

BACKGROUND

The Missing Persons Act provides authority for the heads of executive departments to continue to credit the pay accounts of persons within the scope of the statute who are missing in action, interned, captured, or in a similar status and to initiate, continue, or modify allowances to dependents of persons in a missing status. It also authorizes the shipment of household effects and the transportation of dependents of persons in a missing status to such locations as may be approved by the head of the department concerned. With this authority the departments can continue to protect the financial interests of covered persons in a variety of ways, such as by paying commercial insurance premiums while the person is in a missing status. If allotments to dependents are not in effect when the person was placed in a missing category, the head of the department can initiate an allotment to provide for the dependents.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The law now permits the continued crediting of pay for persons who are "missing, missing in action, interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force, or besieged by a hostile force." The Department of Defense considers that none of these descriptions accurately fits some categories of persons who should be entitled to continued pay and allowances, such as the two Air Force captains who were held by the Soviet Union after their B-47 was shot down over the Barents Sea. To cover such persons the bill would permit the continued crediting of pay and allowances to a person "who is detained in a foreign country against his will."

The bill also restores to the law a provision for the filing and payment of income tax on the 15th day of the third month following termination of a missing status or after an executor, administrator, or conservator of the estate of a missing person has been appointed. This provision was in the original Missing Persons Act when it was approved in 1942, but it was not reactivated when the Act of 1948. Without this provision, the Internal Revenue Service has no express authority to excuse a person who files a late income tax return because he was imprisoned in a foreign country and there is no express authority for granting a refund if the 3-year statute of limitations for filing such a refund expires while the person is in prison.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this bill will not increase expenditures by the Department of Defense, as the Department is now applying the Missing Persons Act to persons currently carried as "missing."

LOWER PEND D'OREILLE OR KALISPEL TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (H.R. 10973) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Lower Pend d'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY TO USE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The bill (S. 970) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce may accept reimbursement for providing meteorological and hydrological work or services requested by States, counties, cities, or other local government units. Reimbursement may be accepted for the total or partial cost of the work or services furnished for the benefit of or in cooperation with such governmental units: Provided, That the Secretary shall require reimbursement for the total direct and indirect costs of work or services so provided which do not have value to the public at large.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Commerce may receive such payment in funds or property to be used in providing the work or services, or both. All funds received in payment for work or services authorized herein shall be deposited in a separate account in the Treasury and shall be available to pay the costs of such work or services, for making refunds, or for crediting appropriations from which the cost of such work or services may have been paid: Provided, That payment for indirect costs not paid from the appropriation bearing the cost of the work or services shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Commerce shall establish regulations to insure that no commitment for work or services that are determined to have no value to the public at large are made to States, counties, cities, or other local government units where such work or services can be obtained from private organizations and individuals who have competency in the meteorological sciences.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I take this means of expressing my thanks and appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (Mr. FULBRIGHT), for his patience and understanding.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am painfully conscious of the distaste of my colleagues for this misnamed, maligned, misrepresented, and misunderstood legislation.

For longer than I care to remember, I have had the thankless duty of presenting this bill to the Senate. Today, in the few minutes remaining before the Senate adjourns, I shall make the presentation as short and painless as I can. I have not forgotten the incredibly long and arduous debate which kept us in session until just before Christmas last year. I can only hope it will not go that long this year.

Some years ago Prime Minister Nehru of India took the visiting Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-Lai to the site of a new dam. "It is in these temples that I worship," said Nehru. "And so indeed he did, as does virtually every other leader of the third world of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Many, like Nehru himself, have done far more than worship in the temple of economic development; they have gone out of the temple to build

dams and schools and factories, to begin the vast enterprise of bringing their long quiescent lands into the dynamic life of the 20th century.

Clearly, the aspiration to economic development is one of the powerful motivating forces in the world. It gives promise and substance and hope to the nationalism of the emerging nations. It has created new ferment in the world, new hopes and new dangers which the advanced nations, Communist as well as free, have tried to influence through military, economic, and technical assistance programs of unprecedented magnitude.

