

America today only places upon us all more responsibility to seek and exercise our duty.

Our duty as men of principle cannot be met alone by sending into the world America's dollars. The world little knows the difference between the American dollar and the Russian ruble. But the world will know—and the world will understand—the difference between the principles of freedom and the lack of principles of Communist doctrine and Communist leadership.

CHANGE OF APPROACH

Fundamental changes must come in America's approach to the world and America's approach to the tasks and challenges of this century.

We must—as a people—turn to the way of principle in our affairs and turn away from the old ways of power by which despots of the age have lived. We do not seek to sit

down at the conference table and divide the world between West and East for, if we do this, our principles are indistinguishable from those whom we oppose.

There is work to do at the summits of diplomacy, but there is also much work for free men—principled men—to do in the valleys of the earth's great rivers. This is the work we must do—leading the world not by our power but by our principles.

SHIELD OF POWER

Power we must keep: beyond question, beyond compare, so that behind that shield, the principles we carry will have the chance to grow. But power must never be America's only work, for we have a greater task as a nation devoted to making this a world of principle in which the waste of human lives and resources is brought to an end.

I say these things here with the feeling that can come only to those who have lived their lives close to work such as we do here. I was born in Texas on the banks of the Pedernales River and knew throughout my early years the season of its flood and drought. My proudest year—and my most satisfying work—was to have the opportunity when I came into public office to lead the way in bringing to the lower Colorado riverbeds the great dams which brought light and hope and opportunity to the hills where I was born. I saw the darkness of 100 years rolled away and the drudgery of the ages ended for the wives and mothers and fathers of that region.

Such work as this is—and will always be to me—the work of a principled land and it is the work of principle which must become America's basis of new leadership in the world.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O Spirit Eternal, apart from Thee we could know no good desire, no outreach of thought beyond ourselves, no discontent with things as they are.

Our prayer is born out of what we see in the world where Thou hast put us bearing Thy image. All about us are the miseries which are the bitter harvest of man's injustice and oppression. We would feel ourselves joined with the destitute and dispossessed.

Open our hearts to the stricken and heavy laden whatever be the portion of the earth they tread.

When we pray for a better world, joyous and peaceful and blessed by plenty, with all its banners bright, give us to see that even as our years grow shorter we can yet have a part in bringing redemption to all men.

And, O God, when we dream dreams that the wilderness that haunts us shall blossom as the rose, give us the dedication to go forth sowing the seed of brotherhood and putting our hands to the plow which furrows the good earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 2, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

that on today, June 3, 1960, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 44. An act 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; and

S. 1833. An act authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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 the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10572. An act to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11761. An act to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

enrolled bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 11761. An act to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10572. An act to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Civil War Centennial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period March 1,

1959, to March 1, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF NAME OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the name of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Louisiana Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the members of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana respectfully request the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or to call a convention for such purpose, as provided by law, to add to said Constitution an article providing that;

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Where the legislatures of over one-fourth of the several States conclude that a U.S. Supreme Court decision has transferred powers not authorized by the Constitution of the United States, and where said decision transfers powers from the several States to the Federal Government, said decision shall, upon the application and request of the legislatures of over one-fourth of the several States, be invalid until subsequently approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided, however,* That said application and request shall be made within 3 years after the date of said decision.

"SEC. 2. All provisions of article 3 of the Constitution of the United States that conflict with this amendment are hereby repealed."

"Be it further resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be sent by the Secretary of State to the Governors and members of the legislatures of the several States, the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S.

House of Representatives, and to each member of the U.S. Congress.

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

"Speaker of the House of Representatives
"Approved by the Governor.

"WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veteran affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Reading, Pa., favoring the opening for use of veterans the 10 wards at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, now closed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Two resolutions adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veteran affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Reading, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 years or more, and to make uniform marriage date requirement for service-connected death benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veteran affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Reading, Pa., relating to the extension of the home loan program to 1965, with respect to World War II veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veteran affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Reading, Pa., relating to the definition of "mothers" in the Veterans Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veteran affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., at Reading, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a permanent Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Restoration of American Republic, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 190, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions signed by Terutake Oyadomari, and sundry other citizens of Okinawa, relating to prepeace treaty compensation claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Seraphim, ruling archbishop of Chicago and Detroit, the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, relating to certain amendments of Public Law 86-90, concerning the Week of Subjugated Nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Richard Schoenfelder and Lidwina S. Wagner (Rept. No. 1503);

H.R. 9226. An act for the relief of Pietro Mela (Rept. No. 1504); and

H.R. 10631. An act for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck (Rept. No. 1505).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 9443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel B. Morgan (Rept. No. 1506).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1764. A bill to extend the Federal Tort Claims Act to members of the National Guard when engaged in training duty under Federal law, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1502).

By Mr. O'MAHOONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 5789. An act to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame (Rept. No. 1501).

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1960. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL 1960 AND MARCH 1960, AND PAY, MARCH 1960 AND FEBRUARY 1960

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1960 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total ¹	2,518,215	2,514,756	+3,459	\$1,097,486	\$996,600	+\$100,886
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense.....	1,474,799	1,469,081	+5,718	589,833	536,242	+53,591
Department of Defense.....	1,043,416	1,045,675	-2,259	507,653	460,358	+47,295
Inside the United States.....	2,354,521	2,351,304	+3,217			
Outside the United States.....	163,694	163,452	+242			
Industrial employment.....	556,079	558,055	-1,976			
Foreign nationals.....	177,826	179,191	-1,365	22,306	* 21,366	+940

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

² Includes 186,539 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 18th Decennial Census, as compared with 186,214 in March.

³ Revised on basis of later information.

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

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

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

Table IV breaks down the above employ-

ment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

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

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1960 and comparison with March 1960, and pay for March 1960, and comparison with February 1960

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	85,991	84,031	1,960		\$37,974	\$34,436	\$3,538	
Commerce ^{1,2}	216,830	216,331		501	20,069	15,778	4,291	
Health, Education, and Welfare	60,197	60,077	120		28,782	26,502	2,280	
Interior	51,193	50,095	1,098		26,276	23,719	2,557	
Justice	30,342	30,435		93	18,007	16,468	1,549	
Labor	6,752	6,680	72		3,906	3,281	555	
Post Office	555,835	554,553	1,282		232,407	213,765	18,642	
State	37,420	37,329	91		17,226	15,569	1,657	
Treasury	80,484	78,918	1,566		41,080	37,487	3,593	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House office	434	424	10		257	232	25	
Bureau of the Budget	414	421		7	335	323	12	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	31			25	27		\$2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	70		1	31	29	2	
National Security Council	63	63			49	44	5	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,793	1,810		17	1,198	1,108	90	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	3	3			2	2		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	5		1	4	3	1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations ³	7	4	3		1	2		1
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2			2			
American Battle Monuments Commission	514	503	11		86	77	9	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,767	6,765	2		4,076	4,079	307	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	591	591			368	328	40	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	3	2	1		1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	737	731	6		495	453	42	
Civil Service Commission	3,566	3,579		13	1,942	1,813	129	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			5	4	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4			3	2	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	75	77		2	46	38	8	
Development Loan Fund	106	104	2		79	70	9	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	226	227		1	156	144	12	
Farm Credit Administration	246	247		1	167	152	15	
Federal Aviation Agency	36,484	35,859	625		21,398	19,230	2,168	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,303	1,305		2	724	744	80	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,228	1,233		5	736	670	66	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	982	979	3		591	534	57	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	338	336	2		272	253	19	
Federal Power Commission	817	816	1		525	487	38	
Federal Trade Commission	743	751		8	536	467	69	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	46	46			35	33	2	
General Accounting Office	4,948	4,990		42	2,889	2,642	247	
General Services Administration ⁴	27,710	27,697	13		12,434	11,883	1,051	
Government Contract Committee	34	33	1		18	17	1	
Government Printing Office	6,542	6,515	27		3,636	3,285	351	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,899	10,906		7	6,238	5,087	551	
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission ⁵					1	2		1
Indian Claims Commission	16	16			15	14	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,358	2,362		4	1,447	1,298	149	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission ⁶					1	4		3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,745	9,694	51		6,348	5,712	636	
National Capital Housing Authority	346	334	12		147	132	15	
National Capital Planning Commission	45	45			30	28	2	
National Gallery of Art	318	317	1		127	118	9	
National Labor Relations Board	1,669	1,655	14		1,045	953	92	
National Mediation Board	130	116	14		94	83	11	
National Science Foundation	555	701		146	366	320	46	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	39	39			22	21	1	
Panama Canal	13,966	13,985		19	4,187	4,116	71	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,202	2,227		25	1,114	1,013	101	
Renegotiation Board	279	285		6	218	198	20	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	185	182	3		103	94	9	
Securities and Exchange Commission	966	965	1		616	560	56	
Selective Service System	6,253	6,253	0		1,832	1,676	156	
Small Business Administration	2,176	2,163	13		1,285	1,179	106	
Smithsonian Institution	1,113	1,120		7	515	467	48	
Soldiers' Home	1,036	1,022	14		328	301	27	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, Water Study Commission	44	44			29	26	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			20	21		1
Tariff Commission	240	238	2		162	147	15	
Tax Court of the United States	149	150		1	106	101	5	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,707	14,359	348		8,378	7,354	1,024	
Texas Water Study Commission	44	38	6		27	22	5	
U.S. Information Agency	10,919	10,935		16	3,966	3,602	364	
Veterans' Administration	172,795	173,233		438	71,659	65,217	6,442	
Virgin Islands Corporation	701	1,004		303	154	129	25	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,474,799	1,469,081	7,384	1,666	589,833	536,242	53,599	
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			5,718				53,591	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,769	1,794		25	1,290	1,188	102	
Department of the Army	387,006	385,753	1,253		182,420	164,137	18,283	
Department of the Navy	344,930	344,892	38		174,001	159,239	14,762	
Department of the Air Force	309,711	313,236		3,525	149,942	135,794	14,148	
Total, Department of Defense	1,043,416	1,045,675	1,291	3,550	507,653	460,358	47,295	
Net change, Department of Defense			2,259				47,295	
Grand total, including Department of Defense⁷	2,518,215	2,514,756	8,675	5,216	1,097,486	996,600	100,894	8
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,459				100,886	

¹ April figure includes 180 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

² April figure includes 14 enumerators for the Census of Agriculture as compared with 100 in March and their pay.

³ April figure includes 186,330 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 18th Decennial Census, as compared with 186,214 in March and their pay.

⁴ April figure includes 14,158 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 14,169 in March and their pay. These IOA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments

in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 3,822 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 3,920.

⁵ New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 86-380. February employment was 9; January employment was 2.

⁶ Revised on basis of later information.

⁷ Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

⁸ Expired by law Mar. 1, 1960.

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

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1960, and comparison with March 1960

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	84,991	83,026	1,965		Government Contract Committee.....	34	33	1	
Commerce ¹	212,135	212,788		653	Government Printing Office.....	6,542	6,515	27	
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	59,756	59,633	123		Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	10,758	10,769		11
Interior.....	50,749	49,653	1,096		Indian Claims Commission.....	16	16		
Justice.....	30,034	30,119		85	Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,358	2,362		4
Labor.....	6,683	6,612	71		National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	9,742	9,691	51	
Post Office.....	554,626	553,380	1,246		National Capital Housing Authority.....	346	334	12	
State ²	9,038	9,016	22		National Capital Planning Commission.....	45	45		
Treasury.....	79,928	78,367	1,561		National Gallery of Art.....	318	317	1	
Executive Office of the President:					National Labor Relations Board.....	1,643	1,629	14	
White House Office.....	434	424	10		National Mediation Board.....	130	116	14	
Bureau of the Budget.....	414	421		7	National Science Foundation.....	555	701		146
Council of Economic Advisers.....	31	31			Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.....	39	39		
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	69	70		1	Panama Canal.....	398	409		11
National Security Council.....	63	63			Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,202	2,227		25
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	1,793	1,810		17	Renegotiation Board.....	279	285		6
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.....	3	3			St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	165	162	3	
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service.....	4	5		1	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	966	965	1	
Independent agencies:					Selective Service System.....	6,107	6,098	9	
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations ³	7	4	3		Small Business Administration.....	2,154	2,143	11	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.....	2	2			Smithsonian Institution.....	1,104	1,109		5
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	14	14			Soldiers' Home.....	1,036	1,022	14	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,726	6,723	3		South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	44	44		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	591	591			Subversive Activities Control Board.....	26	26		
Boston National Historic Sites Commission.....	3	2	1		Tariff Commission.....	240	238	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	737	731	6		Tax Court of the United States.....	149	150		1
Civil Service Commission.....	3,563	3,576		13	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,705	14,357	348	
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	7	7			Texas Water Study Commission.....	44	38	6	
Commission of Fine Arts.....	4	4			U.S. Information Agency.....	2,710	2,724		16
Commission on Civil Rights.....	75	77		2	Veterans' Administration.....	171,682	172,136		452
Development Loan Fund.....	106	104	2						
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	226	227		1	Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,413,250	1,407,513	7,251	1,514
Farm Credit Administration.....	246	247		1	Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....			5,737	
Federal Aviation Agency.....	35,611	35,002	609						
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	7	7			Department of Defense:				
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,301	1,303		2	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,730	1,752		22
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,226	1,231		5	Department of the Army.....	336,208	335,603	605	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	982	979	3		Department of the Navy.....	322,944	322,846	98	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	388	336	2		Department of the Air Force.....	280,389	283,590		3,201
Federal Power Commission.....	817	816	1						
Federal Trade Commission.....	743	751		8	Total, Department of Defense.....	941,271	943,791	703	3,223
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	46	46			Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			2,520	
General Accounting Office.....	4,878	4,919		41					
General Services Administration ⁴	27,706	27,693	13		Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,354,521	2,351,304	7,954	4,737
					Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			3,217	

¹ April figure includes 180 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

² April figure includes 1,924 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,912 in March.

³ New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 86-380. February employment was 9; January employment was 2.

⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

⁵ Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1960, and comparison with March 1960

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	1,000	1,005		5	Small Business Administration.....	22	20	2	
Commerce.....	3,695	3,543	152		Smithsonian Institution.....	9	11		2
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	441	444		3	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	2	2		
Interior.....	444	442	2		U.S. Information Agency.....	8,209	8,209		
Justice.....	308	316		8	Veterans' Administration.....	1,113	1,099	14	
Labor.....	69	68	1		Virgin Islands Corporation.....	701	1,004		303
Post Office.....	1,209	1,173	36						
State ¹	28,382	28,313	69		Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	61,549	61,568	312	331
Treasury.....	556	551	4		Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....			19	
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	500	489	11		Department of Defense:				
Atomic Energy Commission.....	41	42		1	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	39	42		3
Civil Service Commission.....	3	3			Department of the Army.....	50,798	50,150	648	
Federal Aviation Agency.....	873	857	16		Department of the Navy.....	21,986	22,046		60
Federal Communications Commission.....	2	2			Department of the Air Force.....	29,322	29,646		324
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	2	2							
General Accounting Office.....	70	71		1	Total, Department of Defense.....	102,145	101,884	648	387
General Services Administration.....	4	4			Net increase, Department of Defense.....			261	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	141	137	4						
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	3	3			Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	163,694	163,452	960	718
National Labor Relations Board.....	26	26			Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			242	
Panama Canal.....	13,568	13,576		8					
Selective Service System.....	156	156							

¹ April figure includes 12,234 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 12,257 in March. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund

for this purpose. The April figure includes 3,822 of these trust-fund employees and the March figure includes 3,920.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1960, and comparison with March 1960

Department or agency	April	March	In-crease	De-crease	Department or agency	April	March	In-crease	De-crease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Agriculture.....	3,325	3,324	1		Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	2,571	2,563	8		Inside the United States.....	¹ 135,450	² 135,241	209	
Interior.....	6,990	6,705	285		Outside the United States.....	¹ 8,200	² 8,130	70	
Treasury.....	5,196	5,199		3	Department of the Navy:				
Independent agencies:					Inside the United States.....	198,664	198,661	3	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	153	155		2	Outside the United States.....	508	514		6
Federal Aviation Agency.....	883	875	8		Department of the Air Force:				
Federal Communications Commission.....	13	13			Inside the United States.....	155,482	158,172		2,690
General Services Administration.....	1,215	1,228		13	Outside the United States.....	1,426	1,402	24	
Government Printing Office.....	6,542	6,515	27		Total, Department of Defense.....	499,730	502,120	306	2,696
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	9,745	9,694	51		Net decrease, Department of Defense.....				2,390
Panama Canal.....	7,086	7,091		5	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	556,079	558,055	1,046	3,022
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	11,929	11,569	360		Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....				1,976
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	701	1,004		303					
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	56,349	55,935	740	326					
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....				414					

¹ Subject to revision.

² Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1960, and comparison with March 1960

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Belgium.....	2	2					2	2
England.....	3,272	3,259					3,272	3,259
France.....	21,773	21,894	17,434	17,577	4	4	4,335	4,313
Germany.....	80,757	81,101	68,633	68,835	56	55	12,068	12,211
Japan.....	61,409	62,277	20,651	¹ 20,680	15,946	¹ 16,030	24,812	25,567
Korea.....	6,163	6,228	6,163	¹ 6,228				
Morocco.....	3,763	3,815	2	2	849	846	2,912	2,967
Netherlands.....	41	41					41	41
Norway.....	24	24					24	24
Saudi Arabia.....	1	2					1	2
Spain.....		1						1
Trinidad.....	621	547			621	547		
Total.....	177,826	179,191	112,883	113,322	17,476	17,482	47,467	48,387

¹ Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,518,215. This was a net increase of 3,459 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March.

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

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1959—July.....	2,370,694	3,703	
August.....	2,364,320		6,374
September.....	2,345,359		18,961
October.....	2,348,807	3,448	
November.....	2,372,247	23,440	
December.....	2,364,342		7,905
1960—January.....	2,329,442		34,900
February.....	2,331,884	2,442	
March.....	2,514,756	182,872	
April.....	2,518,215	3,459	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of April was 1,474,799, an increase of 5,718 as compared with the March total of 1,469,081. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,043,416, a decrease of 2,259 as compared with 1,045,675 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Agriculture Department with

1,960, Treasury Department with 1,566, Post Office Department with 1,282, Interior Department with 1,098, and Federal Aviation Agency with 625. The largest decrease was reported by Commerce Department with 501.

The April figures include 186,539 temporary employees of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census, as follows: 169,065 enumerators, 12,015 crew leaders, and 5,459 clerks and others.

In the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 3,525 and the Department of the Army reported an increase of 1,253.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 3,217 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 242. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in April totaled 556,079, a decrease of 1,976.

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

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,518,215 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 177,826 foreign nationals working for U.S. military agencies during April who were not counted

in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 179,191. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Belgium.....	2			2
England.....	3,272			3,272
France.....	21,773	17,434	4	4,335
Germany.....	80,757	68,633	56	12,068
Japan.....	61,409	20,651	15,946	24,812
Korea.....	6,163	6,163		
Morocco.....	3,763	2	849	2,912
Netherlands.....	41			41
Norway.....	24			24
Saudi Arabia.....	1			1
Trinidad.....	621		621	
Total.....	177,826	112,883	17,476	47,467

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 3622. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Frank F. Reynolds, U.S. Navy Reserve (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. Long of Hawaii):

S. 3623. A bill to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

RESOLUTION

STUDY OF CONDITIONS IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to authorize the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to undertake a special study of conditions in American Samoa to determine what should be done to improve conditions in American Samoa and help the people of that island achieve a greater amount of self-government. A thorough study of the problems of American Samoa is particularly needed at this time because of the coming independence of nearby Western Samoa now under British jurisdiction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 330) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of conditions in American Samoa for the purpose of determining what should be done to improve economic and other conditions and to give the people of American Samoa a greater amount of self-government.

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

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

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HALEAKALA NATIONAL PARK, HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would give the Haleakala Crater section of Hawaii National Park separate national park status, to be designated as Haleakala National Park.

The Hawaii National Park includes two sections on different islands. The Kilauea-Mauna Loa section, headquarters for the park, is located on the island of Hawaii, while the Haleakala Crater section is on the island of Maui. The two sections are separated by a body of water and are approximately 125 miles apart.

Haleakala should be made a separate national park, not only because of its separate and distinct location, but also because it is uniquely famous in Hawaiian mythology, because the area has rare plants and geological formations peculiar unto itself, and because we in Hawaii are proud of Haleakala's locality, its history, its unusual features, and distinctive attractions.

Haleakala is the world's largest dormant volcano but was once the scene of infrequent eruptions separated by possibly hundreds of years of inactivity. The last such activity took place about 1750. During the long periods of inactivity between eruptions, erosion cut two deep valleys into its sides. When volcanic activity again resumed, flows of lava and blankets of cinders were spread on the valley floors.

Haleakala covers an area of 33 miles and its highest point is 10,032 feet. Haleakala Crater is a depression of 3,000 feet, 7 miles in length and 2 miles wide, with a 21-mile circumference. Within this gigantic crater are massive and colorful cinder cones which tell the scientifically important story of past volcanic activity and might. There are also caverns, a desert plain, forest niches, luxuriant meadows, trees, and the rare and unique silversword. As a part of this outstanding scenic spectacle, two natural values stand out above all others—the brightly colored small crater cones and the exotic silversword plants, found only within Haleakala Crater and nowhere else in the world.

Haleakala is famous in Hawaiian mythology as the place where the demi-god Maui snared the sun. Since Haleakala is so high, its peaks rested among the clouds and when the sun finally rose to its height, it passed over the mountain so quickly that fruits and vegetables took years to mature and Maui's mother was unable to dry the tapa, or cloth, which she hung out each day. With 16 strong ropes and with nooses made from the tresses of his sister, Maui captured the rays of the sun. He released the sun only after extracting a promise that the sun would travel more slowly in its orbit over Haleakala. Because the sun does linger over Haleakala, adding to its rare beauty, the mountain was named Haleakala, which means the House or Palace of the Sun.

The park begins at the 6,700-foot elevation with park headquarters located

on the slopes of the brush-covered mountainside at the 7,000-foot level. Here visitors can obtain an excellent impression of the magnitude and grandeur of Mount Haleakala. An excellent motor highway leads to the crater rim and summit 10 miles away, which, too, are an inspirational sight to visitors.

Hiking and horseback riding are popular activities in the crater, which has a number of well-equipped trail cabins designed to facilitate such use.

The climate is cool to cold, but actual freezing temperatures are rare except above 8,000 feet and this only during winter. The area is generally dry but is subject, also, to violent rains, fog, and drizzle.

There is an observation station near the highest point on the rim of the crater from which a breathtaking panorama unfolds.

About 92,000 visits were made to the Haleakala Crater section of the park in 1959 as compared with about 48,000 in 1951.

Creation of a separate national park would give distinction to this beautiful historic area. I therefore urge favorable consideration of the measure I have introduced today.

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

The bill (S. 3623) to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ACT OF 1960 — ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 26 and June 2, 1960, the names of Senators JAVITS and KEATING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3596) to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey on May 26, 1960.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN
NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE
ON THE JUDICIARY

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

James H. Somers, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of North Carolina, for a term of 4 years.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal, district of Alaska, for the term of 4 years.

Hyman Freehof, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

Herbert E. Patrick, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of Tennessee, for a term of 4 years.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all

persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 10, 1960, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

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

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

Letter dated May 26, 1960, written by Hon. E. Y. BERRY, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Dakota.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Editorial entitled "Mississippi and Wyoming Join in Being Proud of Dr. Humphrey," published in the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss., on May 27, 1960.

ATTACKS ON PRESIDENT EISENHOWER BY SOVIET PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, early this morning Soviet Premier Khrushchev launched a verbal attack upon our President which reached new heights of vituperation. It contained some of the most unusual language ever employed by the head of one government against the head of another government other than in a time of shooting war.

It is necessary to go back to the days of Adolph Hitler to find a parallel.

The harsh, bitter language against not only President Eisenhower, but Chancellor Adenauer of Germany, can be received with dignity. The words are far too reminiscent of slogans chalked on a back alley fence to merit a reply in kind.

But there is some cause for concern as to the motives behind such an attack. This is something which must be analyzed with the greatest care.

Communist politics, of course, have always been something of a mystery to the free people of the world. We can never really be certain as to the internal struggles that may be going on within the Soviet Union. We can only analyze and guess—and pay respectful attention to those whose guesses in the past have borne the closest resemblance to the reality which developed later.

It may be that Premier Khrushchev is having internal troubles. It may well be that he is having external troubles with some of his allies, particularly one which grows stronger and more menacing with each passing day.

And we cannot dismiss entirely the assumption that the whole thing merely represents a revelation of astonishingly bad temper.

We do know, however, that it is the custom of those skilled in statecraft to avoid unforgivable words and irretrievable acts. The essence of statesmanship in the field of foreign relations is always to leave the door open for further negotiations and exploration of moves to ease world tension.

Whatever may have been his motives, it is obvious from this morning's tirade that Premier Khrushchev has no desire to leave any doors open.

The incident underscores the fact that this Nation has a pressing need for unity. I am confident the unity is there and will grow even stronger. None of us, Democrats or Republicans, is going to knuckle under to arrogance.

In correcting our mistakes, we are going to proceed along the responsible lines laid down by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. And in facing the Communists we are going to proceed along the lines of the solid front which Americans always present in times of trouble.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, for the statesmanlike utterance he has just voiced. I wish to associate myself with his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his statement. When the best interests of America are under question, the Senator from Oregon can always be depended upon to stand up and express courageous judgments. The committee of which he is such a distinguished member has conducted itself in accordance with the highest traditions of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join the senior Senator from Oregon in commending the majority leader, and I also wish to be associated in the remarks which he has made.

Name calling, invective, and insults are not going to bring the world any closer to a durable peace. This indulgence—for that is what it is—is not going to make this volcanic planet any safer for the Russian people, the American people, or any other people. On the contrary, it is going to intensify the new headlong dash to disaster which began with the U-2 incident and the collapse of the summit.

The ability to talk tough to the Russians is supposed to have something to do with winning elections in this country. It may be a reasonable assumption, then, that, conversely, the ability to talk tough to the Americans has something to do with staying in power in Russia.

But neither winning elections here nor staying in power there is going to mean very much if the campaign speeches and the press conferences take place on a hill of rubble and ashes. And that is the prospect which the recent incident and Mr. Khrushchev's press conferences—particularly his references to his orders to General Malinovsky—have unfolded very starkly for the world.

