asked me to explain that he would have advised you himself of these views had his time permitted before leaving for Paris.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
*Deputy Assistant to the President.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.*

Mr. BRYCE N. HARLOW,
*Deputy Assistant to the President,*
*The White House.*

DEAR MR. HARLOW: I have just received your letter telling me that the President told you to tell me that he approved of my approval of the mutual security authorization bill. I note you say that the President himself would have advised me but that he was busy preparing for the summit conference.

In all frankness, however, I do believe that the White House automatic typewriters, clerical staff, and your own services could be more usefully employed than in getting out these letters to me and my colleagues. Such transparent and artificial devices as your form letter are a waste of time and money.

Of course I am pleased to know that the President is seeking to lend his support to the mutual security program, but I do believe there are better ways.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
*Member of Congress.*

## Arthur E. Wullschleger Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Arthur E. Wullschleger, of the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., one of the bright residential areas of my fine constituency, came to Washington on May 17 to be honored with a special ceremony at the Smithsonian Institution at which he presented to that world famous depository of historical treasures a priceless Jacquard loom.

The loom, invented in the year 1801 by the man whose name it bears, is one of the most ingenious devices ever fashioned by the mind of man in the field of weaving. Thousands of cards, very similar to the IBM cards used today in machines all over the world, constitute an integral part of the loom and through the use of the punch-hole technique guide the design on the frame.

In presenting this century-and-a-half-old treasure to the museum—Mr. Wullschleger had it restored to working condition at great expense—Mr. Wullschleger was merely doing what he has done often before, namely, giving to his fellow citizens some of the benefits of his wealth and knowledge.

As a citizen of Mamaroneck, Mr. Wullschleger is regarded as one of the most amiable of men and one of the most helpful and considerate people in the community. He has traversed the world many times, his trips to Europe alone totaling more than 100 voyages, but his interests lie with the men and women of his community. He has served as chairman of the zoning board of the town of Mamaroneck and in that capacity has rendered outstanding service.

At the ceremony at the Smithsonian Institution Mr. Wullschleger was presented to the audience by his son-in-law, Arthur "Red" Motley, the distinguished president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, well-known publisher and famous after-dinner speaker.

Mr. Motley and Mr. Leonard Carmichael, the master of ceremonies, who is the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, pointed out to those present that Mr. Wullschleger had come to this country as a young man to seek his fortune. He not only attained his monetary objective but in the process became one of the world's outstanding authorities on colors and fabrics. His impact on his field of operation has been extraordinary.

As his Representative I took pleasure in welcoming him to Washington and showing him every courtesy.

## Results of Survey Concerning Some Important Issues Facing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, May 19, 1960*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent a questionnaire on some important issues facing Congress and the Nation to 22,000 of my constituents. Of the number sent, 17 percent were returned. Under permission previously granted I am placing in the RECORD the results of that questionnaire, together with some additional information about the age groups and occupations of those who answered:

Age groups: Under 25, 1.3 percent; 25 to 30, 4.6 percent; 31 to 40, 18.2 percent; 41 to 50, 20.8 percent; 51 to 60, 19.8 percent; over 60, 25.8 percent; no answer, 9.5 percent.

Occupations: Retired, 15.8 percent; farmers, 3.3 percent; laborers, 6.5 percent; housewives, 8.8 percent; professional, 21.8 percent; businessmen, 22.5 percent; government employees, 11.5 percent; students, 1.0 percent; armed services, 0.6 percent; no answer, 6.4 percent.

DEFENSE

1. Should we, in 1960 and 1961, gear our defense effort to a dollar amount we can afford within a balanced budget? Yes, 78 percent; no, 15 percent.

2. Should we concentrate our defense effort on:

(a) Deterrent capabilities (mainly missiles)?—14 percent.

(b) Conventional weapons, aimed at fighting limited wars?—3 percent.

(c) A combination of both?—78 percent.

3. Do you feel:

(a) Terribly worried over allegations that we are behind the Russians in certain types of missiles?—13 percent.

(b) Confident that our overall deterrent capability will, for the foreseeable future, prevent a Russian attack?—81 percent.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. In our attitude toward Communist nations, are we:

(a) Too soft?—76 percent.

(b) Too hard?—1 percent.

(c) About right?—20 percent.

2. Do you feel that:

(a) We should increase our pressure on international communism, even at the risk of all-out war?—60 percent.

(b) We should keep deterrent capabilities militarily, and coexist with communism, hoping Communists will eventually see that our system is better than theirs?—28 percent.

(c) We should do something else?—21 percent.