The aspirations of the poor nations are the occasion but not really the reason for the American foreign aid program. The reason for our aid—I think we must admit—lies in our own aspirations rather than those of the recipients, or, more precisely, in the profound effects which their aspirations have on our own prospects for peace and security.

Looked at in this way, foreign aid is not a special undertaking like an earthquake or famine relief program, but an instrument of policy—a normal instrument of policy like diplomacy, military power or intelligence, each of which is designed to achieve certain objectives which cannot readily be obtained by other means. I should like in these brief remarks to offer a few suggestions as to why foreign aid is a necessary instrument of American foreign policy, as to the kind of instrument it is and the kind of objectives it is likely to help attain.

The subject is not one which the Senate has neglected. Unlike certain other programs—some of at least equal importance and some of vastly greater magnitude—foreign aid has inspired many hours of colloquy and debate, including 3 full weeks of most enlightening discussion only a few months ago. There is therefore little to be said about foreign aid that has not been said before, but the case for the aid program is no less valid for being familiar. It is, indeed, as strong a case today as it was when General Marshall spoke at Harvard in 1947, and in some respects the prospects of our aid achieving its objectives are decidedly better today, after 17 years' experience, than they were when aid was a new and untested instrument of policy.

Of the bill itself little need be said. Its content is spelled out in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee and is in any case familiar. All that is markedly new about this year's foreign aid bill is the amounts proposed to be authorized, which are greatly reduced below the levels of previous years. It may be that the reductions have been too great; it may be that the program will function more effectively on a smaller scale. It is clear in any case that the proposed authorization cannot be further reduced without undermining the aid program as an instrument of American foreign policy.

The President has indicated that he regards this year's foreign aid request as the minimum consistent with the main-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17133

tenance of a reasonably effective program. In reducing the authorization request to a total of \$3.5 billion the administration has accommodated itself to the doubts and criticisms of the foreign aid program which has been expressed in the Congress in recent years. I strongly recommend that the Senate now respond by authorizing and then appropriating the full amount approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, which is only slightly below the amount requested by the President.

Before commenting on aid as a broad instrument of American policy, I would like to point to certain very important improvements which have been made in the aid program in response to the wishes of Congress.

First. American economic and military assistance, once quite diffuse, has become highly concentrated. Two-thirds of all development lending funds in fiscal year 1965 will go to seven countries which have demonstrated their ability to make effective use of development capital: Chile, Colombia, Nigeria, Turkey, Pakistan, India, and Tunisia. Two-thirds of all military assistance will go to 11 countries along the periphery of the Soviet Union and Communist China. More than four-fifths of supporting assistance funds will go to four countries: Vietnam, Korea, Laos, and Jordan. Selectivity is high and becoming higher: 17 nations which once received economic assistance from the United States no longer receive it and another 14 countries are approaching the point where they will no longer need soft loans and grants.

Second. The disproportion between American aid programs and those of other prosperous free world nations is being steadily reduced. In April 1963 the Development Assistance Committee concluded an agreement on liberalizing aid terms which is having a constructive effect. France, which already contributes a higher proportion of its gross national product to foreign aid than does the United States, has indicated its intention of sustaining a high level of aid. Britain and Canada have committed themselves to larger aid programs on liberalized lending terms. Germany's aid program has grown progressively larger and its lending terms more generous.

Third. The President's request for \$3.5 billion for fiscal year 1965 is the second smallest since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948 and, in proportion to the Nation's growing resources, this year's request is by far the smallest burden since foreign aid began. In 1949 the amounts appropriated by Congress for military and economic assistance were 11.5 percent of the Federal budget and 2 percent of the Nation's gross national product. The current request is for less than 4 percent of the budget and only 0.6 percent of the gross national product.