Mr. Khrushchev may be enjoying these propaganda field days—I say days rather than day for he has by no means exhausted the possibilities which the U-2 opened up for him. He may be providing very spicy copy for the press, radio, and TV. But the personal vendetta which he is carrying on against the Presi-

dent is not serving the cause of peace. It is serving the cause of a renewed cold war which, if it runs its course, can only end in the conflict which no one in his right senses wants.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Khrushchev cannot restrain himself, for his indulgence in this colorful and inflammatory rhetoric has detracted from the proposals on disarmament which he also advanced at his press conference. These appear to be an important development in this complex and difficult field. I hope that these proposals will be carefully studied as they should have been studied, in the first place, at the diplomatic level. If they do contain the basis for a genuine service to mankind, if they promise in any way to pull the world back from the brink of disaster and lighten the burden of taxation for military purposes borne by all peoples, then they should be considered carefully, soberly, and honestly, despite recent developments. Just as the summit meeting should have taken precedence over the U-2 incident in Mr. Khrushchev's perspective, the peace, safety, and stability of the Nation and the world, which are now intimately linked with disarmament, must take precedence in our perspective over his personal vendetta against the President of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader when he discussed earlier today the most recent tirade of Mr. Khrushchev.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill, I wish to announce that at the conclusion of the morning hour next Monday, it is my intention to call up the conference report on H.R. 10569, a bill appropriating funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and to ask the Senate to concur in that report, and to recede from its position on amendment No. 6 on which there was no agreement between the managers on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House. Since amendment No. 6 was not explained in the House when it voted to insist on the House position with respect to that Senate amendment, I desire to make a brief explanation for the benefit of colleagues who will be called upon to vote on this question next Monday.

Senate amendment No. 6 is an amendment to the House bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It strikes from the bill the following language "including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, as now authorized by law." When that amendment was offered, the junior Senator from Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee on the Treasury-Post Office bill, explained that the amendment was unnecessary since the language in

the bill sought to be eliminated was merely a repetition of existing law, and that the language in the report of the House committee expressing the hope that the Post Office Department would be willing to deliver in cities unaddressed congressional franked mail would not be binding on the Post Office Department in view of the language in the Senate committee report stating that the language in question was not binding.

The language in the House committee report on this subject was as follows:

The committee has inserted language in the bill, the purpose of which is to make clear, on its face, that funds in the bill are available, as now authorized by the postal laws, for expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail sent under the frank. It anticipates return to a method of addressing city-delivery franked mail followed on previous occasions, as has long been the case with rural and star-route mail. This would facilitate communication with constituencies in consonance with concepts inherent in the granting of the frank.

Such a procedure would insure complete service being available to every Member to reach every person and every family in his district in the distribution of Government publications and information on the questions and issues pending before the Congress. No patron would be denied the information which it was intended he should receive under the frank. Presently, it is virtually impossible, even after substantial effort and expense, to adequately cover the district.

In refusing to agree with the House on the subject of the delivery of unaddressed franked mail, the Senate committee in its report said:

With reference to new language included in the bill by the House relating to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, the committee does not consider that the language is any extension of the franking privilege currently being administered by the Post Office Department.

In explaining why the Williams amendment did not in any way change the position that the Senate would otherwise take on the question of the delivery of unaddressed franked mail, the chairman of the subcommittee explained the position of his committee on the floor of the Senate, first on April 25, and later on April 27.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the explanations made by the junior Senator from Virginia on the Williams amendment and certain quotations from statements of the Senator from Delaware.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 25, 1960]

Page 8615 (Mr. ROBERTSON):

"Under the present administrative rules of the Post Office Department, mailers may use the simplified address for mail for all rural routes or boxholders in post offices where there is no city delivery service. The simplified address is that mail for rural patrons at all offices or boxholders in noncity delivery offices may receive advertising circulars addressed simply to 'Postal patron' with no other address required. For all mail addressed to city delivery offices other than rural delivery, all mail must be addressed to

house number, street, and city. The term 'occupant' may be used in place of the name of the addressee but all other elements of the address must be shown.

"By administrative action the Department has the authority to issue regulations that would permit the use of the so-called simplified address for mail at all points including city delivery carrier offices. Under this arrangement it would merely be necessary to provide each postmaster with enough pieces of mail, without name or address, to distribute to each patron of the city. A regulation of this type was issued by Mr. Farley and because of the tremendous number of complaints received, the authority for such mail was discontinued. Postmaster General Summerfield also attempted to permit the use of this type of mail and for 18 months the regulation was in effect. The Post Office Department was swamped with complaints. The order was then rescinded. Members of both Houses of Congress, in the posting of their official mail, must now adhere to the same rules and regulations that apply to the general public; namely, mail going to any rural route may be with 'simplified address' (no name or address); mail to city carrier post offices must bear at least the house number, street, and city.

"The House inserted language in the appropriation for operations that the money appropriated 'including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, now authorized by law.' This committee does not consider that this language changes the basic law in any manner and does not in itself require the Post Office Department to make any changes in its present rules and regulations with respect to the use of the so-called simplified address for any mail, including that for Members of Congress."

Pages 8617 and 8618 (Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

"Unless this amendment is adopted it will mean that Members of Congress can flood their States with political propaganda at the taxpayers' expense by the simple expedient of making speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then reprinting and distributing them to everybody in the State.

"The committee states that it has no intention of changing the existing law as it relates to the franking privilege of Members of Congress; therefore this amendment is in order. * * *

"If we do not adopt this amendment it will be possible to send out over our franks an almost unlimited quantity of all kinds of political propaganda at taxpayers' expense.

"I have been advised that even if we leave this language in the bill, the present Postmaster General and his Solicitor intend to interpret the language as providing no change in the franking privilege; however, their successors may make different interpretations. This would be possible because the House in approving the language did give it an entirely different interpretation than did the Senate committee."

Pages 8618 and 8619 (Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

"This amendment would strike out the language which the Senate committee says is superfluous and therefore harmless. I am not satisfied with that reasoning. There may be a different Postmaster General and a different Solicitor who will interpret the language as it was interpreted by the House.

"Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment. If so, I have no desire to continue the discussion.

"Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment, but on a different theory from that which has been presented to the Senate.

This is the language contained in the House report:

"The committee has inserted language in the bill, the purpose of which is to make clear, on its face, that funds in the bill are available as now authorized by the postal laws, for expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail sent under the frank."

"That is the present law, under which we frank our official mail. That was all the language did.

"The Department says that that does not put any compulsion on them to deliver franked mail to unaddressed box holders in cities that have postal carriers. The Department did not request any change in the language of the bill, and in the committee's opinion no change in the bill is necessary, because all that the House report did was to express the pious hope that the Department would voluntarily change the rule. The change had been attempted when General Farley was Postmaster General, but he gave it up. The change was tried later, but was again given up. The Department was very much opposed to doing something that would result in great additional expense, without bringing in additional revenue, and also would provide special privileges which no one else enjoys. But as I have stated, did not request deletion of the language.

"So the Senate committee included the following language in its report:

"With reference to new language included in the bill by the House relating to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, the committee does not consider that the language is any extension of the franking privilege currently being administered by the Post Office Department."

"But in view of the insistence of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, the chairman of the subcommittee is willing—because he agrees that the amendment does not do any more than the committee report does—to accept this amendment; but that will put this measure into conference, whereas it would not otherwise have to go."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 27, 1960]

Pages 8702 and 8703 (Mr. ROBERTSON):

"Mr. President, in view of the apparent difficulty of some of our friends of the fourth estate in understanding the amendment offered last Monday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the then pending Post Office appropriations bill, relating to what he termed the distribution of junk mail without addresses, the chairman of the subcommittee which considered that appropriation desires to repeat what he distinctly said on last Monday concerning what was involved. At that time he said that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was not necessary. He said that the Solicitor General of the Post Office Department had ruled that the mere repetition in the appropriation bill of the statutory authority for the use of franked mail by Members of the Congress did not in any way, shape, or form compel the Post Office Department to change its existing regulation which prohibited the distribution of franked mail that was unaddressed in cities and towns which had street delivery.

"But when the amendment was offered, the chairman of the subcommittee had the clerk of the committee again call the Postmaster General on the telephone, and he received the reply that the Department's position had not changed; that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware was not needed; and that he had so informed the Senator from Delaware.

"Mr. President, far be it for me to accuse any of our friends of the press of putting the Appropriations Committee in a false light, but the whole matter is fully set out on pages 8168 and 8619 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 25, 1960. Yet not a

word appeared in the press to the effect that the committee was informed by the Post Office Department that the language framed by the Department and put in the committee report was all that was necessary to protect the Department from what was only a request—not a law, but only a request—in the House report that the Postmaster General adopt a regulation with respect to the delivery of unaddressed mail.

"In conclusion, after outlining very fully those reasons, the chairman of the subcommittee said that to begin with, the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment, but on a different theory from that which has been presented to the Senate. This is the language contained in the House report.

"Then I went on to say that all this amendment did—and that is still the fact—was to put in conference what we had taken care of in the committee report, and now we have just one more issue to debate with the House conferees, because we had the matter fully covered in a way that could not be raised in conference, whereas the amendment, taking out language of the bill itself, must be argued in conference and must be insisted on by the Senate conferees. There is the possibility, of course, that the House conferees might not agree to take the language out. The conferees might go back for a separate vote in the House. This might require a separate vote in the Senate. After it is all done, we get back to where the committee was in the first instance.

"Mr. President, I think the RECORD was perfectly clear on Monday on that issue. Naturally, I regret that no member of the press who was handling this matter saw fit to let the public know that they were not going to be gouged by a new method of free delivery through failure of the Senate committee to protect them and that their protection was not dependent upon the very able and alert Senator from Delaware and the amendment he offered.

"I repeat, the public was fully protected in this matter. The amendment offered added nothing to the bill except the possibility of an additional fight in conference to sustain that particular amendment."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, Mr. President, when I move next Monday that the Senate recede on amendment No. 6, in order that action may be completed on an important appropriation bill, I wish to make it crystal clear that, whether or not the Post Office Department at any time in the coming fiscal year authorizes the delivery in cities of unaddressed congressional franked mail, it will remain, as in the past, in the discretion of the Postmaster General.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Prof. Carl Q. Christol, of the University of Southern California, entitled "The United States and the International Court of Justice."

Professor Christol is professor of international law and political science at Southern California. In this article, he gives a clear and concise statement of the effects of the Connally reservation upon the operation of the International Court, and also discusses the pros and cons of its repeal. I particularly call

attention to his conclusion, in which he states:

From the foregoing it will be seen that the advocates of repeal of the Connally amendment display a wholesome confidence in the technical competence of the Court and in the judicial quality of its judges. * * * The amendment is a self-imposed roadblock to progress in the affairs of nations. The case for repeal is based on sound reasons. Reasonable alternatives exist. Yet, repeal would create no panacea. It would be but one of many steps which Americans must take upon a long, hard road. With the repeal of the amendment, the work and prestige of the Court is bound to increase. This will contribute materially to the progressive growth of international law and to the rule of law in world affairs.

As the sponsor of the original resolution to which the Connally reservation was added over my protest, I heartily endorse the conclusions Professor Christol sets forth. I hope the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will soon reconsider its decision to postpone the resolution repealing the Connally amendment.

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

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

(By Carl Q. Christol)¹

INTRODUCTION

The attention of thoughtful Americans is again being focused on the role of the International Court of Justice. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message of January 7, 1960, called attention to this Nation's limited access to the Court, and urged the prompt passage of a Senate resolution whereby the so-called Connally amendment of 1946 would be repealed. In 1946 the United States voluntarily accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction subject to the right to determine unilaterally whether a dispute is essentially within its domestic jurisdiction.

The resolution referred to by the President was that introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in 1959 with the support of Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate. Since 1959 members of the administration closest to Mr. Eisenhower, including Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Herter, Attorney General Rogers and others, have been advocating the repeal of the American self-judging reservation.

The attack on the Connally amendment has been bipartisan and widespread. Such bodies as the American Bar Association, in particular its section on international and comparative law, and the American Society of International Law, have long been on record in favor of a fuller participation in the work of the Court by the United States.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The broad problem is to determine whether the Court, as the principal judicial instrument of the United Nations, is able to be an effective device for resolving international disputes. In the presence of unrivaled demands in the United States for a rule of law in world affairs to supplant the rule of force, is the Court capable of serving as a dispute-resolving and peace-securing institution? Can its potential be put to use?

¹ Professor of international law and political science, University of Southern California; member, Los Angeles, Calif., South Dakota, and American Bar Associations; member, American Society of International Law.

The immediate problem is for Americans to determine whether the potential of the Court is adversely affected by the self-judging aspect of the present reservation. In terms of our national interest the question is whether and under what conditions the United States should grant to the Court, and thereby commit itself to the rule of law in world affairs, the power to exercise jurisdiction over international legal disputes to which we are a party.

Prior to and at the time of the San Francisco Conference many able statesmen debated the ultimate role of the United Nations. In looking back over their work it is now clear that they intended to and did create a limited international institution. The most obvious evidence of this fact is the content of article 2(7) of the charter which provides that the United Nations may not deal with matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states.

Many of the smaller states at San Francisco, including a majority of all states present, sought nonetheless, to establish an international court which would have automatic, i.e., compulsory, jurisdiction over international legal disputes. Such jurisdiction, if possessed, would have prevented a state from unilaterally divesting the Court of jurisdiction in legal disputes in which the particular state was involved. However, the United States and the Soviet Union, apparently fearful that article 2(7) did not afford that form of protection which they thought their vital interests required, joined hands to prevent the Court from receiving automatic jurisdiction. Thus, the statute of the Court made provision for optional jurisdiction. Members of the Court were given the power, at their election, to confer upon the Court compulsory jurisdiction over all international legal disputes, or only those which they considered to be commensurate with their public needs. Almost all of the members have attached to their acceptances the proviso that the Court shall not have the power to deal with international legal disputes which affect the domestic affairs of the respective nations.

When the terms of the American declaration accepting the jurisdiction of the Court came before the Senate in August 1946, further fears were expressed respecting the range of subjects falling within the concept of "domestic jurisdiction." In view of the alleged uncertainty as to whether certain enumerated subjects were domestic or international in nature, the Senate, following the lead of Senator Connally—who in turn was relying upon a memorandum filed with the Senate by Mr. John Foster Dulles—decided to reserve to the United States the right to determine what was a domestic matter. In view of the fact that the United States in accepting the statute of the Court had agreed pursuant to article 36(6) that "In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court" some delicate legal and political problems were thereby created.

When the World Court compulsory jurisdiction resolution was before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator Warren R. Austin had proposed that the United States should determine for itself what matters were "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."² In testimony before the committee the late Dr. Lawrence Preuss, professor of international law at the University of Michigan, stated that this proposal constituted "an extremely retrogressive step and

² Hearings on S. Res. 196 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 36 (1946).

would be taking away with one hand what we purport to be giving with the other."² In accepting the wisdom of this point of view the committee report declared that such a reservation would "tend to defeat the purposes which it is hoped to achieve by means of the proposed declaration as well as the purpose of article 36, paragraphs 2 and 6, of the Statute of the Court."³

However, on the floor of the Senate an amendment was proposed by Senator Connally whereby proviso "b" of the American declaration, accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court on matters contained in article 36(2) of the statute was modified to permit the unilateral and continuing control of the United States respecting the meaning of "domestic jurisdiction." Thus, proviso "b," which in its original form read "Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States," was amended to include "as determined by the United States."⁴

It should be noted that article 36(2) of the statute gave the Court jurisdiction over all legal disputes concerning (a) the interpretation of a treaty, (b) any question of international law, (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation, and, (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation. The conflict between the provisions of the statute, particularly article 36(6), and the Connally amendment, are readily apparent.

ARGUMENTS FOR REPEAL

The following views have been expressed by those who favor the elimination of the self-judging reservation from the American declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. First, the American reservation respecting compulsory jurisdiction exists in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation. The United States, having accepted jurisdiction on the basis of reciprocity, accords to any other state the use of the Connally amendment against the United States. Senator Connally's view that the United States needed such a reservation because it was and would be a party defendant, and needed some way to prevent raids by foreign countries on the American Treasury, has proven to be inaccurate. As a recent bar association report has pointed out:

"Thus, the United States which has a larger stake in investments abroad and in military bases abroad than any other nation * * * has * * * prevented itself from utilizing, in its own behalf, the International Court of Justice. This does not seem to make good sense."⁵

Without the amendment the Court would be in a position to provide greater legal security to extensive American foreign interests.

Second, the Court in almost every case coming before it has been obliged to rule on its jurisdiction, and has displayed a conservative outlook respecting the extent of

this jurisdiction. An analysis of the cases involving jurisdictional matters clearly discloses that the Court has not and will not depart from long-accepted principles of international law. It is impossible to conclude that the Court through the application of international law could confuse domestic and international matters as they now stand.

It is unreasonable to believe that the Court could misconceive, through judicial misunderstanding of the law or otherwise, the present meaning of "domestic jurisdiction." The competent international lawyers who compose the Court are quite aware that such problems as immigration, tariffs, and the Panama Canal have been traditionally held to be matters of our own domestic jurisdiction. Thus, many persons object to the self-judging domestic jurisdiction reservation because it needlessly casts doubt on sufficiently clear international legal rules and principles, even though the doctrine of domestic jurisdiction is much like many domestic legal rules and principles, not universal nor absolute in content.

A related position is that through the reservation the United States violates the fundamental doctrine of equality before the law. It is urged that the United States through the reservation has constituted itself both judge and jury in its own case—thereby divesting the Court of a legitimate judicial function. This position has raised serious questions of American good faith respecting its frequent protestations that it is a law-abiding and a law-respecting Nation. As Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, formerly professor of international law at Cambridge, and a recent member of the Court, has said, the spirit evidenced in the amendment represents a "vague apprehension of danger, as exhibited in this nervous quest for security from law, which is difficult to comprehend."⁷

In short, it has been urged that through the amendment the United States continues to forward an ambivalent attitude. The amendment has been widely cited as an illustration of the difference between America's allegedly superficial acceptance of democratic ideals and the extent to which such ideals are actually practiced in world affairs. In this sense the mere existence of the reservation, visible as it is in the area of world diplomacy, suggests to some nations and proves to others no less observant that the United States in the final analysis is irrevocably committed to a nationalistic rather than a community viewpoint in international legal affairs.

Another criticism of the reservation has been raised by preeminent legal scholars. They ask whether the reservation is not inconsistent with American acceptance of the statute, and, by inference, of the charter itself. Two common law trained judges on the Court maintain that the reservation is so inconsistent with American obligations under the statute as to render null and void the whole of the American declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. On the other hand, Judges Klaestad (Norway) and Armand-Ugon (Uruguay) have adopted a somewhat more limited view of the meaning of the reservation. They agree that the reservation is invalid but conclude that this does not invalidate the balance of the American declaration.

A serious criticism of the reservation is that it could be used to oust the Court of jurisdiction in a case brought before it by the United States. Since the United States has accepted jurisdiction on the basis of reciprocity, the Connally amendment can be claimed by states which have not included such a provision in their own acceptance. Thus we have unwittingly conferred upon defendants the power to prevent the Court from taking jurisdiction in important mat-

ters in which we may be called upon to protect our vital foreign interests.

The Connally amendment has provided other states with an excuse to file similar declarations restricting the jurisdiction of the Court. One of the six foreign states which have followed the American example has withdrawn its self-judging reservation, namely, France. It did so after Norway had prevented the Court from taking jurisdiction in the Loans case through reciprocal recourse to the French self-judging provision. The present French reservation excludes from the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only those "disputes relating to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction."⁸

The American reservation, by the impetus it has given to these other states, as well as by its own terms, has caused the Secretary-General of the United Nations to declare that it is capable of rendering the whole system of compulsory jurisdiction virtually illusory. One may well inquire if American self-interest is served by such a prospect.

Another criticism of the amendment has to do with the delicate constitutional relationship between the executive and legislative branches of our own Government in the area of foreign affairs. Those who urge the repeal of the amendment believe that repeal would reduce the possibilities of friction between our own political departments. The American separation of powers doctrine is subtle and even fragile, and the amendment in imposing unneeded legislative conditions upon the Executive's constitutional management of foreign relations is able to impede the effective protection of American rights abroad. This problem was illustrated by the need, on the part of the Department of State, to invoke the amendment in the Interhandel case, although the best interests of the United States dictate that this matter be resolved through adherence to the rule of law in international legal disputes.

Finally, the reservation is at best unnecessary. Even if the Charter did not establish procedures whereby the United States might protect itself against international judicial harm to its truly vital interests, as it does do, the United States has reserved the right to leave the Court upon 6 months advance notice. The use by the United States of its veto in the Security Council to vitiate a decision of the Court, is, of course, an unthinkable thing. Thus, it is urged that the United States should have confidence in the integrity of the Court in determining what in fact constitutes the legal concept of domestic jurisdiction. This should be weighed in the light of the observation that "There is no hope for permanent peace unless the nations of the world are willing to submit their disputes insofar as they involve issues of international law to the World Court for final determination."⁹

The foregoing views have received general approval. Vice President Nixon on several occasions has emphasized the point that international disputes over the meaning of international agreements could better be resolved if the Court possessed a wider jurisdiction and that a modification of the Connally amendment would contribute to this end. Mr. Henry R. Luce has been an outspoken opponent of the amendment. He has observed that the judges of the Court "know as much about international law as there is to be known. Unfortunately, theirs is also the most unused court in the world. A preliminary reason for the scandalous neglect lies right on the doorstep of the United States. [The Connally amendment] is bad law * * * [and] it is also bad foreign policy,

⁸ International and Comparative Law Report, op. cit., p. 23, footnote 2.

⁹ WAYNE L. MORSE, "International Justice through Law," 26 Oregon Law Review, p. 7 (1946).

² Ibid., p. 84.

³ S. Rept. No. 1835, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5 (1946).

⁴ 92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 10624, 10841. For a fuller account of the legislative history one should consult Lawrence Preuss, "The International Court of Justice, the Senate, and Matters of Domestic Jurisdiction," 40 American Journal of International Law, p. 736 (1946), and Francis O. Wilcox, "The United States Accepts Compulsory Jurisdiction," ibid., p. 699.

⁵ American Bar Association, section of International and Comparative Law, Report on the Self-Judging Aspect of the United States Domestic Jurisdiction Reservation With Respect to the International Court of Justice, p. 55 (1959), hereafter cited as "International and Comparative Law Report."

⁷ Quoted by Preuss, op. cit., p. 734.

with a built-in boomerang effect against American interests. The Connally amendment has not only weakened the court by setting a bad example to other nations; it has robbed us of recourse to it. Until the Connally amendment is amended, as the administration urges, our bad example will keep the court in its present scandalous idleness, and also frustrate any U.S. claim to be a champion of law in world affairs."¹⁰

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, has summarized the situation as follows:

"We have available already much of the machinery needed to make a rule of law effective. We have a large body of international law, in addition to those basic concepts of law, order, and fair play that are common to virtually all civilized people. We have treaties with many nations based upon law and a respect for obligations duly assumed. We have the machinery of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, in order to put into effect the rule of law among nations. And we have the basic, moral desire to do what is needed to create peace and well being. This above all is the great force for peace."¹¹

Many similar sentiments have been expressed by countless Americans. Only through an effective international court can the rule of law be applied to international legal disputes.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST REPEAL

Those who feel that American interests can best be protected through the Connally amendment naturally reject many of the foregoing truths. They urge that one cannot be sufficiently sure, or positive (the language varies) that the Court will not interpret the term "domestic jurisdiction" so broadly—and like any other legal term it will require interpretation—that vital national interests may be adversely affected by its rulings. It is urged that the alleged uncertain future path of the Court, as well as the vague and general content of international law, make it a risky matter to confer such competence on the Court.

Another viewpoint is that the Court is composed mainly of foreigners. The judges do come from, but do not represent, 15 different countries. Their individual environments, cultural, social, economic, religious, ethnic, and legal backgrounds are not entirely uniform. Their value systems and their awareness of the world's different legal systems are not identical. However, whether this natural diversity is so great as to prevent the existence of a fair and just rule of law in world legal affairs is certainly to be doubted.

The Court judges have a common background in an almost universal discipline—international law. Further, it is interesting to note that the present judges come from geographical areas where the Anglo-American common law system prevails (4), where variants of the Roman law system prevail (8), where the Soviet system prevails (1), where an Islamic system prevails (2), and where an Asian framework exists (2).¹² At the time of

the last elections, the following were elected as judges: Armand-Ugon (Uruguay), Badawi (Egypt), Basdevant (France), Cordova (Mexico), Guerro (El Salvador), Hackworth (U.S.A.), Khan (Pakistan), Klaestad (Norway), Kojenivnikov (U.S.S.R.), Koo (Nationalist China), Lauterpacht (United Kingdom), Moreno Quintana (Argentina), Spender (Australia), Spiropoulos (Greece), and Winiarski (Poland). Several of the foregoing judges who do not come from common law or civil law areas either studied in such areas or have had a considerable amount of practical experience in dealing with such legal systems.

From 1922 to the present the United States has always had an American national on the World Court, namely, John B. Moore, Charles E. Hughes, Frank B. Kellogg, Manley O. Hudson, and Green H. Hackworth. During this period at any given time a preponderance of the members of the Court have been well indoctrinated in the cultural and social values of Western Europe. Further, during the many years of the Permanent Court of International Justice it was never seriously thought that the quality of justice rendered by that Court was impeded by the national origins of its members. Judge Manley O. Hudson, as a result of his long membership on the Permanent Court and his careful analysis, has concluded that the judicial impartiality of full-time judges is an established fact. He has noted that on several occasions such judges have voted against the legal positions urged by their own country.¹³ So far as the present Court is concerned, it is the observation of one author that national origins of judges have not affected the judicial and impartial quality of their decisions. He states that there has not been "party line" voting, and that the "scales of justice at the international level have generally been balanced with as pleasing a degree of impartiality as ever graced an American courthouse."¹⁴

It has also been urged that the judges might be made the target of national political pressures. It is possible that this may be true. Whether they might succumb to such pressures is a more difficult question. A number of factors are involved in such a charge. It is true that many of the judges have been closely allied with the governments of their own countries prior to acceptance of judicial appointment. Many, and some would urge too many, of the judges have served in the legal offices of their departments of foreign affairs. Others have served their respective countries as prime ministers, supreme court justices, secretaries of foreign affairs, secretaries of justice, diplomats of high rank, and members of national parliaments. Others have been law school deans, professors of law, and private practitioners. Many have combined several of the above responsibilities. All have been lawyers. Frequently they have been members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. All have had long experience in international legal matters.

Whether close association with the international legal problems of their respective nations has created a predisposition to accept their own nation's legal position, if and when advanced before the Court, is to be doubted. These judges are the product of a tough, taut, legal tradition, and it is unlikely that their dedication to, and their understanding of, international law and the rule of law in world affairs could be reduced by political pressures. And even if this were assumed to be possible, the Court decides

matters by a majority vote. On the other hand, it should be noted that frequently an ad hoc judge, designated by a nation which does not have an elected national on the Court in the event of litigation to which that nation is a party, does accept the legal position urged by his or the appointing nation.