3. Foreign aid will cost the American taxpayer about $3.2 billion this year. Below are listed the principal expenditures.

Do you favor continuing:

(a) Military aid ($1.3 billion this year) to the armed forces of our allies?—40 percent.

(b) Defense support ($695 million this year) to bolster the economies of many of our allies?—27 percent.

(c) Special assistance ($245 million this year) to bolster the economies of so-called neutralist or undetermined countries?—15 percent.

(d) Technical cooperation ($181.2 million this year) supplying instruction and know-how to underdeveloped nations?—54 percent.

(e) Development loans in dollars ($550 million this year) to underdeveloped countries repayable mainly in the currencies of those countries?—40 percent.

(f) None of these; end the program?—24 percent.

SPACE

1. Do you feel it is important for us to be able to travel in space as soon as possible? Yes, 42 percent; no, 52 percent.

2. Do you feel that ability to travel in space will have military significance in the foreseeable future? Yes, 51 percent; no, 40 percent.

FARM PROGRAM

1. Do you favor an immediate end of all farm price supports?—36 percent.

2. Do you favor high rigid price supports to guarantee farmers return of their growing costs and return on their investment?—4 percent.

3. Do you favor reducing farm price supports over a period of several years until a free farm economy is restored?—60 percent.

FISCAL

1. Do you believe that the budget of the U.S. Government:

(a) Should always be balanced?—53 percent.

(b) May be unbalanced in years of decreased business activity to stimulate business?—43 percent.

2. Do you favor:

(a) Lowering Federal taxes immediately, without regard to a balanced budget?—9 percent.

(b) Increasing Federal taxes if necessary for additional public services?—6 percent.

(c) Lowering Federal taxes after reducing expenditures and reducing the national debt?—83 percent.

3. Do you favor:

(a) Systematically reducing the national debt each year?—88 percent.

(b) Increasing the national debt in order to provide additional Federal services without raising taxes?—3 percent.

(c) Keeping the national debt at its present level of about $290 billion?—5 percent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

1. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume a definite part of the responsibility for public school education in America, including payment of administration costs and teachers' salaries?—8 percent.

2. Do you favor Federal assistance for public school construction on a general basis?—10 percent.

3. Do you favor limiting Federal aid to the programs we now have, including assistance to federally impacted areas?—32 percent.

4. Should we have no Federal aid whatsoever?—44 percent.

MEDICAL BENEFITS TO THE ELDERLY

1. Do you favor free medical care for all people over 65 paid for by the Federal Government?—7 percent.

2. Should we include surgical and hospital care for persons over 65 as a part of social security?—26 percent.

3. Do you favor Federal incentives to private insurance companies to provide health insurance to the elderly?—18 percent.

4. Do you feel there should be no Federal program of any kind to provide medical assistance for elderly persons, leaving this to States and private resources?—50 percent.

VETERANS PENSIONS

1. Paying pensions to veterans without service-connected disabilities on a basis of need?—16 percent.

2. Giving all World War I veterans an honor pension of $100 per month without regard to need or disability?—8 percent.

3. Pensions to disabled veterans should go up automatically with the cost of living?—60 percent.

4. Other?—35 percent.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

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

Rev. C. Edward Gammon, D.D., minister, Fairlington Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast been the refuge and strength of good and wise men in many generations, we cry unto Thee for our world, tense with suspicion, haunted by the pain of yesterday's wars, our own countryside garrisoned with slender stalagmites of terrible, radioactive death. Thus we implore Thy mercy for all who this day must represent free peoples before the forums of world conscience.

We beseech Thee to grant physical stamina, intellectual vigor, and sensitivity of soul to all honored men of government—for men living with harsh, insistent pressures, struggling conscience, complex decisions, the vulgar demands of entrenched greed; the never-ending pleas of injured minorities and conflicting parochial interests; the outraged cries of the sluggard, men of borderline morals who went too far; the tragic victims of war, hunger, disaster, and disease; men living each day with the tensions of domestic politics.

O dear God, we Americans are hard on our public servants. Be merciful and gracious, a strong God of infinite love and grace to them.

Dear God, in these boisterous days when we Americans go about the business of selecting our leadership for the coming years, grant that, when all is said and done, and the campaigns of 1960 shall have become history, these walls, hallowed by the memories of radiant ideas, flaming words, and courageous men, shall once again be filled with men of honor whose abiding dedication shall be to sustain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

These things we ask in the name of God, the Father of Jesus Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 18, 1960,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on May 20, 1960, the bill (H.R. 12117), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1404) thereon.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;