As the Secretary of State pointed out in his statement before the Foreign Relations Committee, certain facts about foreign aid indicate that the program is sound and markedly improved along lines recommended by Congress; with two-thirds of development lending going to 7 countries and two-thirds of

military assistance going to 11 countries, the program is highly concentrated; three-fifths of all economic assistance is now in the form of dollar repayable loans; 80 percent of all foreign aid funds is spent in the United States, with the result that the adverse effect of foreign aid on the Nation's balance-of-payments is negligible; criteria of development lending and self-help have been improved with experience; allied countries are mounting larger aid programs on more liberal terms; the program is a diminishing burden on the Nation's resources, the smallest by far since foreign aid became an established instrument of American foreign policy at the end of World War II.

Much of the controversy which has attended the annual debate of Congress on foreign aid is rooted, I suspect, in our reluctance to regard foreign aid as a normal instrument of American foreign policy like diplomacy and military power. Foreign aid has been described as everything from a sacred mission to a criminal lunacy, but the Nation has yet to form a consensus on the significance of foreign aid as it has worked out in practice, that is to say, as a perfectly rational tool of policy, no better or worse than any other in moral terms, one which has sometimes succeeded and sometimes failed and one which should be used or not used in any particular situation depending upon the objectives at stake and the prospects for success or failure under the circumstances of the case.

Through the years we have treated aid as something abnormal, presumably because it represents a use of national resources for a purpose other than our own direct consumption. This indeed is the basis of virtually all criticism of the aid program: that it diverts resources from the immediate needs of our own society. And so indeed it does, but the point which is overlooked by the opponents of aid is that it is only one of a number of national programs which divert resources from the needs of our people and in fact one of the least costly.

I share the concern of my colleagues who deplore the diversion of the Nation's resources. This country has great and growing problems ranging from public transportation to public education which are not now being solved and which can only be solved by costly public programs. The diversion of public funds to foreign commitments is therefore a matter of wholly justifiable regret. It is, however, an impenetrable mystery to me why it is that our fears of extravagance and waste are so overwhelmingly focused on foreign aid rather than on other, more costly programs. It is an impenetrable mystery to me why it is that in 1963 the Senate authorized a \$3.6 billion aid program only after 3 weeks of rancorous debate and immediately thereafter approved a space budget of over \$5 billion with only perfunctory debate. This, of course, is to say nothing of our annual military budgets of over \$50 billion, which have recently been approved with no more than a few judicious queries by the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

Unless it is believed that the defense and space programs are models of economy while foreign aid is by some mystery of its own nature scandalously extravagant, we can only conclude that the opposition to foreign aid is not primarily economic but political, that it is not the diversion and possible waste of national resources that troubles the opponents of aid but aid itself as an instrument of national policy. The issue, it seems clear, is not one of economy—if only because there is relatively little to be wasted in the foreign aid program and because so much in fact is wasted elsewhere without giving us undue concern—but rather one of the purpose and effectiveness of aid as an instrument of national policy.

The objective of American aid programs is to contribute to the development of a world environment in which free societies, notably our own, can survive and prosper in peace and reasonable security. The apparently unanswered question in our continuing public debate about aid is not one of economy but whether in fact our aid programs do contribute to the realization of this objective. As Prof. Edward S. Mason of Harvard has put it:

If there is some reasonable expectation that economic development assistance can make a significant contribution to the peace and security of the West, it is surprising how small a financial sacrifice the countries concerned are willing to make to this end. * * * If economic aid is considered to be an instrument of foreign policy, it seems really a rather small instrument to deal with such a very large problem.

Foreign aid must be judged by the political criterion of whether it does or does not contribute to the security of the United States. I think it is clear beyond any doubt that it has contributed to our national security. Are we not more secure, to take one example among many, then we would otherwise be for having helped democratic India to make a modest success of her economic development program? Is the Western Hemisphere not more secure against Communist subversion as a result of even the limited accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress than it would be if we had left our Latin American neighbors to fend for themselves? Are our interests in Africa not more secure for having helped finance the United Nations Congo operation than they would be if we had left the Congo to chaos? And who would question the effectiveness of the Marshall plan not only in bolstering our security but in preventing an irremediable disaster for the West?