Again, it has been urged that the Connally amendment should be retained because of the complex quality of international disputes. This position holds that it is next to impossible, if not impossible, to sever the legal qualities of a lawsuit from political and economic issues. The conclusion is drawn that the American reservation is required to prevent an admixture of such problems from being presented to the Court under the label "legal." Once again, it must be admitted that disputes generally fall to present themselves to courts equipped with a ready-made, simple, and conclusive label. If this were possible, it is indeed likely that there would be fewer disputes and a substantially smaller demand for the existence of courts, both at home and abroad. In American constitutional law the Supreme Court has created the cautious doctrine of "political disputes" whereby it refuses to adjudicate matters which are essentially political, or which are not regarded as expedient to handle. The doctrine of judicial self-restraint, which has also become a part of American constitutional law, has numerous counterparts in the jurisprudence of the World Court. The judges of the latter Court are just as aware, if not more aware than anyone else, that the success and even continued existence of their Court depends to an extraordinary degree upon their application of international law to international legal disputes.

The responsible attitude of the judges, as well as the conservative decisions of the Court, do not support the view that this Court will permit itself to become embroiled in "political" as distinguished from "legal" disputes. And this is true despite the fact that, as every lawyer knows, there is no ultimate line dividing legal from political matters. The record of this Court is adequate evidence of its consistent refusal to enlarge its own jurisdiction by a judicial tour de force. This is a sound reason for dismissing as unfounded the fears of those who seek to retain the amendment.

ALTERNATE PROPOSALS

The students of repeal have suggested alternatives to the present reservation. Prof. Louis B. Sohn, of the Harvard Law School, has suggested that the entire American declaration might be modified so that the Court might take jurisdiction in matters affecting injuries to persons and property, treaty interpretation, and disputes among NATO countries.¹⁵ These suggestions could be implemented without amendment of the 1946 declaration. He also proposes four ways whereby the Connally amendment might be revised. First, the entire amendment could be omitted. Second, it could be retained, but limited to "matters which have been traditionally considered by the United States as matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."¹⁶ Or the declaration could contain a long list of matters considered by the United States as essentially domestic. Finally, he suggests that the list of reserved matters could be open ended and tied to a clause making reference to "any other" matters which the United States considers to be within the traditional reference of domestic matters.

The August 1959 Report of American Bar Association Committee on the Self-Judging

¹⁰ Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 3, pp. 3840-3841. Mr. Luce's views can also be consulted in "Our Great Hope: Peace is the Work of Justice," 43 American Bar Association Journal, p. 407 (1957), where he says at page 410 "The law is the indispensable vehicle of both idealism and national interest."

¹¹ JACOB K. JAVITS, "World Law Is Imperative," the *Kiwanis* magazine, p. 14 (February 1960).

¹² This apparent conflict of 15 judges and 17 systems is reconciled by the fact that a Pakistan judge's legal background reflects the common law, Asian, and Islamic traditions. A detailed analysis of principal legal systems represented on the Court during the period 1922-54 is to be found in S. Rosene, "The International Court and the United Nations: Reflections on the Period 1946-54," 9 *International Organization*, p. 250 (1955).

¹³ Manley O. Hudson, *The Permanent Court of International Justice, 1920-42*. Macmillan, New York, 1943, pp. 345-360.

¹⁴ William Samore, "National Origins v. Impartial Decisions: A Study of World Court Holdings." 34 *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, p. 193 (1956).

¹⁵ Louis B. Sohn, "International Tribunals: Past, Present, and Future," 46 *American Bar Association Journal*, pp. 25-26 (January 1960).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Aspect of the U.S. Domestic Reservation also pointed up some worthwhile alternatives to the amendment. In addition to those suggested by Sohn, it placed emphasis upon the possibility that the Court could be required to make use of American, or other specified, precedents respecting what is or what is not a matter of domestic jurisdiction. Another suggestion related to retention by the United States of the power to determine what constitutes a domestic matter with the assurance that this power would not be exercised unless important and vital American interests were at stake or unless existing American precedents regarded the subject as being exclusively national in character.¹⁷

Another suggestion has been to follow a fairly common procedure whereby the Court's jurisdiction would be established through a series of bilateral agreements. Such treaties would not include a self-judging reservation but would limit the jurisdiction of the Court to specified types of disputes. This suggestion, which possesses some theoretical merit, would have to be proofed against misfire through the most-favored nation concept.

Another suggestion is that States be permitted to confer on the Court compulsory jurisdiction to resolve disputes growing out of treaty interpretation, and that this jurisdiction be not subject to national reservations. Probably the same result could be achieved without difficulty if a State were simply to make a limited declaration respecting the subjects already contained in article 36(2) of the Statute. It will be recalled that treaty interpretation is one such subject.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing it will be seen that the advocates of repeal of the Connally amendment display a wholesome confidence in the technical competence of the Court and in the judicial quality of its judges. They contend that the Court would construe domestic jurisdiction in a manner not adverse to the vital interests of the United States. Those who urge the retention of the reservation are influenced by the fear of possible harm to the national interest if the Court is permitted to determine specific instances of domestic jurisdiction. Both seek to protect and advance the national interest, and both have different views as to how this may be achieved.

It is clear that the age-old dilemma confronting national states respecting "going-it-alone" or reasonable participation in international institutions still exists. The dilemma is particularly acute when one of the alternatives is to vest an international court with jurisdiction to resolve a dispute which may affect important interests of the Nation. Since the Court is empowered to resolve any case referred to it by all of the parties, there is no doubt as to the capability of the Court in this regard. Thus, practical alternatives to the use of the Court would seem to include a willingness to let the dispute drag along in the hope that in the course of time it would either resolve itself or go away, that normal diplomatic means would suffice, and on the other hand, the possibility that the dispute would be resolved not by judicial or diplomatic methods but by recourse to self-help, illegal though the last mentioned possibility is under the charter.

Were there only two nations on the earth, the foregoing peaceful alternatives might be acceptable. However, realism requires one to acknowledge that the disputes of even a few nations do have a direct impact upon the safety and welfare of the other members of the world community. Thus, the nondisputants as well as the disputants,

have a vital interest in the peaceful resolution of discord, including in particular those subjects which fall within the area of international legal disputes.

Our generation is vitally concerned with achieving world peace through world law. The rule of law in international affairs is exciting the imaginations and the energies of lawyers and statesmen throughout the world. An almost universal demand is heard for the effective use of international legal institutions, of which the International Court of Justice is a primary illustration.

In this context it is highly desirable for nations to accept the very broadest jurisdiction of the Court consistent with their vital interests, bearing in mind that their truly vital interests require recourse to law rather than to force for the settlement of legal problems. With these considerations in mind, including the present wide challenges to democracy, it is clear that the United States is presenting a poor example to a bipolar and ideologically oriented world when it establishes and maintains unnecessary reservations to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The vital interests of the Nation—the rule of law and international respect—can best be served through the repeal of the Connally amendment.

The amendment is a self-imposed roadblock to progress in the affairs of nations. The case for repeal is based on sound reasons. Reasonable alternatives exist. Yet, repeal would create no panacea. It would be but one of many steps which Americans must take upon a long hard road. With the repeal of the amendment the work and prestige of the Court is bound to increase. This will contribute materially to the progressive growth of international law and to the rule of law in world affairs. To serve these ends American leadership is confronted with a timely and an impressive challenge.

STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF OREGON ASSOCIATION OF FUTURE FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Future Farmers of America comprise a national organization dedicated to teaching and encouraging young men interested in agriculture the high standards of programs in this vital sector of our national economy.

Two young Oregonians were especially honored at the annual State FFA convention in Pendleton. Over 600 young men and their advisers from the 89 chapters in the State were in attendance at the March 16 through 19 meeting.

Mr. Keith Simmons of the Enterprise FFA chapter was awarded the 1960 Star Farmer Award which is the most highly coveted decoration given by the organization.

In addition to a fine record of scholarship and many activities in the Future Farmers, Keith is a member of the Honor Society, the Letterman's Club, the French Club, and the Student Council at Enterprise High School. He is a member of the American Angus Association, the American Society of Range Improvement, cocaptain of the school football and basketball teams, as well as being business manager and assistant manager of the local school paper. Last year Keith was the first place winner in the FFA Better Farming contest. He has shown livestock at the Oregon State

Fair and has been an active competitor in most of the FFA State Fair activities.

I am informed that in his sophomore year in high school, in 1957, Keith started his project with 26 beef, 6 sheep, 11 sows, 40 turkeys, 2 dairy cows, and 220 acres of land. The money he earned from his summer work and the income from his stock was plowed back into his operations in order to improve the scope and quality of his farm enterprise.

At the present time, Keith's farming operations consist of 59 head of beef cattle, 34 head of sheep, 25 sows, and 220 acres of which he has full ownership.

This splendid record of achievement of a young man is a refreshing contrast to the many stories carried by the local and national press media delineating juvenile delinquency.

I commend Mr. Simmons for the work he has done and congratulate him upon receiving his desired award. I further congratulate him for having been elected vice president of the FFA of Oregon at the annual convention.

Mr. President, the newly elected president of the Oregon Future Farmers is Mr. Dennis Wood, of the FFA chapter at Molalla High School, Molalla, Ore.

In an article published in the March 1960 issue of the Oregon Future Farmer, Dennis, who in the 1958-59 year served as secretary, this year was given the mandate by the convention to serve as president. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Wood, of Beaver Creek, Ore. Dennis received the State championship public speaking honors having won over four other winning speakers representing the 10 FFA districts in the State. At the convention he received recognition as chairman of the State champion parliamentary procedure team and was honored further by being elevated to the State Farmer degree along with 75 other Future Farmers of the State.

Dennis is president of his high school student body and is a serious hard-working student as attested to by his 3.6 grade average.

Among the many various honors won by Mr. Wood was that of the Oregon Broadcasters State Citizenship Award for 1959.

Under the leadership of Mr. Wood and Mr. Simmons, ably assisted by the officers elected to serve with them, I feel sure that Oregon Future Farmers will complete this year's program of activity in agriculture in magnificent fashion. To them, to their district presidents and chapter members, I offer my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names and addresses of the State executive committee of the Oregon Association of Future Farmers, the district presidents, and the board of directors be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

STATE OFFICERS

President: Dennis Wood, Route 1, Box 362, Beaver Creek, Ore. (Molalla).

¹⁷ International and Comparative Law Report, op. cit., pp. 57-59.

Vice president: Keith Simmons, Box 721, Enterprise, Ore.

Secretary: Loren Calkins, Route 2, Box 95, Scio, Ore.

Treasurer: Stewart Holmes, Terrebonne, Ore. (Redmond).

Reporter: Dave Foote, Post Office Box 1012, Central Point, Ore. (Crater).

Sentinel: Dave Leuthold, Route 2, Box 387, Tillamook, Ore.

DISTRICT PRESIDENTS

Snake River District: Don Reed, Halfway, Ore.

Lower Willamette District: Gary Lewis, Route 2, McMinnville, Ore.

Blue Mountain District: Richard Tenold, Route 3, Box 79, The Dalles, Ore.

Capital District: Steve Coleman, Route 1, Box 282, Gervais, Ore.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

District advisers

Eastern Oregon: Norman Koopman, La Grande Chapter.

Lower Willamette: Al Halter, Amity Chapter.

Rogue-Umpqua: John Dube, Phoenix Chapter.

Capital: Darrel Ward, Woodburn Chapter, South Central: Tom Williams, Culver Chapter.

Northwestern: John Johnson, Knappa Chapter.

Upper Willamette: Max Smith, Harrisburg Chapter.

Columbia River: Richard Buckovic, Molalla Chapter.

Blue Mountain: David Reynolds, Stanfield Chapter.

Snake River: Carl Devin, Nyasa Chapter, State adviser

Ralph L. Morgan, Salem, Ore.

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL 2759

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Andrew J. Morrow, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, in a May 20, 1960, letter, has kindly provided me with the comments of his organization upon Farm Bureau amendments being proposed to S. 2759.

Because I feel that many of my colleagues would find these comments of a spokesman for a leading wheatgrower organization of interest, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Ore., May 20, 1960.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for inviting our comments on the proposed Farm Bureau Amendments to S. 2759. In summary, we don't like either set of proposals. S. 2759 would be a terrible plan to live with in the summer-fallow wheat area of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. The Farm Bureau proposals are also quite objectionable to us.

We agree with the second paragraph of Mr. Shuman's letter. Organized wheatgrowers have never advocated the present program—they have always proposed something different, as you are well aware.

Mr. Shuman states that the Farm Bureau's plan would permit wheat to be fed on a fair competitive basis. This simply is not

true. We have been told by AFBF economists that under their plan wheat would sell at not less than 125 percent of corn prices, which they calculate is fair. We are also advised that as it now appears in Congress, the AFBF plan would price 1961 wheat at \$1.27 per bushel, which is 120 percent of 1961 corn prices. On a bushel basis, wheat is considered to be 10 percent more valuable than corn based on feed value and differences in bushel weights. Thus, if the intent is to make wheat available in the feed market it should be 110 percent of corn prices. Their program seeks the lowest possible level of wheat prices—but not low enough to compete with corn in the feed market.

Reference is made by Mr. Shuman to the 500,000 AFBF members who grow wheat. We have no information to contradict this. Many of our wheatgrowers are also members of the Farm Bureau. However, we are quite sure that the American Farm Bureau does not speak for them. The Farm Bureau has an attractive insurance program and our people frankly admit that this is their sole reason for continuing to pay their Farm Bureau dues.

Programs that include a "downward escalator" price support formula, such as cited on page 2 of Mr. Shuman's letter, are a bit in contrast to the price index of nonfarm items, which have averaged a 2.8 percent increase per year for the past 10 years.

We support the principle of an increased conservation reserve. Wheatgrowers believe that land retirement holds, to a large measure, the key. Wheatgrowers, however, believe that at least part of this must be done on a compulsory basis if we are to get the job done.

The American Farm Bureau plan—and others—that propose lower price supports and removal of acreage restrictions would, we believe double the Federal Government's cost under CCC operations. To be sure, the cost per bushel would be less, but there'd be a lot more bushels taken over by CCC.

Finally, we cannot accept Mr. Shuman's reasoning for objecting to the permanent advisory committee under title II of S. 2759. It is as natural for farmers to gather their collective effort around and through commodity groups as it is for business and industry to work through many trade associations. The businessman does not limit his collective efforts to what can be agreed on by the Chamber of Commerce. Furthermore, it is fallacious to assume that commodity groups will pursue their objectives without regard for the position of related groups.

The best evidence of this is the wheat marketing plan of 1960, which, as you know, was developed cooperatively by the National Grange, Farmers Union, and the National Association of Wheat Growers. It also enjoys the support of several feed grain producer groups.

We still support the Wheat Marketing Act of 1960. We know that you have conferred with George Reid, Grange representatives, and others on this proposal.

Again, our appreciation for this opportunity to convey our position on this matter. Sincerely,

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
ANDREW J. MORROW, President.

OPPOSITION BY UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE TO LIFTING OF INTEREST CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BONDS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution from the Union County Pomona Grange.

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

RESOLUTION OF UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE

Whereas there is much talk by many officials in the administration to take the interest ceiling off of Government bonds; and Whereas if this should happen and interest rates on Government bonds are raised, then interest rates would be raised all along the line: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Union County Pomona Grange No. 6 this 26th day of March 1960, That we oppose the lifting of the lid so that interest rates can be raised above 5 percent.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON,
Master.

LAURA E. BATES,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a wide range of economic evidence has been gathered in support of the need for a higher minimum wage for a greater number of workers. It is indeed encouraging to find that even the Secretary of Labor has contributed to this evidence, so that the issue is now only a matter of degree, not of substance.

However, I think it is well, Mr. President, for us to remember that there is a moral issue as well—an issue of common decency, of Christian behavior.

In that connection it is encouraging to note that the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the leading central body of the Protestant faith, fully recognizes this aspect of wage-hour legislation. The general board of the council has wisely concluded that charity alone, though an essential part of the Christian duty, is not sufficient to meet a total Christian obligation.

Nearly 6 years ago the general board declared that:

Christians should work for a situation wherein all have access to a minimum standard of living * * * sufficient to permit care of the health of all and for suitable protection of the weaker members of society * * * and of the able bodied against hazards beyond their control.

A year ago the general board went further—further than any legislation now contemplated—and flatly endorsed the principle of minimum wage legislation extended to all workers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of this forward-looking resolution by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC LIFE, DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORK, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.

Whereas through its action on June 4, 1958, on the churches' concern for public assistance, the general board went beyond the

subject of charitable relief of deprivation and suffering to state its conviction that, "basic economic security must also be strengthened so that the need for public assistance may be minimized"; and

Whereas in its statement of September 15, 1954, on Christian principles and assumptions for economic life, the general board has also declared that, as one basic "norm for the judgment of economic institutions and practices * * * Christians should work for a situation wherein all have access to a minimum standard of living * * * sufficient to permit care of the health of all and for suitable protection of the weaker members of society * * * and of the able-bodied against hazards beyond their control"; and

Whereas the general board affirmed the need for the extension of minimum wage legislation to migratory farm laborers ("The Church and the Agricultural Migrants," September 19, 1951) and subsequently (February 28, 1957, GB-57-1057) authorized representatives of the national council to testify in favor of the principle of extending minimum wage legislation to migratory farmworkers; and

Whereas the general board has likewise affirmed the need for the extension of minimum wage legislation as a means of securing defensible minimum living standards to other wage workers in agriculture ("Ethical Goals for Agricultural Policy," June 4, 1958): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the principle of minimum wage legislation, Federal and State, should be supported as a practical and proven means of assuring at least the minimum standard of living necessary for the maintenance of health and decency for family living today, and should be extended to all workers; and that the general board authorize representatives of the National Council of Churches to testify at hearings in support of the principle of the extension of minimum wage legislation to include groups not now covered.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF THREE HOOD RIVER STUDENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the May 25, 1960, issue of the International Woodworker describes the academic achievements of three Hood River students. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One of these students, Dennis Crowe, has won a 4-year scholarship to Oregon State College and the Bausch-Lomb Science Award. The second Hood River student, Miss Carol See, has won a 4-year scholarship at the University of Oregon. The third, Wayne Kanemasu, is the recipient of a 4-year scholarship to Stanford University. Each of these young people is the child of a member of International Woodworker's Local 3-18.

The people of Hood River can well be proud of the scholarship achievements of each of these young people.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the obituary in the AFL-CIO News of May 28, 1960, of Prof. Edwin E. Witte, who died recently at the age of 73.

This great man was responsible for more pioneering and progressive legislation to promote the economic welfare of working men and women than any other man I know of in recent history.

As one of his students at the University of Wisconsin, I shall always cherish the memory of this man, not only for

his great personality, but for the principles of social welfare for which he stood.

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

[From the International Woodworker, May 25, 1960]

HOOD RIVER IWA PARENTS ARE JUSTLY PROUD OF THREE LOCAL HONOR STUDENTS

HOOD RIVER, OREG.—Dennis Crowe, son of Wallace Crowe of local 3-18 will close his high school career in Hood River, Oreg. with honors this June.

Crowe has been an honor student for 4 years and a member of the National Honor Society for 2 years. He is the recipient of a 4-year scholarship to Oregon State College and the Bausch-Lomb Science Award.

Dennis is a four letter man in football, basketball and track in addition to his student body activities which include president of his class for 2 years, president of the student body and participation in school dramatics.

Carol See, daughter of Ken See, local union 3-18 was recently declared the winner of the IWA Local Union 3-18's \$100 scholarship essay contest. The subject for this second annual award was "Should Labor Unions Participate in Political Elections?"

Carol, a student at Wy'east High School, has been an honor student for the 4 years she has attended high school and is a member of the National Honor Society, in addition to being a member of the student council and officer in several school organizations.

Other honors coming her way recently was a 4-year scholarship to the University of Oregon, an award of \$250 as winner of the statewide essay contest sponsored by the Oregon Council of Churches and the Elk's National Foundation Scholarship Award for Hood River County.

Carol wants everyone to know that she does not spend all of her time studying. She is an ardent skier, having won several awards in that sport. She also hikes, swims, and climbs mountains, and actively participates in young Democrat affairs.

Wayne Kanemasu, son of Wataru Kanemasu, Local Union 3-18 has been selected salutatorian at Wy'east High School in Hood River County, Oreg., to climax his high school career as an honor student.

Wayne is the recipient of a 4-year scholarship to Stanford University, the Bausch-Lomb Science Award and the Elk's National Foundation Scholarship plaque for Hood River County, and a member of the National Honor Society.

In addition to his scholastic achievements young Kanemasu has been active in student body affairs, an outstanding football player and a member of the wrestling team.

[From the AFL-CIO News, May 28, 1960]

DR. WITTE DIES, FRAMED SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

MADISON, WIS.—Dr. Edwin E. Witte, 73, widely known as the father of the Social Security Act of 1935, died here recently as the Nation was celebrating the 25th anniversary of the legislation he drafted.

A retired professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin, he was known throughout the Nation as an authority on labor relations and labor law.

In the early 1930's he was summoned by President Roosevelt to head the committee which worked out the Social Security System that stands as a landmark for all of the social legislation enacted during Roosevelt's years in the White House.

Nelson Cruikshank, director of the AFL-CIO department of social security, expressed "deep regret" at Witte's death. Dr. Witte, he said, "made a tremendous contribution to the people and the Nation in his role as architect of the Social Security Act which has brought dignity and security to retired workers, widows, and orphans."

Witte was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1909, and served as a statistician for the Wisconsin Industrial Commission. He subsequently was a special agent for the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations.

During World War II he served on the National Defense Mediation Board and the National War Labor Board. From 1949 to 1953 he served on the Atomic Energy Labor Relations Panel.

MUSICAL SCHOLARSHIP AWARDED TO JOSEPH F. HEARNE, OF GRANT HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the May 27, 1960, issue of the Oregon Labor Press carries a story concerning the awarding of a music scholarship by Musicians Local 99 in Portland, Oreg.

This scholarship to an 8 weeks' study program at the Congress of Strings at the University of Puerto Rico was awarded to Joe Hearne, of Portland's Grant High School. Mr. Hearne has also received a \$500 cash scholarship in a contest in April at Portland State College. He expects to enter the Juilliard School of Music in New York next fall. Mr. Hearne is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Hearne, of 3014 Northeast Tillamook, in Portland.

Oregon can well be proud of this young man whose musical talents are being developed with the help of Musicians Local 99 in his own community. I ask unanimous consent that the story about Mr. Hearne in the Oregon Labor Press be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STUDENT WINS MUSICIANS' AWARD

A gifted 17-year-old Grant High School senior, Joseph F. (Joe) Hearne, has been awarded the scholarship offered by Musicians Local 99 to the second annual Congress of Strings.

Hearne, a bass player, was chosen by a panel of four judges from a group of the city's most advanced and talented string players. Runner-up was violin player Delmar Pettys, 17-year-old Cleveland High School senior.

Hearne will leave early in June for 8 weeks' intensive study at the Congress of Strings to be held this year at the University of Puerto Rico.

Like the first congress last year at Greenleaf Lake, in Oklahoma, this year's course will be directed by the famous composer, conductor, and educator, Roy Harris. On the faculty again this year will be the leading string players from the country's top symphony orchestras.

The congress was conceived by Herman Kenin soon after he took office as president of the American Federation of Musicians. Its purpose is to assure an adequate number of trained string players for the country's symphony orchestras. Kenin noted that the United States is the only major nation in the free world that does not subsidize music and the arts. He proposed that the AFM, through the Congress of Strings, should contribute to musical education, and bring to public attention the need for musical training.

Hearne's tuition is paid for by local 99, and his travel expenses, room and board are contributed by the AFM. From Portland he will fly to New York, where he will meet about 100 other top flight students of string instruments from all parts of the country. From New York the students will fly by chartered plane to Puerto Rico.

This is not the first musical honor won by Hearne, who is the principal bass player in the junior symphony orchestra as well as a member of the Portland symphony orchestra. A pupil of Herman Jobelmann, he was awarded a \$500 cash scholarship from the committee for the musical arts in a contest last month at Portland State College. He plans to enter the Juilliard School of Music in New York next fall.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Hearne, 3014 Northeast Tillamook. Mrs. Hearne is a former member of State Employees Local 191.

Last year's winner of the Congress of Strings Award was Paul Speaker, who plays the cello with both the junior symphony and the Portland symphony orchestras. Since then Speaker has gone on to win other honors and was soloist with the junior symphony this season.

Judges for the Congress of Strings Award were Joe Dardis, president of local 99; Jacob Avshalomov, conductor of the Portland junior symphony, and Glenn Reeves and Herman Jobelmann, both members of the Portland Symphony Orchestra.

RACIAL DESIGNATIONS IN REAL ESTATE ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called by Neighbors, Inc., an organization in the city of Washington devoted to the development of a soundly based and integrated residential program for citizens of the District, to a practice by Washington newspapers which it feels to be unjustified.

The Washington community has made great strides in many areas in eliminating the undesirable characteristics of an earlier age in the field of social polity. In one respect, however, the continuance of segregating newspaper advertisements by color, the press community lags behind other segments of the community.

Mr. Marvin Caplan, president of Neighbors, Inc., stated it is the belief of his organization that an important function of a newspaper is to investigate and analyze any situation that affects the general welfare of the city it serves. I would concur in this view and I would urge that the newspapers of Washington cast the same searching glance of inquiry upon their own internal policies as that which they devote to the affairs of other institutions in the Capital. In order to provide an opportunity for the newspapers of Washington to review their policy, I am making this statement today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded, together with an attachment listing the organizations associated with Neighbors, Inc., in this effort to eliminate racial designations in real estate advertisements in the Washington newspapers, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NEIGHBORS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1960.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For more than a year now the undersigned organization and some 40 others have been trying to persuade the Washington Post, Star, and Daily News to stop listing houses for sale by race.

We believe that segregating real estate advertisements as the papers now do into columns of undesignated ads for white and into columns tagged "colored" is as anachronistic and as morally wrong as putting "white" and "colored" signs over drinking fountains and the entrances to railroad waiting rooms.

Moreover, the practice also harms this city in many demonstrable ways. It perpetuates and extends segregated neighborhoods. It makes it extremely difficult to keep as an integrated community any area which has once begun to change. It makes it almost impossible to balance the inflow and outflow of both Negro and white homeowners in such an area. The advertisements serve effectively to screen out almost all white families and direct only colored families into a changing area.