It seems clear—

As Herbert Feis has put it—

that as a nation, we invest, lend, give, instruct, rescue, and resuscitate needy peoples in the belief that it will advantage our national security and reputation as well as our souls.

To acknowledge the importance and validity of foreign aid as an instrument of American foreign policy is not to assert its supreme importance or universal validity. It is in fact a limited instrument and must be appreciated as such if it is to be appreciated at all. It is a mod-

est element of our overall policy and a marginal factor in the economics of the recipient countries. Its success or failure thus depends on a great deal more than the amounts that are provided and the efficiency with which they are dispensed and put to use. Foreign aid is inseparable from the political, commercial, and defense policies of the donor and from the overall defense and social and economic development programs of the recipient. Only if we view our aid programs in their total context can we free ourselves of both excessive hopes and unwarranted disappointments.

We must not judge our aid program by impossible standards of achievement. It is not going to eliminate poverty and unrest and instability in the world. Even if it were magnified beyond any level which now seems feasible, our aid would not eliminate these problems because it is simply beyond our means—material, moral, and political—to elevate two-thirds of the human race from poverty to abundance.

But it does not follow from the fact that we cannot solve a problem that we should do nothing to try to alleviate it. An imperfect instrument is better than no instrument and modest progress is patently better than no progress at all. It is by the criterion of modest progress that we must evaluate foreign aid. Just as it makes no sense to think of disbanding our Armed Forces because they may not always secure the Nation against military dangers, it makes no sense to talk of terminating our foreign aid program because it serves only to alleviate rather than resolve worldwide problems of development and defense. Fire departments do not prevent losses from fires; the police do not prevent all crime; but who would suggest that we do without them?

Nor should we underestimate the importance of modest progress. It is frequently pointed out, for example, that even if the development programs of the poor nations are quite successful in, say, the next 20 years, the disparity between their living standards and those of the advanced nations is likely to become greater, not less, than it is now. This is probably true, but it tells us nothing of the probable effects of economic progress. A marked increase in the affluence of an already affluent America is likely to have only minor political consequences, but even small advances in diet and housing and education in a poor country can make a vital difference between hope and despair, between stability and disorder, between democracy and dictatorship.

Thus—

As Herbert Feis puts it—

one may anticipate that the disparity in human condition and experience will lessen, although differences in money income will grow greater.

Foreign aid, as I have suggested, can contribute to the development of a secure world environment for the free societies only as part of a grand strategy for security and peace. No matter how well conceived and administered, foreign aid can be of little value if our diplomacy is

clumsy or if our defenses are neglected. It can contribute little to our security if the problems of our own country—problems of education and employment, of slums and crime and the physical deterioration of our cities—are left unresolved to destroy the magnetism of our own example as a free society. And finally, if it is to contribute to our security, foreign aid must be related not only to our short-term strategy for the containment of Communist expansion, but also to our long-term strategy for alleviating the cold war and developing peaceful and stable relations between the Communist nations and the free nations.

In the context of the cold war the objective of our aid programs is to help build stable and viable nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, nations with the capacity to resist Communist aggression and subversion and with reasonable prospects for both democracy and economic development. Our aim is not to build nations which will be profusely grateful to the United States, never annoy or displease us, and follow us loyally on all international questions. If these were our objectives, a more effective program would be the immediate termination of our aid program and the use of all its funds and a great deal more for the training and equipment of mass armies of occupation.

Ingratitude is disagreeable but not dangerous and slavish compliance is a characteristic for which a free society has no use, either in itself or in its associates. The fact remains, nonetheless, that the United States should and must expect the recipients of its aid to meet certain basic criteria in their international behavior. First and foremost, we have the right to expect the recipients of our aid to act vigorously and effectively to preserve their own independence against Communist incursions.