Dealers arbitrarily list houses as "colored" on streets where houses are owned preponderantly by white families. They do this even with the first vacant house on an all-white block. Such houses could be sold just as well to either colored or white buyers. This is already happening in neighborhoods within a block or two of the District-Maryland line. As a result of these real estate listings, panic sales begin and white families are driven into the suburbs leaving in their wake, segregated communities, segregated churches, and segregated schools.

We have pointed all this out to newspaper officials in numerous conferences. We have supported our arguments with documentation from other cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, where the designations have been dropped. The News says it will change if the other two papers will. But officials of the Post and Star have shown no inclination to eliminate the practice. Not only that, but they have refused to accept our invitation to investigate the situation personally or through reporters, to determine for themselves the truth of our charges. It is this last that is hardest to understand.

We believe that an important function of a newspaper is to investigate and analyze any situation that affects the general welfare of the city it serves. We cannot believe an exception should be made here, when it is the judgment of nearly 40 responsible organizations that the newspaper's practice is harming the city. (See attached list.)

We are writing to you because we know how interested you are in Washington's general welfare. We would be grateful if you would interest yourself in the matter we describe and use your personal influence either to get the papers to change, or at least to urge them to investigate the situation first hand.

A letter from you to the publishers of the Post and Star would be a valuable aid in getting them to reexamine their present policy.

If you wish additional information on the subject of these ads we will be glad to send you a memorandum we have prepared, or have someone discuss it with you.

Sincerely,

MARVIN CAPLAN,
President.

ORGANIZATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH NEIGHBORS, INC., IN EFFORT TO ELIMINATE RACIAL DESIGNATIONS IN REAL ESTATE ADVERTISEMENTS IN WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS

American Council on Human Rights.
Americans for Democratic Action (Washington Chapter).
American Jewish Congress (National Capital Chapter).
American Veterans Committee.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Interracial Council of Washington.
Consolidated Parents Group.

Council of Churches—National Capital Area.

Federation of Civic Associations.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington.
Jewish War Veterans.
Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Colored Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
Oldest Inhabitants, Inc.
Potomac Cooperative Federation.
St. Peter Claver Center.
Washington & Vicinity Federation of Women's Clubs.
Washington Bar Association.
Washington Ethical Society.
Washington Fellowship.
Washington Friends Meeting.
Washington Newspaper Guild.
Washington Urban League.
Washington Real Estate Brokers Association.
Women's Alliance of All Souls Church.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE INDIVIDUALLY EXPRESSED OPPOSITION TO RACIAL DESIGNATIONS IN REAL ESTATE ADVERTISEMENTS

Agudath Achim Congregation.
Arkansas Avenue Community Association.
Brightwood Park Methodist Church.
Capitol Hill Southeast Association.
Chillum Citizens Association.
Manor Park Citizens Association.
Lincoln Park Citizens Association.
Michigan Park Citizens Association.
Petworth Citizens Association.
Stanton Park Citizens Association.
Woodridge Civic Association.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF OREGON STATE GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Oregon State Grange will hold its 87th annual convention June 13 to 17 in Roseburg, Ore. The May 20 issue of the Oregon Grange Bulletin, which is devoted to the convention call, includes two articles dedicated to the convention city of Roseburg.

Because each of these articles contains much information as to the scenery and attractions of this beautiful part of my State, I would like very much to call to the attention of my colleagues the articles to which I have made reference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles, entitled "Douglas County Welcomes Oregon Grange" and "This Is Southern Oregon," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I am particularly pleased to salute the Oregon State Grange in connection with its convention because of the splendid work this fine organization is performing for the farmers of my State.

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

DOUGLAS COUNTY WELCOMES OREGON GRANGE

Laying rightful claim to the title of timber capital of the Nation, Douglas County, of which the convention host city of Roseburg is almost the geographic center, invites grangers from all over Oregon to be their guests during the 87th annual convention of the Oregon State Grange June 13 to 17, inclusive.

Although Roseburg has always been one of the fastest growing communities in Oregon since its incorporation back in 1872, within the last decade it more than doubled its population and is still going strong, despite the explosion of a truckload of dynamite in the heart of the city last August 7, which sort of shook up the town, but it didn't slow us down and we are rebuilding rapidly and well.

Of the things of which we are most proud, we like to list our climate—which we know you will enjoy. Here you can be free from the discomforts of excessive heat or cold, through four distinct seasons—all mild. In winter the normal low temperature range is 49 to 27, and the high range—when you'll be here for your convention—the normal high temperature range is 95 to 68, and the low range 61 to 43, meaning you can and will sleep under covers. We guarantee you'll enjoy it.

So, be our guest for the 87th annual convention of the Oregon State Grange. Be comfortable.

THIS IS SOUTHERN OREGON

Cool, green vacationlands from smooth, sandy beaches of the blue Pacific to snow-clad shining mountains, with lush valleys and high plateaus in between, lend unusual charm to southern Oregon's vast outdoors.

A land of rare beauty and a land of scenic contrasts, in Douglas County, volcanic fury of unknown eras ago fashioned high peaks forming Nature's own skyline of jagged crests. Ancient glaciers carved gentle U-shaped valleys down mountain slopes and in their wake left moraines—dams of glacial debris—behind which ice cold lakes glisten peacefully in the summer sun.

Rugged headlands of ageless rocks defy poundings of the sea and in their defiance place their stony ramparts on spectacular array. At some points on the Oregon coast, they rise for hundreds of feet above restless deeps. Yet nearby may be the white sands of bathing beaches emerging softly from friendly surf.

White water streams play endlessly through irregular aisles of thick forests and wander through hidden valleys of alpine heights which may be reached only over hiking trails. Upland meadows and sylvan glades in their season are fragment with colorful flowers, blooming undisturbed.

Beauty persists even beneath the mountains in marble caverns of fantastic formations, tens of thousands of years in their forming from the time they were under the sea. Green valleys, which once only knew the redman and the twang of his bow, today embrace farmsteads, orchards, towns, and cities populated by a friendly people. Then there are the expansive plateaus seemingly only limited by the horizon, where cattle graze in high dry air on rangelands little changed from the days before the white man came to the Oregon country.

CRATER LAKE

Sparkling as one of Oregon's brightest mountain jewels is Crater Lake, with its mysterious blue resting the caldera of old Mountain Mazama, in its day one of the most fiery volcanos in all the West. Paved highways serve this premier attraction from all directions; from Bend, Klamath Falls, Eugene, Medford, and Grants Pass, gateway cities.

In the southern part of the State, adding to Oregon's colorful, romantic past, is Jacksonville, where a major gold rush was experienced in 1851. Lure of the yellow metal attracted thousands of miners. A gold rush town was born and for a time its population rivaled that of Portland. Today the miners are gone and diggings are deserted. The old town, itself, retains the flavor of yesterday. Buildings remain much as they were long ago when stagecoaches came

thundering in from the outside world and red-shirted miners crowded the streets. A museum is maintained in the old United States Hotel where a President of the United States, Rutherford B. Hayes, paid \$75 for a night's lodging when the hotel opened long ago.

Not all the miners who came to Oregon found gold. John Wesley Hillman was one of these, but his name is an indelible part of Oregon history. With a group of miners he set forth in 1853 into the Cascade Mountains in search of a fabulous lost mine. It was never found but during the search Hillman's donkey brought him to the edge of Oregon's scenic treasure, Crater Lake—today one of the world's greatest scenic attractions.

When Hillman discovered the mountain gem, he had been exploring the highlands day after day. Now it is less than 2 hours distant from valley gateway cities to its deep blue waters and surrounding crater walls, a never-ending source of wonderment and awe.

OREGON CAVES

It was a pioneer hunter Elija Davidson who in the Siskiyou Mountains discovered the underground wonders of the Oregon caves in 1874 when a bear he had wounded sought refuge in their darkness. Later with pine torches he explored the tortuous passages. Today visitors may take guided trips through 2 miles of illuminated passageways into underground chambers of eerie appeal and past countless formations of stalagmites and stalactites. A large chateau under National Park Service jurisdiction provides accommodations.

TIMBER PRINCIPAL RESOURCE

Timber is the principal natural resource of Douglas County, and the largest source of payrolls.

To the residents of the Umpqua Valleys the word timber means opportunity, for the number of trees is legion—located in the 980,000 acres of the Umpqua National Forest (administered by the Forest Service, USDA, with headquarters in Roseburg), in the 390,000 acres of O. & C. land (administered by the Bureau of Land Management, USDA, with headquarters in Roseburg), and in private holdings, tree farms, and farm woodlots.

Douglas County has the largest reserve of uncut timber of any county in the United States. Primary commercial species include Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine, sugar pine, and western hemlock. Thus the community has adopted the slogan, "The Timber Capital of the Nation."

Douglas County also has the largest logging employment of any county in the United States, and of course when the trees roll into the sawmills, veneer, and plywood plants the job opportunities grow even larger—with the county having the third largest employment in the Nation in these plants. Logging and lumber manufacturing account for 58 percent of the county's payroll—the county labor force being 18,000 persons employed by 1,351 establishments and a payroll of \$85 million.

Research, product improvement, and merchandising procedures by Douglas County manufacturers keeps them abreast of the Nation's need for timber products.

A new but important phase of the industrial economy is a nickel mine and smelter at Riddle, it being the only nickel production in the United States, turning out 18 million pounds a year and employing 500 persons.

The potential in lumber, mineral, agriculture, and remanufacturing has only been touched. With these growths ahead, there follows retail, wholesale, and industrial supply opportunities. Whatever your business or plans for the future may be, there is a place for you in the scheme of things in the Umpqua Valleys in general and Roseburg in particular.

CLIMATE GENTLE

Here you can enjoy all the bounties of nature free from the discomforts of excessive heat or cold, through four distinct seasons—all mild. In winter the normal low temperature range is 49 to 27, and the high range 68 to 41. Snow or ice in the city or adjacent valleys is very rare. In summer the normal high temperature range is 95 to 68, and the low range 61 to 43, meaning you sleep under covers. Spring and fall are glorious. The normal wind velocity in winter is 2 to 3 miles per hour, thus moderating the temperature, and in summer is 3 to 5 miles per hour, just enough to be gently cooling. The average rainfall between the Cascade and Coast Ranges is 33 to 35 inches and most of it falls gently between October and May. There are no blizzards, no heat waves, hail, wind storms, or electric and thunderstorms, and no sticky humid days. The average growing season is 217 days.

Whether your choice be rugged mountain grandeur, placid lakes, the restless ever-changing sea, sparkling streams, or peaceful valleys, you can find your heart's desire in Douglas County.

Within the 5,062 square miles of the county are over a thousand miles of highways which unfold a panorama of beauty and richness to meet every mood of the traveler.

At the eastern boundary are the mighty Cascade Mountains with beautiful Diamond Lake awaiting the fisherman's lure or the artist's canvas and brush. Twenty miles distant is one of nature's wonders, Crater Lake, a national park.

Traveling west, the North Umpqua Highway parallels the river to Roseburg. Along this road one may enjoy a thousand vistas of rock gorges, rushing cataracts, waterfalls, deep pools, and the lights and shadows of the grand forest.

Forest trails lead to the summit of crags and buttes, a treasured retreat where sky and forest meet.

In contrast are the countless rolling hills and fruitful mid-Umpqua valleys famed for their beauty and diversity of products. Here can be found every type of rural scene to awaken childhood memories of other days in other lands and climes.

SOUTHERN OREGON LOOP TRIPS

Oregon Caves: From Grants Pass, take U.S. 199, the Redwood Highway to Cave Junction. Join OSH 46 to Oregon Caves. Regular guided tours June through September and chateau open during the same time. After chateau closes, special arrangements may be made for tours through the caves by contacting Grants Pass Chamber of Commerce or Parks Service at the caves. Return to Grants Pass over same route. Accessible the year around, except for short closures by snow in winter months. Total trip mileage 110.

Jacksonville Loop: From Medford—take OSH 238 to Jacksonville. Visit historic Jacksonville museum in old Jackson County courthouse, Log Town cemetery, old gold rush buildings, and oldest Protestant church west of Rocky Mountains. Continue on OSH 238 along Applegate River through Applegate, Provolt, and Murphy to Grants Pass. Return to Medford on U.S. 99 along Rogue River, past Table Rock and Gold Hill. Route accessible the year around.

Crater Lake—Green Springs Mountain loop: From Medford, Ashland, or Klamath Falls, use OSH 62 to Crater Lake and OSH 66 and U.S. 97 as connecting links for this loop trip. See the upper Rogue River on OSH 62 and Rogue River National Forest. Crater Lake accessible the year around on OSH 62—lodge open only from June 15 to September 15—other park entrances closed during winter months. On U.S. 97 see upper Klamath Lake (Oregon's largest) home of the pelican. Klamath Falls is center of huge Klamath Basin. Ashland sponsors

Shakespearean festival each August in Lithia Park. Medford, home of gift fruit packages sent all over the world. Route accessible the year around.

Willamette Valley, Siuslaw, Honeyman Park—Umpqua loop: From Eugene, take U.S. 99 northward to junction OSH 36. Take OSH 36 westward through Cheshire and Blachly, to Triangle Lake, through Swiss-home and Mapleton, along Siuslaw River to Florence. Join U.S. 101 southward to Honeyman State Park.

DECLINE IN PLYWOOD PRICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial and news article dealing with the decline in the price of plywood.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 27, 1960]

IT WON'T LAST, BUT—

So once again lumber and plywood market conditions are such that we've all been reminded of the need to diversify our Emerald Empire economy.

Our plight isn't a hopeless one, but it isn't one any of us are enjoying, especially not those among us who are directly affected by curtailed mill production schedules.

Markets for our forest products are off because of bad weather in major marketing areas—and because Federal tight-money policies are hitting the construction industry particularly hard. Now we know that the weather will change. And we know that as threats of inflation subside the availability of credit to home and commercial builders will increase. We know that this expanding Nation is going to have to do a lot of building in the years just ahead. In the long pull, we'll do all right.

We will, that is, insofar as our timber resources will suffice as an economic base. But our rediscovered thoughts about diversification tell us that it is important that we now take to heart the object lesson of our present situation. Before too long we are sure to have more families here than can possibly be supported by our existing industries. How much easier it would be right now if we had other mass job opportunities for our idled forest products workers. How vital it will be for us to have better diversified employment bases in the future.

There are plus forces at work which we can rely upon with some assurance as we work for an answer to our economic problem. Basically, ours is a promised land for future industrial development. We have abundant low-cost electrical energy, water resources that are the envy of virtually every other part of the Nation, our forest reserves, some minerals, natural gas coming closer every day, and one of the best educated, most highly skilled labor pools to be found anywhere.

Also, we now have a State industrial development and promotion agency working in our behalf. And our Eugene Chamber of Commerce has only recently augmented its annual budget to provide for an intensified effort to bring new industries here.

Miracles we cannot expect, however. Across the Nation hundreds of communities and State and regional agencies are competing for the attention of expanding or relocating industries. There's nothing immediately in sight to indicate that our present situation will be improved except as the lumber market trend is reversed.

So while we grin and bear it, we should be making firm resolutions to see that our current experience is remembered when lumber and plywood prices begin to rise again. What

is happening to us this spring should be all the warning we need to guarantee that hereafter our efforts to gain a better balanced economy will be unceasing. After all, it will be a lot easier to hitch up our pants now than to wait until we have only bootstraps to grab at.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 27, 1960]

FIFTY-EIGHT PLANTS TO CURTAIL PLY OUTPUT—PRICES DECLINE; LAYOFFS LOOM

PORTLAND.—Plunging plywood prices, currently at the lowest point since World War II, brought announcements Thursday from 58 Pacific Northwest plywood firms that operations would be curtailed.

Crow's Lumber Market News Service here said some 4,000 to 5,000 men will be thrown out of work. The shutdowns will affect plants and logging operations throughout the Northwest.

The low price is \$60 a thousand square feet for one-quarter-inch, sanded plywood stock. It was blamed on bad construction weather that cut demand, overproduction, and excessive inventories.

PRODUCTION CUT

The curtailment—the form of suspended operations and reduced schedules—will mean 120 million square feet of plywood or one-third of the region's capacity for a 2-week period will not be produced.

One of the area's largest firms, Georgia-Pacific Corp., a month ago closed down its Olympia, Wash., plant, idling some 240, and said more men would be laid off as the demand slows.

Weyerhaeuser Co., another area giant, said its mills will not close. Early E. Arthur, sales manager for the firm's west coast mills, said, "We see no reason to go below the current list price of \$64."

Simpson Logging Co. announced 75 loggers in the Shelton, Wash., area were scheduled to halt work Friday, boosting to near 1,000 the number out in the Shelton-Olympia area.

CLOSURES NOTED

One firm in the Everett, Wash., area, employing 480, announced it will close June 10. A second has been closed since late April and a third announced it will eliminate one shift and operate on a 4-day week.

In Oregon, plants at Portland, Corvallis, Albany, Eugene, West Fir, Madras, Sweet Home, Roseburg, Sutherlin, Garibaldi and Dillard announced shutdowns or reduced schedules.

Some plants closed indefinitely, others for 1 to 3 weeks; reduced schedules were introduced at others. Several advanced vacations, hoping the market will climb and operations can be resumed when vacation periods end.

COMMENTS ON NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, over the Memorial Day weekend, United Press International carried a dispatch from Moscow quoting Nikita Khrushchev as saying he still wanted a summit conference.

In the same dispatch Khrushchev arrogantly said that President Eisenhower wants peace but that the "road to hell is paved with good intentions and he will really get there."

In his same talk, Khrushchev cynically criticized the President for playing golf, threatened the NATO countries, dismissed the failure of the U.N. Security Council to approve the Soviet motion of censure against the United States for U-2 spy plane missions as a judgment of

"robber by other robbers," insisted that Premier Fidel Castro is defending the genuine interest of the Cubans, said again that high-altitude reconnaissance over Russia might lead to war, and concluded by attesting that he was "ready for a summit, even now."

Does Mr. Khrushchev think the American people are willing to forgive him for vicious insults voiced in Paris?

Does Mr. Khrushchev think the American people are so timid and so frightened they will crawl on their knees to the summit?

Does Khrushchev believe we will again subject the President of the United States to the kind of tongue lashing Khrushchev delivered in Paris?

Does Khrushchev's statement that Fidel Castro is defending the general interests of the Cubans wipe out the blood and misery and the insults Castro has cast upon the United States?

Are we ready to accept the word of the man whose spies stole the atom bomb secret? How impossibly naive does Mr. Khrushchev believe us to be? I would suggest that our Secretary of State might send the following note to Mr. Khrushchev:

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: When you are ready to apologize to the American President and the American people for your inexcusable violence and name calling in Paris; when you are ready to open your skies for aerial inspections; when you are ready to negotiate the freedom of your captive satellite states; when you are willing to permit your people to hear our President in the same freedom we permit our people to hear your speeches; when you are willing to end your threats against our allies we might, upon review of your actions, set a time some 2 years hence for a summit conference.

In the interim we will be influenced by what you do and not by what you say. And if your actions indicate sincerity, we will consider the possibility of meeting with you and discussing the subjects you have suggested.

In the meantime, sir, we suggest you keep your voice down and control your language. We suggest you demonstrate by your action both at home and abroad that you truly want peace.

You may not like this delay, sir. Let me suggest some things for your consideration during these 2 years:

Neither the people of the United States nor the President of the United States has ever threatened to destroy Russia. Or to put it in your language, "we will bury you." We have, I think you will agree, displayed a remarkable forbearance toward your insulting bellicose position. I warn you—do not take our forbearance as an evidence of weakness.

While your steel production has increased, we still outproduce you 2 to 1. Opposing your 300 modern bombers, we have 2,000 capable of attack at supersonic speed. While you have bases in Russia from which to attack us, we have bases around the free world from which to attack you.

Our ICBM has flown 9,000 miles and struck its target. Our atomic submarines have traveled around the world submerged. Our Polaris solid-fuel missile can be fired from beneath the sea. We can survive more than 1 harvest year without facing the threat of starvation.

Now in the matter of outer space, you have in orbit Lunik III and Sputnik IV. We have in orbit Explorer I, Vanguard I, Vanguard II, Explorer VI, Vanguard III, Explorer VII, Polaris, Transit Ib, Polaris V, and Midas. The score is 10 to 2.

To you, Mr. Khrushchev, we may seem clumsy and self-indulgent. Our people are slow to anger. We have been outwitted at the peace tables but we have never lost a war.

Two years is but a brief moment in history, Mr. Khrushchev. During that period we will not attack you—unless you attack us first. At the end of that period, if you truly want peace, your actions will have demonstrated the sincerity of your desire.

You can make the next summit conference a success, but the decision is up to you. How do you stand, sir?

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS DISPOSAL AND U.S. ECONOMIC POLICIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in 1959, U.S. farm production was \$37 billion; this is larger than the entire gross national product of all except half a dozen countries in the world. The surplus of our agricultural production for food is such that the Federal Government spends more than one-half billion dollars a year just to defray the costs of storing surplus grains; this is more than all except two dozen governments in the world spend to defray all of their costs.

In order to meet through positive action the irony inherent in the surplus of our agricultural production for food as seen against the conditions of semistarvation faced by more than 1 billion of our fellow human beings in the less developed areas of the world, the United States, under authority of Public Law 480, title I, has sold during the first 5 years some \$3.7 billion worth of surplus farm commodities for the local currencies of 38 nations. These sales have helped to alleviate both some of the hunger overseas and some of the cost to farmer and taxpayer of the domestic U.S. surpluses.

Yet, our accumulating experience appears to show that we have not even yet utilized the full potential of U.S. agricultural production in the furthering of our foreign policy objectives—and neither have we solved the mounting problems posed by increasing domestic production.

Our new food agreement with India, whereby over a period of 4 years we shall sell, for rupees, \$1,276 million worth of wheat to India, in what the *Hindustani Times* has hailed as a "bipartisan, people-to-people gesture of permanent and enduring significance," represents a vital element in the success of that great nation's next 5-year plan which may well determine whether or not its 400 million inhabitants will feel able to choose the path of freedom as the way out of age-old poverty instead of the path of communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* some excerpts from an excellent analysis of the U.S. surplus disposal program which has come to my attention. Robert M. Stern, assistant professor of economics at Columbia University, pointed out some possible solutions in an article in the April 1960 issue of *World Politics*, which I should like to invite to the attention of the Senate.

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

There is considerable scope for surplus disposal on a purely domestic basis through such measures as the establishment of national buffer stocks and the creation of strategic and emergency food reserves out of already existing inventories, as well as the encouragement of increased domestic consumption by means of advertising or finding new uses, instituting special feeding programs, and diverting supplies to inferior uses (e.g., feeding wheat to livestock).

The establishment of strategic stockpiles of food and related commodities in the NATO countries of Western Europe is another alternative for foreign disposal which has been suggested. Although a beginning has been made along these lines recently by a Canadian donation of wheat, the unwillingness of the United States to retain title to any food stockpile abroad and to assume the costs of transportation, storage, and other incidentals has proven a major stumbling block to further progress. There is no reason, of course, why some compromise on these costs could not be worked out if the NATO countries were convinced of the importance and manageability of such strategic stockpiles. The existence of such stocks might be useful, moreover, in liberalizing imports as countries would perhaps feel less need to protect their domestic agriculture on grounds of ensuring self-sufficiency in wartime.

It may also be possible to establish national food reserves in certain underdeveloped countries along lines indicated by the FAO in order to provide emergency relief in the event of crop failure or damage, to reduce undesirable fluctuations in food prices, and to provide additional elbowroom for economic development.

DIVIDED POLITICAL CONTROL AND PEANUT POLITICKING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, some weeks ago the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] delivered a notable address at the annual meeting of the Harvard Club of Washington. He made the point that the deterioration in the prestige of the United States in world affairs, and in much else in the way of our national decline that has happened to us in the last 8 years was due to a divided house, in that one political party controls the executive branch, and another the legislative branch. He suggested that our progress would be facilitated and the situation vastly improved if both these branches of the Government were in the hands of the same political party.

The address was a nonpolitical, non-partisan address, because the able Senator from Arkansas carefully refrained from indicating which party he thought should control both branches—the White House and the Congress.

There is an interesting corollary to this view. It is brought to light in a brief Associated Press dispatch published this morning in the *Washington Post*. The article indicates that recently a Government agency, following a practice which apparently prevails under this administration, notified a Senator of the party which controls the executive branch that an important piece of news was available for his State. Obviously this gives a great political advantage to the Senator who belongs to the party which controls the executive branch. In the case in point this Senator was notified that he had better hurry to get the

good news transmitted to his State, because in a half hour the agency would have to notify the other Senator who belonged to the other party.

The lesson to be derived therefrom, analogous to the point made by our colleague from Arkansas, is that it is desirable to have both senatorships from a given State occupied by members of the same party. Like the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I will refrain from any partisanship and will not specify which party I believe that should be. Fortunately that situation does not exist in my State. Both Senators from Alaska belong to the same political party and therefore operate in harmony with resulting benefits to our State.

I ask unanimous consent that this little article, entitled "Senator LONG, Hawaii, is LONG, not FONG," be printed at this point in the *RECORD*.

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

SENATOR LONG, HAWAII, IS LONG, NOT FONG

Somebody "goofed." Government agencies frequently give Congressmen advance notice of actions affecting their States. With a Republican in the White House, the odds favor a Republican in Congress getting the word before his Democratic colleague.

The other day, the Small Business Administration called Senator OREN E. LONG, Hawaii Democrat, and told him they were declaring a seismic seawave disaster area, making emergency loans available on the island of Hawaii.

LONG was told to make the announcement quickly because they were holding up calling the "Democratic Senator" for 30 minutes. The other Hawaii Senator, HIRAM L. FONG, is a Republican.

Mr. GRUENING. It is not particularly praiseworthy that so tragic a situation as the tidal wave disaster that afflicted Hawaii with the loss of many lives be used for partisan political advantage.

Somebody "goofed," all right. But the "goof" consists, I think, not in the error by the agency in question, but in the picayunish policy which the "goof" brought to light.

BIRTHDAY FELICITATIONS TO SENATOR KARL MUNDT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of the natal day of a very amiable, affable, distinguished, diligent Member of this body, the Honorable KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. Today he is 60 years of age. That means the earth has journeyed around the sun 60 times since he uttered the first feeble birth cry.

That is the way we measure time. We become the victims of a cliché when we say, "Time marches on." Time does not march on. We march through time. We come to a point and say, "That is an hour." We come to a point and say, "That is a day." We come to a point and say, "That is a year."

A year is nothing more than one journey of the earth around the sun. Our distinguished compatriot from South Dakota has lived long enough so that there have been 60 journeys of the earth around the sun.

Anniversaries are important. To the ladies they spell romance. To children they spell parties. An anniversary really is a milestone, because it marks the individual's progress through this stationary medium we call time. It is a little higher ground than any other day on the calendar.