In addition, we have the right—as Feis expresses it—

to expect and ask that any nation to which we give substantial help will not do the United States serious harm; that it will stand with us in any critical issues if it wishes our help in the future.

Our foreign aid program must also be an integral part of a global strategy of peace. Its broad objective, I have suggested, is to help create a world environment in which free and self-governing societies can survive and prosper in peace and reasonable security. Such a world environment requires the abatement of both the national and ideological differences that divide the Communist nations from the free nations and the profound social and economic disparities between the rich nations and the poor nations. If our aid program is to be true to its own objective, therefore, it must be part of an overall strategy aimed at both the development of the poor nations and the relaxation of the cold war. Our long-term objective must be the gradual development of an attitude of mutual toleration on the part of all countries for all other countries. They may or may not be friends, but they still can and should cooperate to their respective advantages regardless of ideology and wealth.

Looked at in this way, our foreign aid program can be described as an instrument of policy designed in the short run to help wage the cold war and in the long run to help end it. As important as it is in the immediate future to help the less developed nations resist the incursions of an expansive communism, it is equally important that they be prepared to play a constructive role in encouraging the development of peaceful and stable relations among the nuclear powers.

There is no contradiction between the short-term goal of strengthening our position in the cold war through our aid programs and the long-term goal of ending the cold war. By drawing the less developed countries into a free and developing concert of nations, we can foreclose the Communist hope of gaining control or predominant influence over Asia, Africa, and Latin America just as the Western Alliance has foreclosed Communist ambitions in Europe. When this is done, when the Communist powers are confronted on every side with virtually insuperable obstacles to expansion, it will then be possible to offer them an end of the cold war by making it clear that we have no hostile designs against them, that they can have secure and untroubled national existences within their own frontiers so long as they remain within their own frontiers, and that we are prepared to welcome them as associates in a peaceful and cooperative community of nations.

The objective is admittedly ideal. It may perhaps be unattainable but I do not think it is unapproachable. An objective does not have to be within our reach to be worth pursuing.

Ideals—

Said Carl Schurz—

are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and following them you will reach your destiny.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter sent to me by David Bell, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and an attached preliminary report on the amount of unobligated balances as of June 30, 1964, for the military and economic assistance programs. The report shows a total unutilized balance of \$22 million as of June 30, 1964, the lowest at the end of a fiscal year in the history of the program.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1964.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will be interested, I believe, in the attached preliminary report showing the amount of unobligated-unreserved balances, as of June 30, 1964, for the military and economic programs under title I of the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of fiscal year 1964. These are not final figures. They are based on "flash" reports from our field missions and preclosing trial balances in our Washington accounts.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17135

Later changes in these figures, however, are not expected to be large.

You will note from the attached table that \$15.2 million of available military and economic funds were unutilized as of June 30, 1964. In addition, \$6.8 million of principal repayments and interest had accrued in the development loan accounts but were not legally available for obligation during the fiscal year. The total of \$22 million is the lowest unutilized balance at the end of a fiscal year in the history of the program.

These low figures are evidence of the fact that fiscal year 1964 was an unusual year in

terms of demands placed upon the foreign assistance program. Normally we would expect to have an appreciable balance left in the contingency fund. This year, however, it was necessary to use the entire contingency fund to meet exceptional requirements for military aid and to deal with the changed situation arising in Brazil this spring.

If there is any additional information that we can furnish in this regard, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—UNOBLIGATED/UNRESERVED BALANCES¹

Fiscal yearend balances compared, fiscal year 1964² and fiscal year 1963, as of June 30, 1964

[In millions of dollars]

	June 30, 1964, preliminary			June 30, 1963, actual		
	Avail-able	Not avail-able for obligation ³	Total	Avail-able	Not avail-able for obligation ³	Total
Economic assistance:						
Development loans.....	(4)	4.6	4.6	96.2	24	120.2
Alliance for Progress loans.....	(4)	2.2	2.2	92.0		92.0
Technical cooperation/development grants.....	6.0		6.0	47.3		47.3
Alliance TC/grants.....	.1		.1	2.7		2.7
Inter-American social and economic program.....	.2		.2	1.6		1.6
Supporting assistance.....	4.0		4.0	6.0		6.0
International organizations.....				.3		.3
Contingency fund.....	.8		.8	127.1		127.1
Administrative expenses, AID.....	1.3		1.3	2.0		2.0
Administrative expenses, State.....				(4)		(4)
Survey of investment opportunities.....	.5		.5	1.1		1.1
American schools and hospitals abroad:						
Regular program.....	1.2		1.2			
Foreign currency program.....	.1		.1	.1		.1
Total, economic.....	14.2	6.8	21.0	376.4	24	400.4
Military assistance.....	1.0		1.0	22.3		22.3
Total, military and economic.....	15.2	6.8	22.0	398.7	24	422.7

¹ Excludes nonbudgetary accounts—investment guarantees, excess property revolving fund, and MAP credit sales account.

² Preliminary data based on preclosing trial balance.

³ Represents funds not legally available for obligation during the fiscal year.

⁴ Less than \$50,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield me 20 seconds?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the schedule of the Senate, I shall postpone until Monday my reply to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, in which he supports the foreign aid program. I shall oppose the bill and offer a series of amendments starting on Monday.

PROGRESS OF LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to move shortly that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next. Before doing so, I should like to make the following statement:

Since the reconvening of the Senate on July 20, after the Republican convention, the Senate has passed a number of major bills, including a score of Presidential recommendations. Most of these bills, if not all, have been passed by bipartisan effort. Therefore, credit is due both parties. Among the major achievements are the following:

An across-the-board increase for military personnel, through the efforts of Senators RUSSELL, SALTONSTALL, STENNIS,

and the other Members of this body, because, as I recall, the bill was passed unanimously.

A bill to clarify the complicated dual compensation laws, which was so capably handled by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and later by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. In this respect, my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised questions which helped to sharpen the issue and, as a result, enabled the Senate to pass a better bill.

A bill to prohibit futures trading in potatoes on commodity exchanges, which was passed largely through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Republican in this body.

The antipoverty bill, to which much credit is due Senators McNAMARA, JAVITS, KEATING, FULBRIGHT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and many other Senators, who put their shoulders to the wheel in support of the measure.

A military construction bill, which was cleared for White House action due primarily to the intensive efforts of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished Senator

from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The appropriation bills cleared by this body in the past 10 days were as follows: The defense appropriation bill, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and ably assisted by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; the legislative appropriation bill, under the managerial skill of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN], and the ranking Republican, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was passed yesterday and was managed so superbly by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation, which was cleared for the President, and was ably steered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. That bill, as the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is aware, contains an appropriation of \$600,000 for the minting of 45 million silver dollars. This is good news for our States.

Also, a veterans housing bill to which great credit should go to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a bill supported by all Members of the Senate.

The ratification of five important treaties.

An extensive housing bill, through the great efforts and skill of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and who was ably assisted by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and through the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], whose opposition was most constructive and whose suggestions helped make it possible to have a better bill.

The establishment of a Commission on Automation and Technology, so much needed in our times, and for which the Senate is indebted to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the latter two of whom submitted the original resolution on automation.

A \$2.3 billion highway authorization bill, cleared largely through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public

Works, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

A bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement, which was passed largely through the efforts of Senators SMATHERS, AIKEN, and MORSE, but also through the efforts of Senator DOUGLAS and Senator CARLSON whose sincere and constructive opposition contributed so greatly in making an outstanding legislative history and which put the State Department on notice that the Senate will watch this quota system most carefully especially as it relates to an increase in coffee prices.

The passage this morning of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, under the superb leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is a perennial in this respect.

The passage of the National Defense Education Act, under the excellent and outstanding floor managers of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], ably abetted and supported by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVY].