So, my friend, you stand on high ground today. In so doing you have a chance to look back. You have a chance to look around. You have a chance to look ahead. We have a chance to stand on that high ground with you today. We can look back also, and appraise your achievements and your accomplishments.

I think, Mr. President, that if I were to put it in a phrase I would say that KARL MUNDT's whole adult life has been dedicated to human welfare, to the expansion of the enjoyment of living by his fellow men, and to his country.

I say that for a number of reasons. First, he was a teacher, fashioning the mold of young minds which would be the trustees of this country in another generation, helping them to be devoted to basic principles, developing in them a capacity to think, to analyze, and—which is as important—to be able to fluently express the product of the mind. So when I say he has been dedicated to his country, his record as a teacher in those earlier days is living proof of it.

When I say that KARL has been devoted to the expansion of the enjoyment of living by people, I think of his record as a conservationist. He has held office in many societies which are devoted essentially to the business of recreation, conservation, and the preservation of the outdoors as the great playground and the great area where those recreative and restorative processes can remake people. He has, in fact, been a pioneer in that field. He has devoted much of his life so that the living of other people might be expanded and might be more enjoyable.

When I say he has dedicated himself to his country, I think of my first associations with him in the House of Representatives, where he did an outstanding job in pointing up and alerting not only the Congress but also the country to the threats and to the dangers of subversive activities, sabotage, and those things which are threats to the internal security of this country. He did an outstanding job as a Member of the House of Representatives. How timely it is to recall this now, when there is so much emphasis upon the whole question of intelligence and what the Soviet forces have been doing in our own country in developing knowledge of our nuclear secrets, wherever they could, to put them in a better offensive position.

KARL MUNDT has developed a background of familiarity with and an expert knowledge of that field, which is exceeded, insofar as I know, by no Member of the House or of the Senate. It is a testimony to his devotion to his country.

I think it can be said in truth and in candor that as a Senator he has had only one pole star to guide him; that is, the well being not only of the country and

its people as a whole but also of the folks who sent him to the Senate from the great sovereign State of South Dakota. His work has been durable. He has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a long time. The record of the committee is an attestation to his fidelity, to his diligence, and to his knowledge in that field. I think he has had a profound effect upon the farm policies of the country. He knows the needs of his people. Senators can testify to how ruggedly and how tenaciously he fights for what he thinks is right and just not only for his farmers, but also for the farmers of the entire country.

Senator MUNDT has performed notable work on the Committee on Government Operations, and it was my pleasure to serve on that committee with him.

He has been an aggressive member of the Investigating Subcommittee, and his efforts have been relentless, in the interest of our own survival and security, to head off the unending efforts at sabotage, and to bring about a disclosure in the nuclear age of the secrets that are conducive to our survival.

He has done a splendid job in the field of investigating racketeering, and has stood up nobly and courageously. It takes real moral courage even to accept an assignment on the committee making that investigation, which has labored so long and has exposed some of the nefarious practices that are truly an incubus upon the whole economic system of the country. They are like a cancerous blight. He stood up redoubtably and with great moral courage in the face of threats, and in the knowledge, of course, that to do so might have political repercussions. That task in itself was exhausting, and he has performed it as we would expect of a real statesman.

I add to my tribute the useful application of the knowledge he has gathered in the House and the Senate. It is one thing to develop background and knowledge; it is another to make it useful and applicable. To do so requires some facility of expression, and everyone knows that he has it.

Consonant with his duties, and never shirking his duties in the Senate, he has been liberal with his time when his fellow countrymen in all parts of the country have asked him to come and to give them the benefit of his wisdom, his knowledge, and his background on the subjects he has had an opportunity to explore. He has, therefore, had a very significant and impressive effect upon our own security and the well being of the country.

I have often said an anniversary is an opportunity to look back, to look around, and to look ahead. When we look ahead, I have a sentiment—and it is a political sentiment—for the people of South Dakota. I know those people. I have campaigned in that State. I sold books there. I sold the same book KARL MUNDT sold when we were college students in order to get enough money to pay our tuition and return to school. He was infinitely more persuasive and a far better salesman than I, and I noticed in looking at the company records that he did much better than did I in that field.

Nevertheless, I sold books in South Dakota, and I got to know something of the robust and rugged qualities of its people. So today in the Senate I say to them, as I look ahead, Senator MUNDT is more than a Senator; he is more than a public servant; he is more than an individual. He is an investment by the people of South Dakota.

They sent him to the House of Representatives, and when they did, it was as if they were saying, "You are on your own. Now see what you can do." Well, he did pretty well. They honored him by sending him to this body.

I say today the citizens of South Dakota have a large investment in KARL MUNDT, and that investment has paid great dividends, not only for his people, but also for the people of the United States as well.

As we mark KARL MUNDT's 60th anniversary, I say he is virile. He looks extremely healthy to me. I have seen him in action. I have seen him burn up energy, and, after all, vitality is a consideration people note.

I say he has made an excellent record as a Senator. The people of South Dakota have an interest in him, and if I were living in his State I would go to my neighbors and say, "I am going to conserve that investment and I am going to do what I can to keep KARL MUNDT in the Senate."

I salute you, my friend, as a friend.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the birthday of one of our most distinguished and best liked colleagues, the senior Senator from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT.

I have known KARL for many years. He was a Member of the House of Representatives before I came to the Senate and for the past 12 years has been one of our colleagues in the Senate.

I did not know until coming to the Senate floor which birthday KARL is celebrating today. Judging from his energy and the tremendous pace he keeps up, he must be many years younger than I.

I wish to pay tribute to KARL MUNDT on his birthday. It has been a real pleasure to serve with him on both the Appropriations Committee and the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. As a member of the Appropriations Committee KARL has been one of its most prudent and best posted members on all of the thousands of requests for appropriations that are considered each year by that committee. I have always greatly admired the good judgment he has used.

It is on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee that I have come to know and appreciate KARL MUNDT's services perhaps most of all. He has been a true and sincere friend of the farmers—not just occasionally on a few subjects, but every day and every year, and in the consideration of all the many, many problems of farmers. They never had a more able and eloquent spokesman and fighter for their cause on the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate, and in many other public forums. I express

the fond hope that I will have the privilege of serving with him for many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in commending and congratulating the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on this his 60th birthday. Senator MUNDT and I served in the House together, and at one time he was the chairman of the famous Smith-Mundt committee, which traveled over the European Continent at the end of the war, and of which I was fortunate enough to be a member. From that committee came many sound recommendations which laid down guidelines for the foreign policy which was to ensue in the future of our country.

I recall seeing KARL at that time in the Forum of the Senate in Rome. He may have forgotten it, but that was an occasion, I assume, on which he had dreams about the future.

I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the great help and assistance he has been to the States of Montana and Wyoming in obtaining funds in the Senate Appropriations Committee for the Yellowtail Dam in the Big Horn Basin.

I consider it a privilege to be permitted to participate in this spontaneous celebration, and to extend my congratulations to Senator MUNDT on his anniversary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my life has been enriched for more than two decades by the privilege of knowing our colleague Senator MUNDT, who today celebrates his birthday. I wish to congratulate him, and extend to him every good wish. A great deal might be said, has been said, and should be said, about his public service. We could enumerate many, many achievements of his in contribution to our economy, to all agriculture, and in his efforts to preserve our natural resources, including his interest in their development.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator MUNDT on the McClellan Select Committee on Labor and Management Relations, which committee was sometimes known as the Labor Rackets Committee. That was not an easy assignment. There was much pressure. It was discouraging at times. It was not easy to delve into facts involving beatings and shootings and overturned trucks and arson and boycotts and blackmail picketing. It was not easy to find the facts always, and to determine whether or not the worker's money would be paid in as dues or used for his pension and welfare benefit, or that those funds would be properly taken care of. It was a job that had to be done. It was a job that needed to be done for the good of certain segments of our economy. Had that job not been done, those segments of our economy would have continued to move in the direction of becoming a racketeering economy.

KARL MUNDT, as vice chairman of that committee, as much as anyone else, is responsible for a job well done. That means so very much not only to the workers of this country, both organized and unorganized, but to every individual who operates a farm and wants to haul his produce to market, or who operates

a store, and to the small trucking operator, or anyone engaged in our free enterprise economy.

I am thoroughly convinced that without the efforts put forth by this investigating committee, and the great amount of evidence that was developed and the legislation that resulted from those efforts, the lot of the rural people, both in business and in agriculture in the State of South Dakota, would be very difficult indeed. Our economy has been well served by KARL MUNDT, and I hope it will continue to be so well served.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is my desire to participate in the felicitations being extended to our good friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT. South Dakota, in the Black Hills, has produced a great deal of gold. However, 60 years ago today there was brought forth in South Dakota a real bar of gold when young KARL MUNDT came into this world.

Since that time he has been a source of joy and real warmth to his friends throughout the country. I might say, too, that he has been a real source of misery to Communists and to those who would destroy our Republic. He has brought added security to our Constitution and to the other documents upon which our Republic is founded. He has added immeasurably to the valuable work done by the committees of Congress. I know whereof I speak in this regard, because for 3 years I sat next to this man as he served as vice chairman of the committee commonly known as the Rackets Committee, or the McClellan committee.

For 3 years I watched as this man brought out, by his brilliant interrogation, many important facts relating to the wrongdoings of certain leaders in the union movement. For these actions he has brought down upon himself the dislike of men like Hoffa, Beck, Reuther, and other men who engaged in these activities. For that disrespect and that dislike, I believe the people of South Dakota should and do love him.

Mr. President, serving as I do as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, it has been my duty to arrange for speakers to go throughout the country to extol the many superior virtues of the Republican Party. KARL MUNDT never turned me down on requests to speak. He has spoken in every State of the Union before Republican groups and other groups who are interested in good government in this country.

I do not wish to extend these remarks, but I could not take my seat without expressing my great appreciation for KARL MUNDT's service, because he, like myself and many others in the Republican Party, is basically interested in preserving our Republic, preserving our free economic system and our private enterprise system. To this end KARL MUNDT has lent his strength and his brilliant oratory.

On the 60th anniversary of his birthday I congratulate him and the people of South Dakota and commend the people of that great State for their wisdom in sending their two splendid Senators to

this forum. In particular, on this day, I wish to recognize their superior intelligence in having selected KARL MUNDT to represent them here. I hope and pray that they will again elect him and send him back to the Senate in November of this year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear these words of commendation for the people and the State of South Dakota, and for my distinguished senior colleague in the Senate, KARL MUNDT. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], has visited South Dakota, and he knows that the State produces gold in the Black Hills of western South Dakota. But the people of the Black Hills area would join the Senator from Arizona in saying that gold was struck in the hills of Humboldt when KARL MUNDT was born. The people of western South Dakota as well as the people of eastern South Dakota are proud of the record which has been made by my colleague.

I have had an opportunity to know of KARL's services over the more than 21 years of his career in Congress. I was his senior colleague by 2 years during the 10 years he served in the House of Representatives. I continued to serve in the House when he first came to the Senate, where I joined him later to become his junior here.

He is an effective legislator for the State of South Dakota. There is no interest of any part of South Dakota for which he does not have a real and intelligent concern and for which he does not perform effective service. It has been a pleasure to work with him both in the House and in the Senate, as well as in South Dakota.

On the national scene Senator MUNDT has achieved well-deserved special recognition. The Senator from Arizona has already mentioned the excellent work of my colleague in exposing labor racketeering and in chasing Communists, and ferreting out subversive activities.

KARL MUNDT deserves great credit for the interest he has taken in the international field, particularly when he served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and sponsored there the Smith-Mundt bill creating the Voice of America and legislation providing for the exchange of teachers and students. His has been a real contribution to international understanding, appreciated by the people of my State, and I am certain by the Nation at large as well.

It has been my great pleasure to serve with my colleague these many years and I am happy to extend congratulations to him, and express the hope that he will continue to serve for many more years.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues from other States in congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I had an opportunity of getting to know him better when we were both in Florida last year. We went fishing together. One of the best ways to learn of the sterling qualities of a man is to go fishing with him.

That experience, which was most enjoyable for both Senator and Mrs. Mundt and for Mrs. Gruening and me, strengthened my affection and admiration for him. I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating him on his 60th birthday. That is a very important milestone in a man's life. I hope he will be on earth for many more years to come.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was amazed when I learned that our colleague, KARL MUNDT, had joined the ranks of sexagenarians. He is young in spirit and young in thinking. It is a privilege to work with him in this body, as it was in the House of Representatives, where I served with KARL for a number of years.

Reference has been made to his outstanding work for the State of South Dakota and for the Nation. He is a legislator who is known throughout the world by reason of his work on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, and his outstanding interest in and concern for closer contacts between our country and the other countries of the world. This is evidenced by legislation which bears his name, relating to the exchange of teachers and other persons between the United States and foreign countries; by his great interest in the work of the U.S. Information Agency; and by his endeavors to strengthen the efforts being made in our country to project the true image of America to other nations.

As has already been started, KARL MUNDT is a skillful fisherman. Sometimes he claims to be a greater fisherman than he actually is. He claims, for instance, to have been with his colleague from South Dakota, Senator CASE, on a fishing trip, and to have caught more fish than did Senator CASE. The fact is, as some unbiased observers have related, that Senator CASE caught two more fish than Senator MUNDT caught, but that KARL crept around behind and cut the heads off two of the fish which Senator CASE caught. As a result, KARL got the prize. I assure Senators that Senator CASE strongly disputes KARL's great fishing ability.

Mr. President, we have in these two fine men—Senator MUNDT and Senator CASE—what appears to be just about the most effective team serving in the U.S. Senate to promote the interests of their State, always consonant with the interests of our country.

It is a great pleasure to me to salute KARL MUNDT on his birthday. I hope he will be here next year, so that we may again celebrate his birthday anniversary, and that we may continue to do so for many years to come. Certainly there is no public servant who more faithfully and assiduously attends to his duties than our colleague, Senator MUNDT.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our dear friend, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT. As I understand, the record books show that KARL is 60 years of age today. When one is associated with him, sees him, and observes

him at his work, one would think he was 20 years under the 60-year mark.

It has been my pleasure to serve with the senior Senator from South Dakota on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. His State and my State of Kansas are interested in many matters which are very important to the great agricultural economy, and to other activities, as well.

I am certain the good citizens of South Dakota realize how fortunate they are to have as one of their Senators a man so capable as Senator MUNDT. I have observed his actions, his work, and his industry as they have pertained to agricultural problems and the agricultural picture as a whole, as they present themselves in the National Congress in Washington. I can testify that he is a tireless worker. He is always in the forefront of what he considers to be, and what I know is, the best interest of legislation affecting and assisting the great farming economy, and certainly affecting his great State of South Dakota. On soil conservation, flood control, and related activities, his record is one of great industry, brilliance, and success.

One has to work with a man to know him and to appreciate him. KARL MUNDT is one of the great working Senators of the U.S. Senate. When we consider that his teammate is Senator FRANCIS CASE, we know that South Dakota has a senatorial team which is hard to beat.

So on this occasion I join with other Senators in wishing KARL the very best of everything. I feel certain that whatever happens "down the line," we will have KARL MUNDT back in the U.S. Senate because of the great record of what he has done, not only for the people of South Dakota, but also for the people of the United States.

I, for one, am better and richer for having been associated with him and for having followed, many times, the pattern which KARL has set.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in the tributes being paid today to such an old friend as KARL MUNDT. When I first came to the House of Representatives, in 1947, I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which KARL MUNDT was a very distinguished member, and saw much of his work there.

Perhaps my relationships with KARL MUNDT illustrate something in which I deeply believe. He and I do not see eye to eye on many issues. He is more conservative, as the world defines that word, than I am. That may be attributable to the places from which we come, to our origins and backgrounds, or to our philosophies. But there is one thing I wish to say to KARL: I thank God he is here. I hope he will continue to be a Member of the Senate, because I have no illusions about my own omniscience. I believe this amalgam of ideas speaks eloquently for the security of our Nation and the peace of the world.

I have seen KARL work most effectively. I admire him most for his great dedication to the cause of education, especially higher education. I remember very well his pioneering of the Smith-Mundt bill,

which has turned out to be probably as effective a program in the international field as we have ever carried on in the long range. I hope very much that we can communicate with the same comprehensiveness in many other aspects of the technical assistance program of the United States, and get as much private enterprise participation in it.

This only adds to the concept which I have of the service rendered by KARL, both to his State and to the country. In addition, we all know that both the House and Senate are great clubs.

KARL has been an unflinching friend, warm and courteous. Not so long ago, when I had a very keen desire to serve on the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of a new committee which I had joined, though I was the newest member of the committee, and though he knew in advance that he might not agree with what I might advocate in that committee, he was most eager to see that my desire was realized, because he thought I could be of some use in that connection.

It is the way a man lives and performs that shows his work. I can give personal testimony as to the distinction with which the senior Senator from South Dakota has performed. I am glad of this opportunity to express my affection and friendship for an old and valued colleague.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised today to learn that KARL MUNDT is 60 years old. I congratulate him, and I congratulate the State of South Dakota and the United States, because of the years of service he has been able to render.

I say I was surprised to learn that he was 60 years old, because if I were properly pushed and urged, I would have been willing to wager, before today, that he might not see his 30th birthday again; but to imagine KARL being 60 is a little beyond my capability. Certainly his vigor and his activities are such as to indicate a spirit and a physical youth far younger than those years normally bring.

It has been my privilege to know the senior Senator from South Dakota for a number of years. I knew him before I came to the Senate, and while he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I have served with him in one capacity or another for a great many years—perhaps for the past 14 years. It was my privilege to be with the Smith-Mundt committee on its tour of some 21 countries in Europe in 1947, when the basis was being laid for the exchange program which he and former Senator Smith of New Jersey so foresightedly established. It has been my privilege to serve with KARL MUNDT on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a number of years, since he became a Member of the Senate.

The measure of a public servant, of course, is the devotion he gives to his responsibilities. Throughout the years KARL MUNDT has consistently devoted himself to the interests of his beloved State of South Dakota and of the Nation. His activities have not been limited to isolated fields, but they have been

broad. I shall not dwell on his international interests, other than to say that I agree with what has been said about the scope of his interest in international affairs, especially during this period of his service, when the international responsibilities of the United States have reached a point of such importance and such vital concern in our world conduct.

I wish to testify for a moment as to KARL's devotion to agriculture and to the interests of the small businessman. Both activities are typical of his State of South Dakota. He has devoted himself with meticulous care to the advancement of the best interests of the farmers of South Dakota and of the Nation. I can testify to that because of our association on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He has devoted himself to the interests of the small businessman, who constitutes such an important part of the economy of his State and of my neighboring State of Iowa. He has been zealous in protecting their rights and advancing their cause. In many cases over the past several years if it had not been for KARL MUNDT the interests of agriculture and of the small businessman would not have benefited to the degree that they have.

I am not prepared to go into great detail at this moment. As I say, I learned only a little while ago that today was the 60th anniversary of the birth of the senior Senator from South Dakota. I have heard the remarks which have been made by other Senators. I have been aware in the past of examples illustrating his distinguished service. I can assure the Senate that they have been numerous. As a neighbor and a friend, and as a midwesterner, I wish to testify to the outstanding service KARL MUNDT has rendered his country and his State.

As the years have gone by his ability to represent his State has increased beyond measure. His ability to serve his country has increased in line with his experience and the breadth of his activities. He is one of the most valuable Members of the Senate, and one of the most valuable representatives of the people of his country, and especially of his area in the Middle West, that the Congress has had in many years, to my knowledge.

Again I congratulate him. I believe the Senator from New York said the other day with reference to someone else's birthday something which I shall paraphrase in this case. This is not original, and I do not wish to sail under false colors. I congratulate KARL MUNDT today on the 30th anniversary of his 30th birthday. We wish him well. We wish him happiness and strength. Judging from his appearance, he will live to a very ripe old age indeed; and judging by his vigor and his activity, he will continue to serve in whatever capacity may be his opportunity during the many, many years ahead of him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to join in the fine things that have been said about a fine friend.

I remember KARL, back in 1930, when we were both serving the Kiwanis. He was the Governor of his State and I was

the Governor of mine. Much water has gone over the dam since then.

I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues in conveying congratulations and best wishes to KARL MUNDT, a great public servant, who is 60 years young. A man does not live in years. He lives in thoughts and services. To all of us the attainment of a chronological age means different things. In my view the mark of a man is determined not by age, but by the work he has done, not merely in self-service, but in serving his State and his Nation in great causes. That KARL MUNDT has done. By this yardstick the people of the great State of South Dakota and the citizens of America can be justly proud of KARL MUNDT.

During his distinguished career—and he came to the House the same year I came to the Senate—KARL has given dedicated support and leadership to the often difficult tasks and great responsibilities of public service. In addition to outstanding contributions in such fields as conservation, education, strengthening our internal security program, public affairs, and problems of the farmer, this South Dakota Senator has made a great contribution toward improving international relations. Above and beyond the call of duty in the Senate, KARL has also tirelessly contributed to better educating the American people on subjects of national interest through speaking, writing, and leadership in fraternal, service, public affairs, and other organizations. He has a fine record of 20-odd years of dedicated, devoted service in the House and in the Senate. That service reflects a fundamental reason why KARL MUNDT has merited, and in my judgment continues to merit, the confidence and support of the people of South Dakota. I personally wish for him and his dear wife many more years of happiness and service to God and country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am happy to join our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending heartiest congratulations to a very distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, KARL MUNDT, on the 60th anniversary of his birth. I have reached the time of life when I do not believe 60 is getting along. Sixty represents a young age.

KARL MUNDT has had a long period of constructive service to our country as an effective and efficient legislator. He is a dedicated American patriot. He and I, upon occasion, have not seen alike on public questions. But what a melancholy world this would be if all did see alike. Very little, if any progress toward a better life would be made under those circumstances. Here in the Senate, with our different points of view and divergent thinking, which is the basis upon which constructive legislation is fashioned and enacted, KARL MUNDT is at his very best.

Articulate, dedicated, earnest, and persuasive, the senior Senator from South Dakota brings to the arguments which he makes to us, on the issues which confront the Senate, a powerful means of helping to shape legislation in the best interests of the American people. Here we debate our differences, and hammer out what a majority of us thinks what best serves the people.

I wish for you many happy returns of the day, which I hope we may celebrate here in the U.S. Senate, KARL, next year, and for many years thereafter.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, it is my happy privilege to join with my colleagues in extending birthday greetings to the senior Senator from South Dakota. I can look back to the 76th Congress, when he and I became freshman Representatives. Naturally, I had a very unusual opportunity to watch him in action, because we were mutually interested in certain projects and were concerned in promoting various programs vital to our country and the Republican Party.

I know of his indomitable courage, perseverance, and effective work, whether it be in the committee room, on the floor, or in a conference endeavoring to effect a compromise in order to promote legislation of interest to him and to his State.

I recall also 6 years ago, when he was chairman of the Government Operations Committee, which conducted the so-called McCarthy hearings, serving on that committee with him. As chairman, he was fair and courteous and, I am sure, he acquired a national reputation for the efficient manner in which he conducted the hearing.

I know also, because of his interest in constitutional Government, he truly is a champion in defending our way of life. I am sure the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for his work in that regard.

I have had the privilege of serving with KARL MUNDT on the Appropriations Committee, and several of its subcommittees. I know the people of South Dakota are aware of the unusually effective service he has rendered, and of the many projects which he has been able to promote and for the construction of which he has been able to secure funds. That is a very vital service, of course; but probably more important than his dedicated service to his own State and to promoting the welfare of South Dakota I think is the fact that he has become a national leader in every sense of the word. In that regard I am sure the people of South Dakota will give him an opportunity to continue his very valuable services in the Senate of the United States. I know he will continue to serve the best interests of the United States and of his own State, and in doing that he will maintain the outstanding record of achievement which has marked his more than 20 years of service in the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suppose no one would be more surprised than I was in learning that KARL MUNDT is having a birthday, because he seems to be the kind of fellow who should not have birthdays. If anything, he looks younger than he did when I first saw him about 20 years ago, when I came to the Senate. He was a Member of the House at that time. He was making his mark and having his voice heard as a Member of the House of Representatives at that time.

After he came to the Senate, it was my good fortune to have him assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I have been a mem-

ber up to the present time. There has been no more intent worker on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry than the Senator from South Dakota, **KARL MUNDT**.

I have watched his work in other fields as well, and have noted the efficiency of his efforts, as well as the success of those endeavors. When he undertakes a project, if he believes it to be a worthy project, he is persistent. He approaches problems with courage, intelligence, and, as I have said, great persistence, and stays with those problems until a conclusion is reached.

I believe the people of South Dakota have been very fortunate in having his services available to them as a Member of both Houses of Congress over the last 20 years, and I am sure the people of South Dakota really appreciate what their senior Senator has been doing for them here in Washington.

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, one would be insensitive, indeed, if he did not express his appreciation for the generous and warmhearted remarks which have been made by colleagues for whom he has such great respect and with whom he has associated for so long.

I simply wish to say "Thank you" to my many good friends on both sides of the aisle who have made such generous remarks about the senior Senator from South Dakota today. This will go down in my personal record books, I am sure, as the most memorable birthday I have ever had.

Since I have been 21 years of age I have looked forward to my birthdays increasingly with less enthusiasm and less enchantment, but this is one I shall always cherish.

I recall, I believe it was 6 years ago, when the Senator from Idaho [**MR. DWORSHAK**], who mentioned it, and others were serving on the committee conducting the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings, in which I was cast as the reluctant chairman. During the hearings, which happened to project through my birthday, during one of the recesses, Walter Winchell blandly announced on all the hooked-up television and radio stations that the chairman was having a birthday this particular day. When I returned to the office the next morning, there were eight different birthday cakes in various states of disrepair. There were some pipes, which really made the effort worth while, and there were some assorted neckties, and over 5,000 birthday cards. These came mostly from people I did not know.

To have nice things said about one's self by friends and associates is indeed heartwarming. I thank everybody who had something to say in this connection today.

VISIT TO UNITED STATES BY PRIME MINISTER DIEFENBAKER

MR. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are honored today by a visit from the Honorable John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada. There has been much favorable comment in the press of the United States regarding this visit.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* two editorials which have appeared in the press of today, one from the *Washington Post*, entitled "Tried and Proved," and the other from the *New York Times*, entitled "Mr. Diefenbaker in Washington."

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

[From the *Washington Post*, June 3, 1960]

TRIED AND PROVED

The friendship of Canada means vastly more to the United States than either the American people or their Government customarily take the trouble to acknowledge. The visit here today of Prime Minister Diefenbaker affords a welcome opportunity, however, to do just that.

We would not wish to characterize Canadian-American friendship as a merely material thing, activated by a common danger on the one hand and, on the other, by the fact that the two countries long have been each other's largest customers in trade. Yet it is inevitably in these areas—defense and commerce—that the mutual problems arise and in these matters that a friendship which has deep cultural and political roots is tested and strengthened.

Lately the tests have been rather severe, and Mr. Diefenbaker's 3 hours with President Eisenhower will, we hope, be a means of identifying afresh the common interests which must somehow be made to prevail. Mr. Diefenbaker is entitled to a sympathetic ear—and to continuing efforts at improved consultation.

He has the task of overcoming a nagging and growing deficit in Canadian-American trade that, by American standards, would long since have been likely to prompt the most severe protectionist measures. Canada has had the good sense to recognize that this is not the answer—but the right answer, a greater opportunity for Canadian exports, requires some bold steps toward freer trade by both countries. He has also the unending problem of maintaining Canadian collaboration in constantly changing continental defense programs over which Canada has relatively little control. There is no easy answer for the political and economic problems this raises in Canada, but the recent moves to strengthen joint defense planning are in the right direction.

As the Paris summit meeting collapsed, it is said that Mr. Diefenbaker found it necessary to defer for a day his own public comment on the fiasco. When it came, his support for the American position was unequivocal—and there is no reason to doubt that his personal assessment was made without hesitation. But public hesitation there was—however slight—and if Mr. Diefenbaker took this time to appraise Canadian public opinion and to contemplate anew the problem of being a middle power in a world ruled by giants, Americans can be all the more thankful that his appraisal came out as it did. At this moment, the ties that bind were tested and found amply strong. Such a friendship deserves the most tender care.

[From the *New York Times*, June 3, 1960]

MR. DIEFENBAKER IN WASHINGTON

When President Eisenhower invited Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada 2 months ago to visit Washington and today's date was set, neither man could have known that the summit meeting was going to be a complete failure. It would in any case have been useful to review United States-Canadian relations and to discuss informally world conditions. In present circumstances a conference is almost a necessity.

The United States and Canada have a joint defense plan which is under some criticism

in Ottawa. Canada switched last year to primary dependence on the U.S. Bomarc missile, which the Canadian Liberal opposition says was a great mistake. Mr. Diefenbaker will presumably seek some reassurance. On another aspect, he and his Conservative Government are more strongly in favor of an international agreement to end nuclear weapons tests than we are.

A perennial source of debate, conflict, and, in large part, of satisfaction, is the state of Canadian-American trade. Canada is having another prosperous year, but her trade deficit with the United States is increasing and her unemployment continues to be exceptionally high. The United States is not being especially blamed, except insofar as our import quotas on lead, zinc, and some agricultural products limit Canadian exports. The chief problem, as a meeting of the Canadian-American committee on business experts has just pointed out, is tariff barriers, and that applies to both countries. The American dollar is nearing parity with the Canadian dollar, which should help Canadian exports.

Longstanding major problems between the United States and Canada can hardly be ironed out in a 1-day visit, but they can be discussed and remedies or studies can be set in motion. No two major nations of the Western World are so inextricably bound together in every possible way as the United States and Canada. The more often our leaders can get together, the better. A Canadian Prime Minister, in any circumstances, is a most welcome guest to the United States, and this, it needs no saying, goes for John Diefenbaker.

MR. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* my remarks in welcoming to our country Prime Minister Diefenbaker, of Canada.

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

WELCOME TO OUR GREAT FRIEND FROM CANADA

MR. KEATING. I am sure all Americans join me in extending a hearty welcome to a distinguished visitor to Washington today, Prime Minister Diefenbaker, of Canada. This forthright and forceful leader of our neighbors to the north occupies an important place in the councils of the free world and is an eloquent champion of the democratic way of life. He is widely recognized as a stand-out leader in the world's quest for peace.

I am confident his conversations with President Eisenhower and other American officials will help to further solidify America's traditional bonds of friendship and cooperation with the people of Canada. Certainly it should be plain to all of us that the recent upsurge of interest in strengthening our ties with the nations of Latin America must be matched by increased attention to our relations with our friends to the north.

Far too many people tend to take our cordial relations with Canada for granted. All too often we appear to regard these good friends as something less than full partners in meeting the responsibilities of the Western Hemisphere. I hope the Prime Minister's visit will help sweep away some of these misconceptions.

It is important for all Americans to recognize Canada's present status in the world and vis-a-vis America. It is vital that we remember that Canada is a vital and independent and proud nation, which wants and deserves to be treated as a full-fledged member of the family of free nations.

The United States must respond to these newer aspects of our relations with Canada in a number of ways. For one thing, there is a great need for more vigorous efforts to

impress Americans with the history, traditions, and world standings of Canada by means of courses in our institutions of learning. A pioneer program in Canadian studies at the University of Rochester is a fine example of the kind of thing we should be undertaking in this area.

The recent establishment of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, bringing together legislators from the two countries for frank and informal discussions of problems of mutual interest, is another substantial step in the right direction. I am confident the recent meetings of this group in Washington, as well as their future deliberations, will do much to strengthen the mutual understanding and common resolve to meet problems head-on which is essential for harmonious North American relations.

Finally, it is comforting to know that America is being represented today in Canada by a man who is keenly aware of the need for improving relations with our friends to the north. He knows and understands Canada's gripes and he is fully cognizant of the interdependence of the two countries. Ambassador Richard B. Wigglesworth is, indeed, an ideal person to lead the way toward even greater good will and ties of friendship between Canada and the United States. It is a task to which all Members of this body, and all Americans, should dedicate themselves.

KHRUSHCHEV'S LATEST BLAST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am sure all of us are familiar with Sir James Barrie's charming story of Peter Pan, the little boy who would not grow up.

The more I hear of the rantings of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, the more I am reminded of Peter Pan, except for the obvious fact that Nikita Khrushchev is not a little boy. He simply sounds like one.

The awful fact of life is that he is a self-centered, power-mad dictator who has the power to plunge the entire world into a nuclear holocaust.

Not satisfied with wrecking the summit conference and smashing the hopes of millions of people around the world the King Kong of international diplomacy now occupies himself with personal attacks upon the American Presidency.

If his intention is to divide the people of this country, he is dead wrong. Where pride and honor are concerned, Americans stand together, and Khrushchev's absurd and insulting remarks will unite them as could no other force short of war.

Apparently Khrushchev feels that the population of the entire world shares his own mentality. There are no limits to his arrogance and crudity. A Russian-speaking acquaintance of mine has informed me that some of Khrushchev's remarks before the National Press Club here in Washington would never have been printed if they had been accurately translated into English.

It would be easy to write off this foul-mouthed demagog if he were just that and nothing more. But the tragedy of it is that he is not. He is the leader of the second most powerful nation in the world.

The pity, then, is that we have to listen to him. One would think that warm receptions President Eisenhower received everywhere following the summit breakup would have made some impression on Khrushchev. Apparently not.

In sum, the exponent of a brutalitarian philosophy is in complete harmony with his nature when he talks like a brute. Brutishness is all he knows, all he understands.

To kow-tow, apologize, or "send regrets" to a man like this is as unthinkable as tearing our flag into small pieces and grinding them into the mud.

Whatever feelings President Eisenhower may have had personally—and I know they were not only considerable but formidable—he knew that he could not let the American people down by even acknowledging Khrushchev's insults at the summit. The people of this country are grateful for it, as are the people of the entire free world.

I doubt very much that Khrushchev appreciates this, or even understands it. His rich and revolting vocabulary does not include such words as "pride" and "honor."

THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I think it is indeed regrettable that the House Agriculture Committee has not seen fit to go along with President Eisenhower's requests concerning the Sugar Act.

The committee has reported a bill extending the present law for 1 year, instead of the 4 requested by the administration. It also refuses the President authority to reallocate quotas.

The President has asked for this authority to adjust certain foreign quotas when he finds such action is called for, either in the national interest or to insure domestic supplies of sugar. I think the committee has been extremely shortsighted in this respect and I certainly expect this bill will be opposed if it comes before the Senate in this form.

As we all know, the administration has bent over backwards to avoid appearing to use the sugar quota system as a means of retaliating against certain anti-American actions of the present Cuban Government.

Still, I think it is time we took a hard look at this situation. We continue to pay Cuba 2 to 3 cents a pound over the world market price and the result is that American consumers are forced to pay extra millions of dollars a year.

This system, furthermore, has stirred up resentment against the United States in those areas which have either a lower quota or none at all. In addition, it has tended to make a hollow joke out of our claim to be in favor of free enterprise and of the free flow of international trade.

Perhaps the time has come, particularly in view of the present atmosphere in Castro's Cuba, to place sugar on a free trade basis in which the American market would be open to all would-be suppliers on a freely competitive basis. I think that at the very least, this is deserving of serious consideration.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CLOTHING WORKERS AGAINST FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's unanimous decision by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of

America to take direct action against low-wage-produced imports should be no surprise to anyone who has studied the problems of the American clothing industry.

It is incredible that the United States has done so much to curb competition from substandard labor conditions within our country and virtually nothing at all to protect our domestic market against much worse conditions abroad. No American industry should have to compete with 14-cents-an-hour labor, whether in sweatshop mills in this country or a foreign country. Yet that is the burden imposed at present upon America's clothing industry, among others, in facing competition from Japan and other countries.

I have been working vigorously with a number of other Senators and House Members on a bipartisan bill (S. 2882), which would apply the principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all goods sold in this country regardless of their point of origin. While there has been tremendous interest in this proposal, there has been no positive action.

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that the unions have decided to resort to self-help. It is regrettable that this has become necessary, and I am sure that the decision was reached reluctantly. But Congress' lack of initiative could not have been expected to encourage patience or hope for constructive relief.

Only one final word. I do not believe it is fair to construe the union's action as a repudiation of its longstanding support for reciprocal trade any more than S. 2882, the bill to which I have referred, should be so construed. We long ago decided as a matter of national policy that the interests of a free enterprise system were enhanced not diminished by the elimination of sweatshop competition. The only purport of the union's action is to give this principle international application. Of course, we want to preserve free trade not only in the interest of other nations, but in our own national interest as well. But free trade, like free enterprise, does not require competition with goods produced under conditions we prohibit as a matter of law in American factories.

Mr. President, it is to be hoped that the resolution of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America will spur congressional activity in this field. It is not too late in the session to enact the needed measures. I am confident that both labor and management in this industry would prefer this solution to their problems to the strikes and boycotts and other costly self-help tactics which the convention approved.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD REDUCTION OF REDISCOUNT RATE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the action of the Federal Reserve Board yesterday in lowering the rediscount rate in Philadelphia and San Francisco is good news. It means that the Federal Reserve Board is finally and tardily recognizing what a number of us have been saying on the floor of the Senate for many, many months: That record high

interest rates caused by a deliberate Federal Reserve money restriction tighter than the Nation has suffered for more than 30 years—since Andy Mellon was riding high in the Treasury—has seriously restricted the growth and prosperity of our economy.

This drop in discount rates by the Federal Reserve is sure to have an easing effect on interest rates provided it is promptly followed by a similar discount rate cut in the other 10 Federal Reserve cities. The Federal Reserve Board has already started supplementary open market operations to expand the supply of money by buying Treasury bills. Last week it purchased more than \$318 million of such bills.

This action should help significantly to stimulate the Nation's sagging homebuilding program, which has suffered from 10 years of stagnation, because high interest rates have made interest cost a much bigger charge against home buyers than the cost of any element—labor, material, land, or any other element of cost that goes into home construction.

Lower interest costs should also assist massively in hospital and homebuilding, as well as in the construction of all the other private and public billions of dollars of capital investment projects in our vast economy.

In providing this stimulation more jobs will open up for the more than 3,600,000 unemployed. The American economy has been sagging in recent years in comparison to the surging economic growth of the free democracies of Western Europe and Japan and the challenge of dictatorial tyranny of Russia? Lower interest rates will help.

Mr. President, the Federal Reserve Board has been far too late in shifting gears. Professor Friedman, of the University of Chicago, has demonstrated that there is a lag of 6 months to 2 years between the initiation of monetary policy by the Federal Reserve Board and real impact on the economy. Meanwhile the steel industry slogs along at 65 percent of capacity or less. Unemployment continues depressingly high. The construction industry sleepily loafs along at a stroll. Hospital and school construction lag far below what they should be.

The Federal Reserve Board, of course, deserves credit for having acted at last. But this molasses-in-January lassitude is one more indication of many we have had of the clouded crystal ball of our economic policymakers—their inability to foresee economic slackness. Once again it should be clear that the Federal Reserve Board would contribute far more to our economy if it simply followed a policy of monetary neutrality, letting the money supply expand with the gross national product, and let the free play of supply and demand determine interest rates.

The high-interest, tight-money policy has cost the Federal Government billions of dollars in additional interest cost on the national debt. The additional cost this year compared to the cost of the same size debt with 1952 interest rates is substantially more than \$3 billion, for which the taxpayer is buying not a mis-

sile, a plane, a house, or a single hour of any kind of governmental service, but he is buying only \$3 billion of empty air.

The cost of private credit, meanwhile, has skyrocketed, at immense cost to every home buyer, auto buyer, appliance buyer or anyone else who has to finance his purchase on time.

The cost to the unemployed, the un-built hospital, and school and home has also been immense.

And the benefit? Well, there are two potential benefits. Some monetary economists argue the view sincerely held by the Federal Reserve Board that high interest rates stem inflation and high prices by discouraging people from buying homes, building schools and hospitals. In this way the demand pressure on limited resources is said to be kept down, and the pressure on prices reduced.

But there has been no real pressure on American resources for years now. We have no shortage of manpower. A far higher proportion of workers are out of work in America—and have been for several years now—than in any other industrialized nation in the world including our free allies. More have been out of work for many months than for any period in the past 20 years, including most recession periods. Do we have a shortage of facilities? I challenge any Senator to indicate any substantial industry in America where there has not been an abundance of factory facilities for a long time now.

The inflation justification for tight money has had no validity under the economic circumstances prevailing in this country for a long, long time.

What benefit remains? There is one. The moneylenders have of course immensely gained by this super Government price support for interest. Personal interest income has risen since 1952 more than twice as rapidly as any other form of income, including rent, wages, and profits of business. It has increased from \$12.1 billions in 1952 to a fat \$24.9 billions—annual rate for April—today. Eight years ago farmers enjoyed incomes of 25 percent higher than moneylenders. Since then farm income has thudded down from \$15.3 billions to \$10.9 billions. Meanwhile personal interest income has soared right through the stratosphere, so that today the interest recipients enjoy an income that is far more than twice what all the producers of food and fiber receive, a massive 130 percent more in fact.

Benefit in the high interest rate policy? There is indeed, for the big moneylenders. I wish to make clear that I do not for a minute challenge the motives of the Federal Reserve Board, the Nation's money managers. They are men of fine character. But the fact is that the viewpoint that predominates throughout the Federal Reserve Board is the viewpoint of the banker, the man whose whole life, whose education, training, experience, background has been on the lending side of moneylending. Somehow, somehow, Congress must discharge the responsibility that the Constitution has explicitly given us over the

Nation's money supply, and thereby the Nation's interest rates, by instilling a far greater sensitivity to the need of the Nation's small businessmen, farmers, home buyers, and taxpayers, as well as the patriotic citizen who fervently wants national economic growth, and put an end to artificially high, restrictive, stultifying interest rates.

MEDICAL EXPENSE DESTROYS BUDGET OF SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, household budgets based on the limited, fixed incomes of our senior citizens are austere at best. High premiums for even the most superficial medical and hospital insurance must be paid out of money desperately needed for proper shelter and adequate diet.

Any needed medical care not covered by such insurance must simply be put off by these people, often until it is too late. This is the actual, living story of the senior citizens of our Nation, brought home to us again and again in the letters we receive. Here is an example of such a letter. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Record at this point.

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

DEAR SIR: Please vote for the Forand bill, H.R. 4700.

My husband is 69 and receives \$94 per month in social security benefits. Out of this we pay \$8.10 a month for a hospital policy, which pays \$10 a day for a hospital room. The cheapest bed in our local hospital is \$10.50 per day, in a six-bed ward.

I have been following your efforts to have social security benefits increased with great hope. I will be 62 in October, and eligible for partial benefits, but even with that we cannot possibly live independently. We make our home with a son and after our doctor and hospital and drug bills are paid and a modest life insurance premium kept up there is very little left for our actual living costs of food, housing, and clothing. So with the present benefits, we are still dependent on our children. Please keep up your good work of trying to make old folks more independent.

DANISH AND SWEDISH CONSTITUTION DAYS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, next Sunday and Monday will be the anniversaries of very important national holidays for two Scandinavian democracies, Denmark and Sweden. Our Nation has enjoyed a long history of friendship with both of these nations, which we can attribute to the fact that we share the same fundamental beliefs in democratic government and individual freedom, and to the fact that so many of our own countrymen are descended from immigrants from Denmark and Sweden.

June 5 is the anniversary of the adoption of the Danish Constitution of 1849. Under this constitution, Denmark has been a constitutional monarchy, governed by a parliament called the Rigstad. It is today one of the world's most advanced democracies, and it can be proud of one of the world's highest levels of educational and cultural achievement.

Monday, June 6, will be the anniversary of the adoption of the liberal constitution of Sweden, in 1809. Sweden is also one of the world's model democracies today, and enjoys one of the world's highest standards of living.

Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in saluting the people of Denmark and Sweden and in extending the greetings of the people of the United States on their national holidays.

POSTAL SERVICE NEVER INTENDED AS MONEYMAKING ENTERPRISE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Eisenhower administration proposal to increase postage rates on first-class letter mail from 4 cents to 5 cents and on airmail from 7 cents to 8 cents an ounce, and to increase second-class mail rates, is an unfair proposal. Despite the fact that Postmaster General Summerfield is a vigorous proponent of the enactment of this postal rate increase, I assert that action should be denied during this session; and that if any consideration whatever is to be given to increasing postal rates for letters and for daily and weekly newspapers, the entire matter should be postponed until next year.

If this proposal is pressed to a vote at this time, I will actively oppose passage and vote against such legislation.

I assert, Mr. President, that individuals and businesses using first-class mail are paying enough right now with the 4 cents per ounce letter rate and the 7 cents airmail rate. No additional burden should be placed upon letterwriters and, Mr. President, my view is that any proposed increase on second-class mail would unduly burden publishers of daily and weekly newspapers. Increasing their rates at the present grim period in the world would be most untimely.

In this cold war period of crisis piled on crisis—when the people of our Nation should be more, not less, informed on vital issues—no step should be taken which could conceivably diminish the number of newspapers serving the public.

I assert, Mr. President, the Summerfield-sponsored increase in second-class mail rates would severely handicap many hometown weekly and daily newspapers already struggling to stay in business and serve their communities.

For some smalltown papers in my own State of Ohio, as well as other States, such an increase would sound the death knell for further operation.

Not many newspapers, already operating on a dangerously thin margin, can readily absorb what appears to be an increase in their mailing costs of upward of 200 percent. One small publisher has estimated it would cost him more than \$2,500 a year. How many small hometown newspapers can afford an increase so staggering?

Mr. President, hometown, country, and big city newspapers always have shown willingness to accept a reasonable increase in their postal rates. It is a fact that major newspaper associations for years have formally expressed that willingness.

It is a fact the Eisenhower-Summerfield proposal is without justification. Countless hometown daily and weekly newspapers have rightly condemned it in their editorials.

My view is, Mr. President, that it is of little importance whether the Government incurs a small deficit through the use of the mails of America's newspapers. In these grave, fast-changing times, it is of the utmost importance that newspapers—dailies and weeklies—go into as many homes as possible. How else are our citizens to be informed on the towering issues which confront America?

Mr. President, the postal service of the United States was never conceived nor intended to be a moneymaking business and to produce a surplus.

This is an important, in fact vital, service furnished the citizens of our country by their Government.

To me it seems extremely important that the Congress act to encourage dissemination of information to our citizens. It is important to our people that they receive in the mail, or by home delivery, daily, weekly, and Sunday newspapers.

An informed public is of extreme importance in this grim period of international anarchy. With the Soviet Union and Red China arrayed against us, boasting through their leaders of an intent to bury us by economic means if not by actual shooting war, there never was a time in the history of our country when it was so urgent that our citizens be fully informed.

The Post Office Department renders a needful and real public service in speeding the delivery of newspapers and news magazines into the homes of America. This is a vital service comparable to the use and maintenance of highways, schools, and all factors in the defense of the Nation and for the advancement of our citizens.

I assert postal rates on first and second-class mail should not be increased at this time. If postal rates must be increased, the added rate should be borne by heavy magazines and third-class mail. Certainly no American objects to reasonable charges for the use of the mails. Nor are they gravely concerned about an alleged annual deficit which is, in reality, a return on their tax investment. This is a proper service of Government.

However, American people have every right to resent proposed increases in their mailing costs, and American newspaper publishers surely are correct in condemning the exorbitant increases in their second-class mail rates proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

It is an odd fact, Mr. President, that while the administration advocates increased postal rates for individual Americans and newspapers, it continually opposes any really adequate legislation designed to benefit our citizens—adequate housing, adequate school aid, adequate water pollution control, adequate aid to depressed areas, new public works projects and other vitally needed legislation.

President Eisenhower should be far more alarmed over the tremendous waste

of taxpayers' money in national defense expenditures than over a comparatively small deficit in Post Office Department operations. He could have saved billions of taxpayers' dollars annually by promoting real unification of our Armed Forces and cracking down on duplication and wasteful spending in connection with our national defense efforts.

Before the Congress should even consider laying the heavy burden of increased rates on citizens and on our newspapers which contribute so essentially to national welfare, we must demand that Mr. Summerfield convince us his Department is practicing rigid economy and has cut unnecessary spending to the bone.

The Post Office Department was designed to provide our people with service. American newspapers provide information valuable to our citizens. The one must not curtail the value of the other.

It is a fact that some publishers of weekly and of daily newspapers have experienced difficulty in continuing their publications and in maintaining the solvency of their publishing companies. This in view of the high cost of newsprint and of the rising costs of skilled labor and the advancing cost of living generally, which has made it reasonable to increase salaries.

I feel that postal rates against such publications, which are so important in this period of grave international tension and cold war, should surely not be increased.

I suggest that Postmaster General Summerfield carefully review the operations of the Post Office Department and seek to enforce economies before seriously and persistently urging increased rates on first- and second-class mail.

There is no occasion for anyone to be alarmed over the claimed deficit in the operation of the Post Office Department. There is no justification, by reason of that claim, to increase rates on first- and second-class mail matter.

KHRUSHCHEV'S STATEMENTS AT HIS PRESS CONFERENCE THIS MORNING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make some comments upon the address made by Chairman Khrushchev at a press conference this morning. It has already been said, and properly, and therefore I do not think it needs to be burned into the consciousness of the American people, that this outburst of vituperation will neither scare the American people nor hurry them into any improvident action.

President Eisenhower's reputation is far greater as a leader of the forces of the world which conquered tyranny in World War II and as a peace leader in the last 8 years than Khrushchev can tear down, and one does not have to engage in an insulting contest with him as to his own record, which will not bear that kind of examination.

What will come of this intemperateness and this attempt to scare the world, engaged in by Khrushchev and Gromyko—and let us remember that Khrushchev reiterated in his speech the

threat to bomb or hurl rockets upon the bases from which any plane flying over the Soviet Union may have taken off—what will come from all this is the greater union of the free world.

This, I believe, may prove to be the decisive mistake which the Communists have made, and the decisive action which will enable the free world to win for freedom.

On the very same morning that Khrushchev made his completely intemperate attack, we find news reports stating that "Britain seeks end of snag on trade."

The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the British Cabinet stated to a meeting of the Assembly of the Western European Union that his Government—and this is official—is now "ready to consider anew the proposal that Britain should join Euratom and indeed the European coal and steel community."

He goes on to say:

First we have to know whether we should be welcome. Then, since this has not only technical but political significance, we have to know what the effect would be upon the immediate situation.

He then goes on to indicate that the immediate situation includes an effort to reconcile and, indeed, get together the European Free Trade Association with the European Economic Community.

He assured the assembly of the Western European Union that these two organizations are "by no means irreconcilable."

It seems to me that this is really the momentous news. Khrushchev's expressions are the fumings of a man who is either calculatedly angry or intemperately angry, or he cannot control his temper, even in the interest of peace.

If this step is taken, if Britain enters a unity with the Continent of Europe, which this news betokens, as the British Government is prepared to do, this is a decisive, factual, overwhelmingly important move for the unity of the free world, and a tremendous blow in its victory in this struggle with the Communists.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with regard to what the Senator from New York has stated, I have the statement which was issued by Mr. Khrushchev. To me the most significant thing about the statement is the fact that he made no distinction between planes which accidentally stray off course and those that might fly over Soviet territory with deliberate design.

That, it seems to me, is an extremely dangerous position for him to take, because it is inevitable that in Germany, for instance, a plane will stray off course, as planes have done from time to time, and be forced to land in East Germany or in other Communist territory. Often they have been released and sent back to where the flights originated.

Now Mr. Khrushchev says that if planes stray off course, the Russians will launch bombs at the base from which

they took off. However, he cannot always be certain which base it might be.

While I believe Mr. Khrushchev is bluffing and rattling the missiles again, and is probably in something of a desperate situation himself, nevertheless his present statements might later be turned into an alibi or excuse for an unwarranted attack upon any of the Western European nations should the high Soviet command hereafter decide such a course to be desirable. He is evidently trying to put upon President Eisenhower his own feelings. Of course, we all know that Mr. Khrushchev is desperately afraid of a united Germany. We all know that the United States has been in the forefront in urging a united Germany. So Mr. Khrushchev's statement is simply propaganda, and false propaganda, at that.

However, I repeat that the significant thing about his statement is that he made no distinction between commercial planes which might unintentionally fly off course, and planes which might be sent over Russian territory for a definite purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his observations, which, as usual, are pertinent and astute.

That is what I meant when I said the Russians would bomb the bases from which they believed the planes had come.

Mr. President, such a statement as Mr. Khrushchev's is not only vituperation; it is the most arrant kind of irresponsibility by a Nation—at least, by a leader of a nation—which makes the professions of seeking peace in the world which Khrushchev makes.

If I might comment to the Senator from Vermont on one other thing, I should like to discuss the statement by Khrushchev concerning his discussions with the President on Germany. There, too, the record is so eloquent that it is the Russians who have been keeping the two Germanys apart, and making their threats with respect to denying access to Berlin, and making a separate treaty with the East German government, and refusing to allow free elections, the latter being a proposal which we have made to them time and time again for the purpose of bringing about the reunification of Germany.

I do not believe any German, any American, or anyone else in the world, will be fooled by the effort again to divide the free world. Especially will it appeal to the Germans as little as it appeals to us that Khrushchev calls Adenauer, the respected leader of West Germany for so many years, and who has led his country into such great prosperity and security, a lunatic, any more than when he calls our President dangerous.