In praising the Senate as a whole and attempting to single out some members for their skill, effort, and cooperation in connection with specific pieces of legislation, some will always be inadvertently omitted from the list, but one who could never be forgotten is the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]; I must say that the effort that brought about these achievements could never have been accomplished without the leadership, counsel, spirit of cooperation, and duty always manifested by him.

Next week, we hope to conclude action on the independent offices bill, perhaps the public works bill, and also the agricultural appropriations bill.

It is anticipated that we will bring up legislation having to do with nurses training, and also the interest equalization bill.

Let me say to all Senators on both sides of the aisle that we have made great progress.

I wish to personally thank each Senator for his valuable contribution in assisting the leadership to get these measures through so expeditiously.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The majority leader, as usual, has been very gracious in expressing appreciation to those who have helped to put through the legislative program.

All Senators know—and I would have the country know—that if it were not for the able leadership of the majority leader, his ability to handle men, his deftness in carrying out a very difficult

assignment, none of these pieces of legislation would have been enacted. The entire Senate and the entire country owe the Senator from Montana a great debt of gratitude for his statesmanship.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am indebted to the Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks.

COFFEE PRICES ALREADY GOING UP AFTER ENACTMENT OF H.R. 8864, THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT YESTERDAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the gracious references of the Senator from Montana about the efforts of the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Illinois in opposing the coffee bill yesterday.

I especially appreciate his statement that Senators should keep close watch on what will happen after passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times for this morning, which on page 32 gives the movement of future prices in coffee on Friday as compared with Thursday.

I should like to read two of these futures.

When the market closed on Thursday, March futures for 1965, on B grade coffee stood at 47.23 cents per pound. When the market closed last night, after we had passed the bill, it stood at 47.74 cents per pound—an increase of 0.51 cents per pound, or approximately one-half cent.

May futures which had been 47.11 cents per pound on Thursday, after the market closed last night was 47.68 cents per pound, or an increase of 0.57 cents per pound, or slightly over one-half a cent.

Each cent of increase in the price of coffee means from \$30 to \$35 million to the American consumers. The increase yesterday, which will probably be reflected in subsequent increases, amounted to \$15 to \$17 million.

This is precisely what the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Illinois had prophesied would happen. This increase was undoubtedly due to the passage of the bill yesterday. So far as I know, there was no change in weather forecasts for Brazil or for anywhere in Latin America to justify any expectation that the supply of coffee would diminish. There was no information to indicate that there had been any expected increase in demand. What happened was that we had passed the coffee bill. The news reached New York and the speculators decided that this meant prices next year would be higher than this year.

Mr. President, this is only the beginning. This is merely the first installment

on the bill. This is merely the reaction in the first hours after our action yesterday.

The Coffee Council is meeting now, as I understand, in London, and will meet again next week to make its final decision on quotas. It will be very interesting to see what they do.

Yesterday's trading indicates that the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Illinois were correct as to the effect of this pact upon the future course of coffee prices.

The chickens are coming home to roost, but they are not coming home to those who supported this measure; they are coming home to the American people. They are coming home to the families of the plainsmen out West who drink their cups of coffee to brace themselves against the asperities of the weather. They are coming home to the people who live in the small towns and in the big cities. They are coming home in the form of an increased price of coffee.

It is my intention, in conformity with the excellent admonition of the Senator from Montana, to try to keep watch from time to time on what happens to coffee prices.

I can say that they began yesterday afternoon, just as I expected them to begin—with an increase.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I concur with him in his remarks, and I trust that a check on these coffee prices will be made and a record kept.

Mr. President, I rise to commend the majority leader for his fairness, his understanding, and his generosity with respect to the accomplishments of this body in the past few weeks.

The majority leader is always fair and just. He conducts himself with impeccable integrity.

His remarks as to the work of the minority leader and the cooperation given on this side of the aisle are another indication of that integrity, and I thank him wholeheartedly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming most sincerely for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 3, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.