The Russians are not quite so crackpot as they might sound. There is a real purpose to everything Khrushchev is doing, and that purpose is very clear now. One is to insert a wedge in the free world by introducing the question as to the bona fide desire to reunify Germany. There is no doubt about that. It is borne out by the record stating in ad-

vance how they propose to launch an attack based on a convenient incident or a convenient reason. It is the tactic of "We told you so. Now we have done it."

I do not believe our people will be scared by this talk. As a matter of fact, Khrushchev is now inuring us to scares by repeating them so often. However, what I think it will do, and as is shown by the statement of British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Profumo, is to make the free world unified, because the free world will realize that this is the price of survival. In that respect, we will be striking a decisive blow for the introduction of freedom, as many persons, like myself, among others, have contended was the only way in which we could really marshal the resources of the free world and take the lead from the Communist bloc.

I hope this process will continue, and that our people will realize what is at stake and will lend themselves to it.

The unification of the free world must be the watchword concerning what Khrushchev has stirred up in this long drive to scare the free world.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on another subject, but one which does not wander too far from the one on which I have just spoken, I noted also with great interest, as my colleague [Mr. KEATING] has reported, the result of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' effort to secure protection against imports. This is a very serious matter and deserves the attention of Congress.

That does not mean it should necessarily have attention in terms of perfectionism or some artificial scheme which would result in destroying imports as compared with exports. Nevertheless, Congress must take a new look at the whole situation in order to subserve the national interest and, at the same time, to see to the problems which are being created for particular industries.

It seems to me that at the very least we must consider the problem of phasing, and to what extent and over what period of time we can give particular industries the opportunity to adjust themselves to particular types of competition.

Also, I agree that some standard must be set which will protect us against unfair labor conditions, even judged by the standards of the countries which are exporting to the United States. Also, we must use our international negotiating power, economic and otherwise, to write plans regardless of adverse labor conditions in other countries which are exporting to the United States. All these things can be done and deserve urgently the attention of Congress.

I hope before Congress adjourns to make a rather full-scale presentation of my detailed views upon that subject. Yet I repeat, as I have said a number of times before, that I believe foreign economic policy and exports and imports are likely to prove one of the major issues, perhaps the major issue, of the 1960 presidential campaign.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PRODUCTIVITY COUNCILS IN CANADA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill for the establishment of an agency of Government which will be responsible for the development of labor-management councils to increase American productivity, and helpfully to deal with problems—severe problems of labor-management relations on a plant or community level. I have recently had remarkable confirmation of the effectiveness of this technique from our neighbor, Canada.

Mr. President, with reference to a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate on May 24, regarding the national necessity for successful labor-management relations and suggesting that my proposed legislation, S. 3121, to establish a Bureau of Productivity Councils, may provide the guidelines for achieving such peaceful and cooperative relations.

I am indebted to the Honorable Patrick Conroy, labor counsellor to the Canadian Embassy in Washington for some highly interesting material on how Canada has been trying to meet the problems of labor-management cooperation. I believe that this information is especially significant to us, since it outlines the actions of a nation with ideals and with a tradition virtually the same as our own, with an economic system and with needs to increase productivity nearly identical with ours, and with a people who, as are the citizens of the United States, are imbued with a great spirit of individualism and independent thought.

In closing, if I may, I should like to compliment our beloved northern neighbor, Canada, for sending us a representative so alert and so sensitive to the common interests which bind our two nations together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details of the record of the Canadian experience in this field be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A SUMMARY HISTORY OF CANADIAN LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

During World War II, and deriving essentially from both wasteful wartime methods in production and needed production for the war effort, the Government of Canada, through the Federal Department of Labor, established what was then known as the Industrial Production Cooperation Board. The purpose and function of this board was to establish at the plant level joint labor-management committees and which would meet regularly and cooperate in employing all legitimate methods leading to more efficient and increased production. The work of the joint committees would not impinge on, or be regarded as a substitute for, collective bargaining, an area that would remain the exclusive jurisdiction of the bargaining representatives of the employer and union or unions concerned.

During the short period in which these local labor-management production committees were in effect for the war period, the results indicated that if enough heart and effort were put into the job at hand, the relations between labor and management could be noticeably improved. With the general letdown immediately following the war, there was a tendency to discard

joint committees established during the period of hostilities but wiser councils prevailed, and the Government of Canada decided to continue into the peacetime period what had heretofore been regarded as something of a wartime experiment.

The work of the Industrial Production Cooperation Board was reviewed by the Government of Canada in 1947. Since that time, development of the joint committee idea has been proceeding at the local plant level, with the view to laying a foundation for both better methods of production and the presumed better relationships between the parties that would flow from cooperation.

At the present time, there are some 1,500 labor-management committees established throughout the country with 415,000 workers being represented on these committees. Most major industries have, in varying degree, been attracted by, and consented to, the establishment of joint labor-management committees at the plant level. From a U.S. viewpoint, the number of Canadian workers now represented through these joint committees would appear to be quite small. A better appreciation of the numbers involved in Canada could, however, be secured were the Canadian figure to be related to the population and labor force ratios of the two countries, and then multiplied by 10. In other words, were the same types of committees in effect in the United States, and having been developed to the same degree in this country, it would mean that somewhere between 4 and 5 million U.S. workers in most of the major industries would be represented in joint labor-management committees.

Establishing the joint committees in Canada has not been easy work. The Government of Canada has been faced, principally, with the problems and prejudices of labor-management relations but has, nevertheless, persisted in its efforts to lay this foundation at the plant level for better relations between the two major parties in industry. Despite the problems that continue to exist, the Government of Canada is hopeful that the good example, already established in improving labor-management relations by joint effort will be seen in an increasingly larger area of industry and that, ultimately, joint labor-management committees will come to be a standard feature of relationships between employers and employees.

[From the Canadian Department of Labour annual report for the fiscal year ended Mar. 31, 1959]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION SERVICE

At the close of the year, the Department had a record of 1,491 labor-management committees. According to the latest figures available, approximately 415,000 Canadian workers are represented on these committees. All major industrial classifications, including manufacturing, transportation, mining, service, communications, retail and wholesale trade, construction and finance, are covered by these committees.

The Labour-Management Cooperation Service¹ has carried on the work of encouraging labor-management cooperation through joint committees since May 1947. Previously this work was administered by the Industrial Production Cooperation

¹The Service maintains a staff of trained industrial relations officers in various locations from coast to coast. Branch offices are located at Amherst, Nova Scotia; Montreal and Three Rivers, Quebec; Toronto, Hamilton, and Windsor, Ontario; Winnipeg, Manitoba; and Vancouver, British Columbia. As an aid to the promotional work of its field representatives, the Service prepares and distributes printed material, films, and other information.

Board. The establishment of the Labour-Management Cooperation Service recognized the valuable work done during World War II by labor-management production committees in many vital industries. The Department has had the continuing support of major national employer and labor organizations in this work. An advisory committee comprised of representatives of employers' associations, and the trade union movement has been appointed to advise the Minister on matters relating to the administration of the Service. The present members of this committee were appointed under Treasury Board minute dated June 26, 1958.

During the year, many inquiries were answered concerning labor-management cooperation and the operation of labor-management committees.

A regular bulletin, "Teamwork in Industry," containing ideas and information on industrial relations, human relations, and other topics of interest continued to be issued monthly. During the year the combined circulation, English and French, averaged 15,000 copies monthly. A condensation of the highlights in this publication appears monthly in the Labour Gazette.

A new series of posters, illustrating various phases of joint consultation and labor-management cooperation was issued. Each of these posters has an accompanying pay envelope message amplifying the subject of the poster. During the year requests for 45,600 posters and 270,180 pay envelope messages were received from committees. This was an increase in demand of 11,000 posters and 90,000 stuffers over the previous year.

Among the activities most frequently reported on by labor-management committees are the following: measures to promote better understanding between management and labor, improved production efficiency, improved quality, accident prevention, good housekeeping, improved communications, reduced waste, and reduced absenteeism.

[From Teamwork in Industry, May 1960]

CITY OF LONDON COMMITTEES SET BRISK PACE IN CIVIC GOVERNMENT—MANAGEMENT, UNION HEADS FEEL STRONGLY THAT L-M TEAMWORK IS A VITAL NECESSITY FOR EFFICIENT COMMUNITY ADMINISTRATION

Across Canada, over 1,500 groups of people in business, civic, and industrial enterprises are practicing what is known as joint consultation.

Identified variously by such titles as "labor-management," "union-management," "labor-management production," "union-management cooperation," "labor-management consultation," and "joint union-management consultation" committees, these organizations average about 10 members, half from management and half from union ranks.

The management representatives consist generally of top brass and heads of departments, while labor representatives are elected through secret ballot by the union members concerned. Although men predominate numerically, there is a comparatively impressive sprinkling of the fair sex. Ages of members range from the late 'teens to the sixties.

What these men and women have in common is an ideal—the ideal of cooperation. To their way of thinking, the health and success of an industry—or of any enterprise, for that matter—depends chiefly on the ability of labor and management to submerge the differences that separate them in order to promote the interests that unite them.

Where labor and management are jointly dependent on the same enterprise for their livelihood and security, it follows that they have a mutual stake in its welfare and progress—and a mutual obligation to assist each

other in keeping that enterprise financially sound and vigorously competitive.

There are individuals who argue that collective bargaining should deal with these issues, but this is an erroneous notion. At the bargaining table it is virtually traditional for labor and management to split cleanly into two power groups, each of whose chief intent is to test and somehow weaken the strength of the other. The subjects debated are invariably limited by the rather narrow scope of the bargaining contract, and any deadlocks must be resolved by the conciliatory intervention of a third party, objectively removed from the dispute.

The quieter, more reasonable atmosphere of the regular monthly union-management committee meeting is infinitely more receptive to the concept that, for the long-range good of everyone—employer, employee, shareholder and customer—it is not who is right that is of paramount importance, but what is right. It is this attitude which union-management committees are bringing to the solution of everyday problems of safety, plant housekeeping, waste, equipment care, employee morale and production efficiency.

PLENTY OF BACKING

Readers of *Teamwork in Industry* are aware that the Labor-Management Cooperation Service is supported by the Department of Labor, and that the Canadian Government has given strong encouragement to the founding and growth of the labor-management cooperation movement in this country.

The ideal of teamwork between employer and employee has also earned the backing of union and management organizations here at home, including the Canadian Labor Congress and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. In the United Kingdom the equivalent joint works councils are flourishing. Furthermore, industrial relations experts in many countries look upon joint consultation as the forerunner of increased labor-management amity, forced into being by the vastly accelerated international competition now making its appearance in the world trade picture.

President Eisenhower and U.S. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell are the most recent illustrious advocates of labor-management cooperation.

In a new story published in the April issue of *Teamwork in Industry*, Mr. Mitchell quoted the President as saying that it was his intention to encourage regular discussions between labor and management—outside the bargaining table—to consider the interests of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability and economic growth.

"The advantages of open, continuous communication outside bargaining are clear," added Mr. Mitchell. "Problems not susceptible to bargaining can here be met—the impact of research and development on employment, any practices that may be detrimental to labor or to management or to an entire industry, the impact of foreign competition, and the maintenance of a high order of productivity."

Though neither President Eisenhower nor Mr. Mitchell pins a name to his suggestion, the words used describe to a "t" what Canadian industry has been achieving through joint consultation ever since the Canadian National Railways pioneered the labor-management cooperative movement 35 years ago.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. HUKAM SINGH, DEPUTY SPEAKER OF THE LOK SABHA (HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE, THE LOWER CHAMBER OF THE INDIAN PARLIAMENT)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am privileged to introduce and present to the

U.S. Senate a distinguished guest of our country. When guests come, they are always welcome. When they come here from a country such as his, a country having a long history of friendship for our people, they are especially welcome.

It is my honor to present—and in a moment I shall ask him to stand and take a bow—the distinguished Deputy Speaker of the Lok Sabha, which is the House of the People, the Lower Chamber of the Indian Parliament, the Honorable Hukam Singh. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all of us are highly honored to welcome our guest. He comes from a distinguished and historic part of this globe.

One of us had the privilege of being Ambassador from our great Governor to his; and on many occasions we have listened to Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, speak glowingly of the people of India, of their zeal to be free, and of their comradeship in spirit with the freedom-loving people of the United States.

May I, as one on the minority side of the Senate, join in this welcome, and say to our guest that we earnestly hope that the ties of amity and good will which now exist between our two great nations may not only continue but be ever strengthened.

ENACTMENT OF PROVISIONS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7681) to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, with certain amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in assuming that the morning hour is completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that the unfinished business is House bill 7681, which is now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of Senators I wish to state that it is the intention to complete consideration of three bills this afternoon, namely, Calendar No. 1417, House bill 7681, the unfinished business; Calendar No. 1438, Senate bill 2583, to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; and Calendar No. 1470, Senate bill 3044, a bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of

products and services, and for other purposes. I understand that all these bills are noncontroversial.

It is planned, upon completion of the consideration of the bills I have mentioned, for the Senate to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

As previously announced on Monday, immediately following the morning hour, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

It is planned that on Monday next the Senate will consider the following measures:

Calendar No. 1469, Senate bill 2998, extending the life of certain vessels; Calendar No. 1453, Senate bill 3018, relating to Government-insured ship mortgages; and Calendar No. 1477, Senate bill 2584, relating to the construction differential subsidy.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL] have been informed that this measure will be considered on Monday next.

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.

NEED FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks today to a sequence of events which have taken place over the past 6 months and which vitally affect not only my own State but the entire West. I refer to a series of hearings conducted by the House Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems into appraisal practices of the Bureau of Land Management.

Normally I would not find it necessary to address myself to the conduct of a subcommittee of the other body; however, the consequences of these hearings prompt me to do so.

Mr. President, I think it is generally agreed that the fantastic rate of growth in our Western States makes it imperative that needed public domain lands be moved into private ownership. From the days of our Nation's founding it has been a verity that expansion of the country demands private development of land. Today, more than ever before, the Western States need to have additional public domain developed privately. The times insist upon it.

My own State of Arizona is a classic example. Less than 15 percent of Arizona's vast stretches of land are in private ownership. I have constantly urged the Department of the Interior to use the tools at their command under public law to allow additional portions of the State to be transferred to private ownership. I feel that the Department has to the best of its ability, operating with

myriad antiquated land laws, performed its duty in the public interest.

The responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management is clear. It should be administering the public domain and should be seeing to it that private owners are permitted to acquire public lands.

Yet, instead of being allowed to operate as the law demands, this Bureau has been brought to a virtual standstill by the actions of the House subcommittee which I mentioned earlier. It started with a 60-day blanket stop order on all transactions involving appraisals. This stop order stemmed from the subcommittee, which operates under the House Government Operations, so that it might continue its investigations.

At that time, I objected to this interference in the operation of the Bureau of Land Management for I felt, and still feel, that at such time as the subcommittee was prepared to make specific recommendations, these recommendations would warrant study and necessary action taken.

I know that many of my colleagues witnessed the effects of this stop order. Its only accomplishment was the frustration of Bureau of Land Management employees, hamstrung by fuzzy indictments and ungrounded accusations.

Following the lifting of this ban, there followed an antiland speculation policy order, issued by the Secretary, but which contained specific recommendations of the subcommittee.

Among these recommendations were requests that the Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems be granted review jurisdiction over, first, private exchanges involving disposal of public land located within a radius of 35 miles of centers of population and, second, public sales of Government land involving tracts of one section or more located near expanding centers of population. This request was granted by the Secretary to the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I suggest that the assumption of such authority by an investigative subcommittee is, at best, questionable.

I know of only two types of land transactions which require review by the Interior Committees of the House and Senate. One is park concession contracts, and congressional review was established by public law. The other is military land withdrawals, and this was established at the request of the House Interior Committee.

It is all too apparent, Mr. President, that this investigative subcommittee has assumed authority not only from the executive branch, but from the Congress itself.

To return to the subcommittee hearings last winter which precipitated these events, the subcommittee in February issued a press release—charging "multi-million dollar loss to the Government in three land transactions revealed in recent hearings in Arizona." That same press release enclosed a copy of a letter from the chairman of the subcommittee to the Department of the Interior which said:

The subcommittee is not prepared to state, at this time, final conclusions or to make final definitive recommendations.

That is to say, no conclusion except the scatter-gun charge that the Bureau of Land Management had cost the Government millions of dollars.

These charges of gross waste in my own State led me to inquire into the facts. It was gratifying to learn that the facts did not bear out the committee accusation.

I want to make it plain that when I refer to the committee, I am specifically excluding the minority member, the greatly admired CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan. A quick scanning of the transcript of the hearing in Phoenix shows that Mr. HOFFMAN repeatedly tried to get the truth into the record.

Testimony was adduced from hand-picked witnesses to comment on values of the selected lands in the three cases in question. The real facts were not brought out and placed on the record, and, therefore, any conclusions based upon the hearing transcript alone are invalid because they must necessarily be based upon incomplete information, misinformation, and distortions. The facts could have been produced for the record, so we cannot escape the impression the facts were not wanted on the record.

It is all but incredible that the subcommittee should even pretend to give any weight to the testimony of these personally selected witnesses. No effort was made to show on the record that they were qualified to furnish competent opinions.

During the hearings, ridicule was directed at the Bureau for what was called the magic of its land appraisals.

Any legerdemain that existed was not the Bureau's, but instead was the brand of magic whereby the subcommittee could reject fact for unsupported opinion, could reject constructive inquiry and choose to condemn by inference. As a byproduct, this subcommittee has cast a question on longstanding national policies which the Congress has written into the Nation's public land laws.

The stated reason for the Phoenix hearing was to determine whether the Bureau of Land Management used appraisals either too high or too low in consummating the three Arizona exchanges involved.

The exchanges were made under provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315(a), which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to exchange unreserved public land for privately owned land. One of the act's chief provisions is that the privately owned lands must not be less valuable than the public lands which the applicant seeks.

It is important to keep in mind that these cases were exchanges, not sales, of land. But the subcommittee has displayed a remarkable lack of interest in what the Government acquired. Its efforts have been concentrated on what was received from the Government, and not upon what the Government received in return. As Mr. HOFFMAN said during the hearing, anyone who attempts to decide who benefited from a horse trade has to have at least a sketchy idea of the merits of both horses.

So bear in mind, Mr. President, that these cases were not sales. They were

exchanges. And the exchanges were made on the basis of equal values. The Department did not sell anything—it made fair trades. I submit that the transcript does not reflect this concern for insuring that the trades were fair.

The hearing does show a preoccupation with the question of whether the Government squeezed every cent out of its land. The majority fails to acknowledge that in an exchange, where the bartered items are equally valuable, no cash need change hands.

In fiscal year 1959 the Bureau of Land Management completed a total of 136 land exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act. It traded away 411,133.90 acres, and in turn received 317,572.01 acres. These exchanges were in the 11 States of, to list them alphabetically, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

In Arizona, where the subcommittee points darkly to a mythical giveaway, the statistics argue against it. That fiscal year the Bureau consummated 19 Arizona private land exchanges. The private parties involved received patent to 23,217.85 acres, and the Federal Government received 72,590.76 acres. Uncle Sam got more than three acres for every one acre he relinquished in Arizona in these swaps.

Those who make a business of appraising real estate find it necessary, not to mention proper and prudent, to take into account the various factors bearing upon the economic value of land. They must consider such items as improvements upon the land, its location, the utilities which may or may not be available, public access, and other matters.

Are not the same factors equally applicable to Government-owned lands? The subcommittee majority holds that this is not so—another eerie bit of magic.

The subcommittee left a number of questions unanswered at the Phoenix hearing. Some of them are:

Why does it persist in treating the exchanges as sales? Why not treat them as exchanges—or trades, as in fact they were?

Why ignore the provision of the Taylor Grazing Act which calls for the Government to obtain land of not less than equal value in exchange for the land it trades away?

Why judge only one side of an exchange—the side the applicant obtained from the Government? Why not at least take into account what the Government received? Does it not matter that the Government obtained valuable lands? Or that the lands which the Government obtained are in an area of rapidly rising values? Why not at least consider the possibility that the Government got the best of the horse trade?

Would the majority decree a new national policy on public lands—a policy of exacting the highest dollar price, freezing land exchanges because prices may go up next week or a decade hence? How would a newly enunciated policy square with the Federal policies that date back to the Homestead Act of 1862? Does anyone think for a moment that such a policy could do anything but

strangle the economic growth and development of the communities in the western land States?

The Phoenix hearing resulted in a blend of magic and omission, confusion compounded by ignorance. Yet the subcommittee in its wisdom announced that it had found the Government had suffered multimillion dollar losses.

Congressman HOFFMAN, when he submits his report on the hearing, will be quite capable of exposing it for what it was. But every Member of both Houses of Congress, and especially those Members from the public land States, will have an abiding concern over what this subcommittee is doing to wreck our long-established tradition of administering the public lands.

Mr. President, I should like to make one more point in regard to these investigations.

When the charges have died down and testimony is recorded, the subcommittee will undoubtedly make recommendations to revise some of the public laws under which the Bureau of Land Management operates.

This, Mr. President, is not a novel recommendation. As a matter of fact, last year, on August 11, I introduced for myself and Senator BARTLETT, Senate Joint Resolution 130 the purpose of which is, "For the establishment of a commission to study the nonmineral public land laws of the United States to facilitate the enactment of a more effective, simplified, and adequate system of laws governing the transfer of title to public lands to individuals, associations, corporations, and to State and local governments or their instrumentalities." This joint resolution was introduced in the House by my colleague from Arizona, Mr. RHODES.

The resolution is still lying before the Interior Committee, awaiting reports from Government agencies. The resolution requests \$150,000 to carry out its provisions. I will not try to estimate the cost to the taxpayers of this series of subcommittee meetings throughout the West while a resolution to authorize a complete study with less pyrotechnics has lain idle before the Congress.

Mr. President, I will not contemplate on the intent of the subcommittee's probings into land transactions in my own State, or in other Western States; yet it seems to me that we can approach this problem in a manner much more fair, and on sounder ground, with a commission which would be dedicated to the unsnarling of our public land laws, not obsessed with the desire to assume authority relegated to an executive agency.

ALLEGED BLOCKING OF MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have one more item of very brief duration that I should like to speak on at this moment, to take advantage of my having the floor.

Appearing in the Washington Daily News, I believe night before last, under the byline of John Herling, was an ar-

ticle entitled "Is Lyndon Sitting On Labor Bill?"

This article is so full of inaccuracies and misstatements that I could not cover all of them in the time I have allotted to myself, but I want to make one thing clear. In that article the statement is made:

For weeks now, the Senate Labor Subcommittee, headed by JOHN F. KENNEDY, has been ready to present the Senate with a bill to raise the minimum rate from \$1 an hour and enlarge coverage to bring in millions of workers.

That statement is not true. The bill has been reported from the subcommittee to the full committee, and the full committee has been ready to meet every day this year that a committee could meet. We have been waiting for certain members to be present. The delay occasioned in working on this bill has not been due to the activities of the majority leader, and I want to make that perfectly clear as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I point out another inaccuracy in the statement. It reads, "has been ready to present the Senate."

We have 2 or 3 weeks of hard work on this bill before we can unscramble the unholy mess it is now in. We have a decision to make about the tipped worker, the man who works in a restaurant or hotel and who depends on tips for his livelihood.

I alone have over 50 amendments I will offer in the full committee, if it ever meets, but I did want to take this opportunity to express surprise that a responsible journalist would go so far afield in accusing the majority leader of holding the bill up. I can assure you, Mr. President, there has been no holdup by the majority leader. We have been merely waiting for a time when we could get a quorum.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to state to the Senator from Arizona that yesterday I made some comments on that article. It happened that on the two occasions when the early meetings were called I was acting as majority leader in place of the Senator from Texas, and the responsibility for calling those meetings at 10 o'clock was my own entirely. I cleared the matter with the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], each time. There were, as a matter of fact, good and cogent reasons not related in the article, why we had the meetings on Tuesday and Thursday at 10 o'clock. There was no intent, consideration, or idea at all to keep us from consideration of the minimum wage bill, which, when the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reports it, will be given priority and quick consideration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for his remarks. The Senator from Montana spoke on the matter yesterday. I am in fullhearted accord with what he said. I should like to read one paragraph, because it will completely absolve not only the majority leader, but

the majority whip. The Senator from Montana said:

Last Tuesday, while I was acting as majority leader, I arranged for the Senate to meet at 10 a.m. This arrangement was made at the request of Senator KENNEDY. He had to leave early in the afternoon for some reason and wanted to be present during the voting on the depressed areas bill.

I think that completely absolves the Senator of the responsibility which the columnist is trying to place upon the majority leader and others, as to why the bill has not been acted on in 2 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say, with regard to the following Thursday, that the reason for the early meeting was the fact that we could not finish consideration of the oleomargarine bill the night before. In an attempt to finish consideration and finally dispose of the bill, the Senate met at 10 o'clock on that Thursday.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I remember that very distinctly. I believe the majority whip will recall that I asked him several times during the day what the intentions were for the next day, which was Thursday, and he said, "I do not know. It depends upon how long your Members speak."

I recall that one of the Republican Senators had announced he had a rather lengthy discussion of the bill if certain amendments did not apply.

I know that at a very late hour—I believe the last hour—the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], decided—and I am sure he decided reluctantly—we would have to meet at 10 o'clock the next morning to complete action on the bill.

ENACTMENT OF PROVISIONS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7681) to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, with certain amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is H.R. 7681 the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have heard of no opposition to this measure. It is a House bill. It was considered by the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, which reported it favorably.

We recall that in 1959 we had what is known as Reorganization Plan No. 1. The House, in studying the plan, discovered what was thought to be a defect in the plan, and therefore the House disapproved the plan. In lieu of the plan, the House passed this bill.

The real purpose of the bill is to enact the administrative transfers incorporated in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949. At the same time, the bill would reaffirm the traditional authority of the Secretary of the Interior governing the disposition of valuable minerals on the

public lands, to assure that enactment of the provisions of the reorganization plan cannot be construed as being an infringement upon his general authority relating to such minerals.

Mr. President, that is the apprehension which arose in the House of Representatives when it was considering Reorganization Plan No. 1. To make certain that the traditional authority and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the vital minerals over which he now has jurisdiction would not be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, the plan was killed. The plan, as we know, could not be amended, but had to be either accepted or rejected. Since the House discovered what was believed to be a defect in that regard, I have mentioned, the House killed Reorganization Plan No. 1, and, in effect, substituted this proposed legislation for the plan, so as to have provision included in the law which would make certain that the traditional authority and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior over minerals was not to be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I know of no objection to the bill. Both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have approved the bill, and the Budget Bureau has approved it. I know of no reason why the bill should not be passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill—H.R. 7681—to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments, is of considerable interest to the people in the Black Hills area of South Dakota, where the Black Hills National Forest is located, and where, from time to time, we have the matter of the exchange of non-Federal lands for national forests lands or timberlands, which offer to the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service benefits in administration.

Personally I believe that the bill is well conceived, in that it will make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to handle these exchanges without requiring a duplication of attention, services, and effort by the Department of the Interior.

The amendment which was proposed by the committee to modify the reorganization plan as originally submitted is also important, to guard against possible delegation of authority by the Secretary of Agriculture in the making of land exchanges. I also heartily endorse the idea of the first paragraph in section 2 which makes clear that there are preserved for the Department of the Interior ministerial duties and administrative duties relating to the disposition of minerals on these public lands.

The bill as a whole and the reorganization plan as a whole are well conceived to centralize responsibility in the handling of two different types of public property, namely, forest lands on the one hand, and mineral interests on the other.

I heartily commend the action of the committee in bringing out the bill in this form, and support the idea of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, as amended by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7681) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS AND TENANTS OF LANDS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1438, S. 2583.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2583) to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2583) to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 2, line 22, after the word "all", to strike out "acts and" and insert "acts", and in line 24, after the word "Act", to insert "and delegate the authority conferred by this Act, including the making of determinations and decisions to any other officers or officials of the agency"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, except as provided in section 4 hereof, the head of any executive agency is authorized, to the extent administratively determined by him to be fair and reasonable, to reimburse the owners and tenants of lands or interests in land in the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the possessions of the United States hereafter acquired by purchase, condemnation or otherwise for any projects or activities under his jurisdiction for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by such owners and tenants in the process, and as a direct result, of moving themselves, their families, and their possessions because of said acquisition, which reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments that may otherwise be authorized by law: *Provided,* That the total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants shall in no event exceed 25 per centum of the fair value of any parcel of land or interest in land, as determined by the head of the executive agency concerned. No payment under this Act shall be made unless application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages incurred, is submitted to the head of the executive agency concerned within one year from (a) the date upon which the parcel of land or interest in land is to be vacated under agreement with the Government by the owner or tenant or pursuant to law, including but not limited to an order of a court, or (b) the date upon which the parcel of land or interest in land involved is vacated, whichever first occurs.

Sec. 2. The head of each executive agency may perform any and all acts, make such rules and regulations as he finds necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act and delegate the authority conferred by this Act, including the making of determinations and decisions to any other officers or officials of the agency. All functions performed under this Act shall be exempt from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 237), as amended (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011), except as to the requirements of section 3 of said Act.

Sec. 3. Funds appropriated or otherwise available to the head of an executive agency for the acquisition of real property or interests therein shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any acquisition of lands or interests therein by the Tennessee Valley Authority or to any executive agency or situation provided for in (a) section 401(b) of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 624-25), as amended, (b) section 305 of the Housing Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1100-1101), as amended, or (c) the Act of May 29, 1958 (72 Stat. 152).

Sec. 5. The term "executive agency", as used in this Act, means any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a bill which would provide for the payment of expenses of moving people from an area where land may have been condemned for reservoir purposes, such as the building of a hydroelectric dam, a flood-control project, or public works improvement. The lands, farms, homes, and so forth are taken for reservoir purposes, and families have to move. The bill would simply provide that the Federal Government may pay the expense of moving those families. The expense of moving is not an element of damage which can now be considered in the price of condemnation or in the damages which may be assessed for the taking of property.

This is in keeping, as I understand, with the authority which other agencies of the Government have. I know of no opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] wants to ask a question on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960—ORDER TO PRINT SENATE BILL 8

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to consider H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. I requested that the Senate strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof Senate bill 8 as that bill had passed the Senate on February 4, 1960. In reading the RECORD of June 2, I discovered that Senate bill 8 was printed in the RECORD as it was originally introduced and not as the bill passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 8 in the form in which it passed the Senate be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Alabama indicate again his desire?

Mr. HILL. The Senator will recall that yesterday the Senate took up House bill 10128, which was the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960, and I asked unanimous consent to strike out everything after the enacting clause in the bill and to substitute in lieu thereof Senate bill 8 as it had passed the Senate. That request was then granted. We know that consent was afterward vitiated. But there was printed in the RECORD a copy of Senate bill 8 as it had been originally introduced and not as it passed the Senate.

The bill as it passed the Senate was in very much different form and contains different provisions from those contained in the original bill as submitted. So that the RECORD may be correct, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate bill 8 as it passed the Senate.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was not here yesterday when the request was made. I understand the request was granted and later rescinded.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator from Alabama now asking that that action be affected in any way?

Mr. HILL. No. The only request I now make is that Senate bill 8 in the form in which it passed the Senate on February 4 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator contemplate later in the day asking unanimous consent that Senate bill 8 be substituted for the House bill?

Mr. HILL. I contemplate making that request, but not at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not today?

Mr. HILL. Not today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Possibly next week? The week after?

Mr. HILL. I cannot now say. As Abraham Lincoln once said, it is a wise

man who does not have more sense today than he had yesterday. I do not contemplate asking to have the bill considered today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. I am glad to hear him recognize the sterling qualities of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. HILL. I must say he had many good qualities.

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

There being no objection, Senate bill 8 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 8

An Act to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries

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

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize a two-year program of Federal grants to the States to provide assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities in local communities and for teachers' salaries.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 3. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for the next fiscal year, an amount equal to \$20 times a number equal to the school-age population of the United States, as defined in section 5(b)(4), for the purpose of making payments to State educational agencies to provide assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities in local communities and for teachers' salaries under this Act.

ALLOTMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 4 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the school-age population, and effort for school purposes of the respective States. Subject to the provisions of section 6, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 4 for such year as the product of—

(1) the school-age population of the State, and

(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b)).

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) For purposes of this Act—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), except that (A) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (B) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for purposes of this Act.

(3) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

(4) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(5) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age (in the State and in all such States, respectively).

(c) As soon as possible after amounts appropriated under section 4 become available for payment, the Commissioner shall pay to each State, which has complied with the provisions of section 7 for the year with respect to which such payment is to be made, the amount allotted to it pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 6.

MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL FINANCING

SEC. 6. (a) The allotment of any State under section 5 shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year, with the exception that during the first year that allotments are made under this Act this provision shall not be applicable. The total of such reductions shall be reallocated among the remaining States by proportionately increasing their allotments under section 5 for such year.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) The "State school effort index" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the State's school expenditures per public school child by (B) the income per child of school age for the State; except that the State school effort index shall be deemed to be equal to the national school effort index in the case of (i) Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia, and (ii) any State for which the school expenditures per public school child are not less than the school expenditures per public school child for all the States;

(2) The "national school effort index" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the school expenditures per public school child for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (B) the income per child of school age for all such States.

(c) (1) The school expenditures per public school child for any State for purposes of determining its State school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof for elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data for the several States are available to him, by (B) the number of children in average

daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools in such State, as determined by the Commissioner for such most recent school year.

(2) The school expenditures per public school child for all the States for purposes of determining the national school effort index for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total expenditures by all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) and subdivisions thereof for elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources, as determined by the Commissioner for the same school year as is used under paragraph (1), by (B) the number of children in average daily attendance for such year in public elementary and secondary schools in all such States, determined as provided in paragraph (1).

(3) The income per child of school age for any State and for all the States shall, for purposes of subsection (b), be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the incomes per child of school age for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 7. The State education agency of each State which desires to receive an allotment and payment under this Act shall submit an application to the Commissioner which—

(a) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this Act;

(b) sets forth procedures to insure that funds will be allocated among school facilities construction projects within the State so that priority is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities;

(c) provides assurance that every applicant, whose application for funds received under this Act for a construction project is denied, will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

(d) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of funds paid to the State under this Act;

(e) specifies the proportion of its State allotment that will be expended for (1) the construction of school facilities and (2) for teachers' salaries; and

(f) certifies that funds the State education agency specifies for teachers' salaries will be distributed among the local education agencies of the State to be expended solely for teachers' salaries in accordance with this Act.

In the case of any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the foregoing provisions of this section with respect to the funds specified for school construction to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

MATCHING BY STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

SEC. 8. (a) After the first year that allotments are made under this Act, a State in order to receive its allotment for the following year must have matched the Federal funds the State received under the Act in the previous year by having increased its expenditures for elementary and secondary education by an amount that is not less than the product of (A) the State's share and (B) the expenditures for elementary and secondary education from State and local sources in the base school year 1959-60: *Provided*, That the State allotment shall be

reduced by an amount equal to the sum by which the State fails to match the prescribed amount set forth in this section. The total of such reduction shall be reallocated among the remaining States by proportionately increasing their allotments under section 5.

(b) The "State's share" for a State shall be 5 per centum of the remainder of 1.00 less the State's allotment ratio as computed under section 5 except that in no case shall the State's allotment ratio be less than 0.33% or more than 0.66%.

(c) For the purposes of this section expenditures for elementary and secondary education for any year means the total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools by the State and subdivisions thereof made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of data supplied to him by the State education agencies.

(d) A State shall be considered to have matched its Federal funds in any year in which its school-age population is less than its school-age population in the base school year 1959-60.

(e) If for any reason a State should fail to receive funds under this Act in any given year, for the purposes of the matching provisions contained in subsection (a), the State will be considered to have received Federal funds under this Act in that year.

PERIOD FOR USE OF FUNDS AND CERTIFICATION BY STATES

SEC. 9. (a) Upon receipt by the State, funds paid under this Act for any fiscal year shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act not later than the end of the fiscal year following such fiscal year for which such funds were distributed.

(b) The State education agency of each State receiving funds under this Act shall, prior to the termination of such following fiscal year, (1) certify the amount of such funds received by such State which have been so distributed and expended, and (2) pay to the Commissioner any amount of such funds which have not been so expended.

(c) Any funds paid to the Commissioner under the provisions of this section shall be reallocated and paid to the States under the provisions of this Act during the fiscal year following that in which such funds were so paid to the Commissioner.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) The State education agency of each State which receives funds under this Act shall give adequate assurance to the Commissioner that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on school construction financed in whole or in part under this Act will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5).

(b) With respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section the Secretary of Labor shall act in accordance with Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the officer or agency primarily responsible for State

construction or supervision of construction of such schools, whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law.

(d) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; except that, in any State in which a State agency has exclusive responsibility for the financing of the construction of school facilities, it means such State agency. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(e) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for education which is provided by a school district for elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(f) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

(g) The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public elementary or secondary school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

(h) The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS AND TENANTS OF LANDS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2583) to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I direct a question to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I should like to inquire of the Senator concerning the effect of the language on page 2, line 15, regarding the date on which the 1-year period for filing the statement of moving expenses or damages begins. If a date has been fixed for the land to be vacated, and the Government agrees that the owner or tenant may remain on the land, does the 1-year period begin to run from the time he finally leaves, from the date that the Government first agreed informally he might stay on until notified that he must leave, or from the subsequent date when the Government might say to him, "We now need the land and you will have to move off within 30 days"?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I correctly understand the question of the Senator from Vermont, my interpretation of the

provision in the proposed legislation is that if an agreement is made at the time the Government takes the land or at the time the Government makes a contract for the taking of the land, an agreement is made between the landowner and the Government that by a certain date the land shall be vacated, then the time begins to run as of that date, unless the landowner vacates the land sooner. If he vacates the land earlier than the date or the time given him to vacate the land, the statute would begin to run from the time he vacated.

If an agreement is made that the landowner will vacate the land at a given time—say by the 1st of August or by the 1st of July, or some other time—and that time comes and the landowner has not vacated at that time, but continues to stay on, in violation of the agreement, without the consent of the Government, the statute then would begin to run from the time that it was agreed he would vacate the property, even though he did not vacate it as he agreed to do.

Mr. PROUTY. If the court should say, for example, that the land had to be vacated on August 1, 1960, going through the legal formalities—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean in connection with a condemnation proceeding?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The court would fix the day on which it would have to be vacated.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. Then if whatever governmental agency might be involved told the landowner that they would not require the land for perhaps 2 years or a length of time beyond the time when the court had said the land had to be vacated, would they be subject to the provisions of the bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In my opinion—and I can only express an opinion—if such an extension were granted by the Government, by someone having authority to grant such extension, then that would toll the statute of limitations on filing a claim, and the statute would not begin to run against the filing of the claim until the party actually vacated or until the agreement expired.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the answer to my question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe there is any doubt about the fact that that is the intention of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. That answers my question. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have been very glad to express these views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2583) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADVANCES ON GOVERNMENT INSURED SHIP MORTGAGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of Calendar No. 1453, S. 3018, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3018) to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government insured ship mortgages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

MULTIPLE USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senate will consider within the next few days S. 3044, a bill that is of significant importance to the future well-being of the national forests throughout America. This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield of the resources, products, and services these forests provide. It enumerates the basic renewable surface resources for which the forests were established and have been so successfully managed and administered over the past half century. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and local agencies in the development and management of the national forests. These are time-tested principles and policies which have been ardently supported by the Congress since 1897 through various legislative and annual appropriation acts. Our support of the U.S. Forest Service in its development and administration of the national forests has been nonpartisan and shows an awareness by both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the tremendous natural resource value inherent in these public lands.

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senate committees which considered so thoroughly the "Program for the National Forests" that was submitted last March by the Department of Agriculture. Again this year the Appropriations Committee, under the able direction of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], demonstrated its interest in the full development of the national forests by providing certain increases to implement this program with which Senators are all familiar. It is gratifying that in conference a substantial amount of the proposed increases was accepted.

Mississippi is one of the 39 States having national forests. Our four forests, aggregating slightly over 1 million acres, are of tremendous importance to my State, and particularly to the counties in which they are located.

Under the multiple-use policy of managing these forests for the greatest benefit of the greatest number of people, all of the purposes for which the forests were established are making significant contributions to the welfare of Mississippi, the South, and the Nation. The

planned and coordinated development and use of outdoor recreation, range, timber, water, and wildlife is the reason why the national forests in Mississippi are valuable resource areas supplying a sustained yield of forest products, goods, and services for our people. Sawlogs and pulpwood are harvested as raw material to help keep our mills running. Some of the finest outdoor recreation areas in the South are providing enjoyment and relaxation for the visitors to these forests. Wells, creeks, and rivers are enhanced by a steady flow of clean, pure water for agricultural, industry, and urban uses. Cattle graze on ranges where forestry and beef raising have been made compatible through multiple-purpose planning. And in Mississippi we are proud of the wild game that abounds on the national forests. The sportsmen realize the advantages of multiple-use management, because they can hunt and fish while others camp and picnic, and still others harvest the forest and forage products.

For years I have supported forest research as an adjunct to multiple use and sustained yield of our forest resources.

Enactment of S. 3044 will establish by statute what the U.S. Forest Service has been practicing under various acts, administrative regulations, and appropriation act language, for the past 50 years in the management and development of the national forests.

Passage of this bill will be another milestone in our constant efforts to make the national forests the best managed public properties in the world.

It will be the first time that all of the renewable surface resources on the national forests appear in a single statute. It will leave no doubts in the mind of anyone that we intend that the national forests shall be managed, developed, and utilized for the greatest good of the greatest number of our people in the years ahead. There are no appropriations involved; no pending legislation is affected; and we have the support of conservationists, wildlife enthusiasts, timber users, forestry associations, stockmen, and service organizations from all over America.

Mr. President, in our concern for the many global and space-age problems that confront us, this bill might appear of minor consequence. In our traditional concern for the well-being of our national forests, it is, however, important legislation. We should consider it as such, and press for its speedy enactment into law.

Mr. President, from the timber resource standpoint, what we will have in this Nation 40 or 50 years from now depends upon not what we do about it then, but what we do about it now. It takes planning. It takes resourceful application of those plans. More than that, it takes time to grow a forest or wood products. We are actually laying the pattern and the groundwork now, which is the only time it can possibly be laid, for what will be our situation with reference to forests and forest products a half century from now. This bill is certainly a forward step.

PERMISSION TO USE CERTAIN STREETS IN SAN FRANCISCO FOR PARK PURPOSES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, S. 3018, to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances of Government-insured ship mortgages, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 1560, H.R. 8024.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 8024, to amend the act of May 9, 1876, to permit certain streets in San Francisco, Calif., within the area known as the San Francisco Palace of Fine Arts, to be used for park and other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first I desire to say that the minority cleared this matter with the majority prior to taking it up. This is, in effect, a non-controversial bill. The purpose of it is to amend the act of May 9, 1876, to permit certain streets in San Francisco, Calif., within the area known as the San Francisco Palace of Fine Arts, to be used for park and other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill, as it appears in the report on the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The land described in H.R. 8024 is presently owned by the city and county of San Francisco, Calif. By the act of May 9, 1876, the Federal Government relinquished to the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., a strip along the edge of the reservation known as the Presidio, later designated the Presidio of San Francisco, subject to the provision that certain streets as laid out on the city map be forever dedicated to that purpose. This requirement has prevented the people of California from fully developing the cultural, recreational, and artistic potential of this area resulting in a request for the elimination of this statutory restriction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL ESTATE TO THE OXNARD HARBOR DISTRICT, PORT HUENEME, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be further temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1561, H.R. 8713.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8713) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain real estate to the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, Calif., and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the minority has cleared with the majority the taking up of this measure.

The bill H.R. 8713 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain real property consisting of a wharf and contiguous area to the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, Calif., thus permitting the harbor district to expand the port facilities. The conveyance would be at the fair market value. A companion bill, S. 3017, was introduced by my colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself.

The property proposed for conveyance by the Navy to the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, Calif., comprises wharf No. 1, located south of the central basin and east of the Port Hueneme Harbor entrance and north of the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory. The entire harbor development of Port Hueneme was acquired by the Navy during World War II. Subsequent to the war, this wharf and the property proposed for conveyance were leased to the Oxnard Harbor District so that they might provide commercial facilities at this port. Commercial shipping uses the Navy harbor entrance and central basin.

The Oxnard Harbor District is interested in expansion of port facilities. The present improvements are in a deteriorated condition requiring rebuilding. The Navy requirement for this area is primarily to meet a mobilization requirement in the event of war. The Navy has no present intention to rebuild the facilities presently outleased. The Oxnard Harbor District plans to rebuild and expand the facilities but requires title before such a program can be developed.

Rebuilding of the facilities by the Oxnard Harbor District would actually improve the Navy's mobilization potential since the use of the improved facilities could be obtained by leasehold if necessary in time of emergency. Rebuilding by the district will eliminate the necessity for rebuilding with Government funds and also eliminate the delay of construction when the emergency arises. The proposed use by the Oxnard Harbor District would not interfere with the current peacetime Navy requirements at Port Hueneme.

The growth of the Oxnard Harbor District program is presently stunted by (a) necessity for restoration and reconstruction of wharf No. 1; (b) inability to provide additional berths to create operating flexibility; (c) acquisition of Navy-owned facilities to enable capital investment in cargo features needed to attract new business; (d) removal of light draft commercial vessels from this area to the Ventura County Harbor now under construction; (e) unfavorable land freight tariff structures.

The Navy Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, comprises 1,662 acres with an investment of \$51,641,650. The Navy acquired the entire Oxnard Harbor District property comprising 318 acres by condemnation at a cost of \$2,164,000

in March 1942. This purchase included the 22.07 acres contained in this bill and wharf No. 1 which is reported as costing \$544,000 when constructed in 1940.

Some of the conditions which the Navy will specify and the district will accept include:

First. Relocation of utilities, structures, and improvements by the purchaser at no cost to the Navy;

Second. Maintain the position of existing Navy bulkhead line (wharf No. 2) and widen the slip to 400 feet;

Third. Provide for permanent Navy control of harbor operations.

Information available discloses that the cost of the Oxnard Harbor District expansion program would approach \$10 million. Ownership of the property is one of the major factors necessary to permit this program through financing by general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, and tax proceeds.

In view of the proposed use of this land by the Oxnard Harbor District, its availability in time of mobilization, the assurance of improved maintenance and capital improvements, and the facts that the property is not required for current peacetime naval needs, all contribute to the favorable report on the part of the Navy for the sale of the property at fair market value to the Oxnard Harbor District. No appraisals have been made as yet to ascertain the value of the property which would be required before the Secretary would establish the sale price.

From the above, the committee feels that it is clear that not only will the interests of the Oxnard Harbor District be served by the enactment of this measure, but so will the interests of the United States in several respects. Particularly important is the fact that the rebuilding of these facilities by the harbor district will improve the Navy's mobilization potential.

The enactment of this measure will not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds. The conveyance is to be at the fair market value.

Neither the Bureau of the Budget nor the Department of Defense has any objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8713) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADVANCES ON GOVERNMENT-INSURED SHIP MORTGAGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3018) to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government-insured ship mortgages.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until Monday, June 6, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1960:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of section 8392, title 10, United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

- Col. Frank W. Berlin, [REDACTED], Iowa Air National Guard.
- Col. Vito J. Castellano, [REDACTED], New York Air National Guard.
- Col. Homer R. Flynn, [REDACTED], Georgia Air National Guard.
- Col. Edward R. Fry, [REDACTED], Kansas Air National Guard.
- Col. William D. Ott, [REDACTED], Kentucky Air National Guard.
- Col. Valentine A. Siefertmann, [REDACTED], Hawaii Air National Guard.
- Col. James M. Trall, [REDACTED], Idaho Air National Guard.
- Col. Joseph W. Turner, [REDACTED], Oklahoma Air National Guard.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

- Johnny M. Barton, [REDACTED]
- Raymond K. Bopp, [REDACTED]
- William K. Brown, [REDACTED]
- Donald D. Eddy, [REDACTED]
- Donald P. Hahn, [REDACTED]
- Richard J. Houck, [REDACTED]
- Nell D. Martin, [REDACTED]
- George C. Mohr, [REDACTED]
- Richard H. Ol, [REDACTED]
- John C. Rambeau, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Keith D. Sayther, [REDACTED]
- Edward P. South, [REDACTED]
- Thomas N. Vaughn, [REDACTED]
- David C. Wolfe, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

- Bernard J. Doyle, [REDACTED]
- John A. Junghans, [REDACTED]
- Gene D. Parish, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

- Teresa Cavatoni, [REDACTED]
- Vera M. Longbottom, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

- Milton L. Bauermeister, [REDACTED]
- Horace J. Brown, [REDACTED]
- Calvin C. Chapman, [REDACTED]
- John W. Coursey, [REDACTED]
- Jared M. Dunn, [REDACTED]
- James W. Dyer, [REDACTED]

- Jon M. Igelman, [REDACTED]
- Francis J. Major, Jr., [REDACTED]
- John G. Weg, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

- Paul H. Hyland, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

- Frank J. Fresques, [REDACTED]
- William R. Silvka, [REDACTED]
- John R. Yates, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

- Catherine B. Adams, [REDACTED]
- Mildred Adams, [REDACTED]
- Hazel E. Anderson, [REDACTED]
- Mary B. Borden, [REDACTED]
- Patricia A. Farrell, [REDACTED]
- Bette J. Harris, [REDACTED]
- Helene R. Haskins, [REDACTED]
- Edith Marquez, [REDACTED]
- Cora H. Miyagawa, [REDACTED]
- Barbara J. Parry, [REDACTED]

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenants

- Fredrick W. Arndt, [REDACTED]
- Daniel P. Barry, [REDACTED]
- Philipp H. Baumann, [REDACTED]
- Charles A. Boatwright, [REDACTED]
- Ronald G. Boss, [REDACTED]
- Richard E. Byam, [REDACTED]
- Vincent P. Cerisano, [REDACTED]
- Thomas W. Ciambrone, [REDACTED]
- Gerald Dixon, [REDACTED]
- Ronald C. Dufresne, [REDACTED]
- Robert H. Engel, [REDACTED]
- George R. Fessler, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Darryl W. Freed, [REDACTED]
- David E. Hanlon, [REDACTED]
- Charlie J. Jennings, [REDACTED]
- Ernest C. Johnson, [REDACTED]
- Dana K. Kelly, [REDACTED]
- Milton H. Leppert, [REDACTED]
- Joseph F. Melichar, [REDACTED]
- Donald L. Moyer, [REDACTED]
- Kermit J. Nisley, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Leonard W. Riley III, [REDACTED]
- James B. Sanders, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Matt M. M. Sayre, [REDACTED]
- Francis J. Schmidt, [REDACTED]
- Robert H. Seh, Jr., [REDACTED]
- John P. Slauson, [REDACTED]
- Anthony S. Syracuse, [REDACTED]
- Ronald S. Wardell, [REDACTED]
- Robert J. Whitcomb, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

- Michael F. Anderson, [REDACTED]
- Jerome A. Baak, [REDACTED]
- Wilbur R. Brown, [REDACTED]
- Delbert C. Butler, [REDACTED]
- Martin V. Case, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Gary W. Fredricks, [REDACTED]
- Jimmie D. James, [REDACTED]
- Eugene F. Lavarell, [REDACTED]
- Terry D. Murphy, [REDACTED]
- James L. Wakefield, [REDACTED]

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduates

- Willard W. Bryant, [REDACTED]
- William A. Carter, Jr., [REDACTED]
- Robert O. Clement, [REDACTED]
- Terence J. Hedges, [REDACTED]
- Kenneth C. Hovis, [REDACTED]
- Jack H. Nelson, [REDACTED]
- Twila J. Novak, [REDACTED]
- Roger M. Quick, [REDACTED]
- James C. Randall, [REDACTED]
- James W. Walters, [REDACTED]
- Laurence E. Watts, [REDACTED]

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Of-

ficers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.
Harvey W. Schiller
Eliot Sohmer
Stanley A. Spivey
Joseph T. Stewart, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 13: 5: *Examine yourselves to see whether you are holding to your faith.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, as we seek to respond to the obligations and opportunities of our high vocation, may we be grateful for Thy many overtures of counsel and companionship.

Grant that, being drawn together by a common peril and a common ideal, we may be helped to maintain that continuity of faith and fortitude which will insure our national freedom and security.

We humbly pray that we may put forth a determined effort to build a finer world order and a nobler spiritual unity of all mankind.

May the welfare of humanity be the concern of all the nations and may we be partners in the great enterprise of enthroning the spirit of that lowly Nazarene who taught us to love Thee and our fellow men.

Hear us through the mediation of the Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 471. An act to amend chapter 561 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority to remit indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge as the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force have;
- H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi;
- H.R. 2588. An act for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah;
- H.R. 4549. An act for the relief of Jacob Naggar;
- H.R. 4834. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Turchi;
- H.R. 5150. An act for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church;
- H.R. 5880. An act for the relief of Nels Lund;