

A7580

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 1

contributed greatly to the disinclination of the public to participate in their government, in politics, if you please. After all if we are to have representative government the people must participate in it through their representatives and in choosing and electing their representatives. Lobbying in essence is nothing more than the people participating in their government. It should be encouraged not discouraged.

There are improper lobbying techniques. Falsely accusing another of improper lobbying techniques is itself an improper technique. These improper techniques should be attacked but when they are attacked one should be careful to make it clear that it is the improper technique not lobbying itself that is the basis of the adverse criticism. Good lobbying should be encouraged.

Frankly, I have been shocked by both *Time* and *Life* magazines. Nor is it just *Time* and *Life*. They merely reflect an approach to public debate that is all too common today in our country. But *Time* and *Life* seek the image of promoters of the best in public morals and to a great degree they deserve this image.

I want to say something else. I think a great deal of the criticism of the letter of James Carey is just as off base as some of the things Carey said in his letter. The fact that his letter said his group was going to try to beat those who had voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill I thought was perfectly proper. If we want our people active in Government they certainly should try to beat representatives they think are not good and elect those they think are good. My quarrel with Carey is that he does not think people can disagree with him unless they are tools, bigots, or uninterested in the welfare of the common man. I answered his letter by accepting his challenge at the polls, but appealing to him to keep the public debate on the facts and logic of the issue and off the attacks on the integrity of those with whom he disagreed.

Lest there be any misunderstanding I should mention that I basically disagree with Mr. Zagri on the Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted for it after thorough study and with conviction that this was in the best interests of the general public and of the unions themselves. Furthermore, the powerful Teamsters union headed by Harold Gibbons, another one of my constituents, has provided the basis of my opposition each time I run for election in a district which has powerful labor organization. There is little question in my mind that they will continue to provide this opposition.

Here is Mr. Zagri's letter. I think it is up to his accusers to prove their case. I will be happy to place in the *Record* the reply the editors of *Life* make to Mr. Zagri:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The editorial in *Life's* issue of July 27, titled "Danger: Hoffa Man at Work," is so grossly inaccurate and so brazenly unfair to the Teamsters and to myself that I cannot let it pass without a protest.

First of all, I most emphatically deny that

I have ever threatened any Member of Congress with political reprisals of any kind, no matter how they choose to vote. I have far too much respect for our Nation's lawmakers to approach any of them with anything but the most complete courtesy. I hereby challenge any of the three Representatives you mention, Mr. UDALL, Mr. THOMPSON, or Mrs. GREEN to cite one example of unethical conduct on my part.

I might add that you are completely wrong regarding the lady from Oregon's unladylike departure from character. She most certainly never used the phrase you quote to me and I'm sure she never would.

Never at any time have I used the name of Speaker RAYBURN and again I challenge you to cite a single occasion on which I have.

We of labor are well aware that the right kind of labor reform legislation would benefit the Nation, just as business reform legislation would also, but we are convinced that none of the bills now under consideration could possibly do anything but great harm to all organized labor.

In this connection, informed labor relations experts are well aware of the ironic fact that the Teamsters Union, admittedly the prime target of all the proposed new measures, would survive under even the toughest bill, whereas most other unions could not.

Nevertheless, we of the Teamsters Union, as members of organized labor, undertook a drive to defeat pending laws which we feel to be punitive rather than corrective, and which we fear would eventually eradicate all the great gains made by labor since the Wagner Act emancipated the working man. In every case when we have opposed a measure which we considered harmful to labor we have suggested an alternative which we felt would be of actual benefit.

Since our campaign began we have followed the classic patterns adhered to by groups seeking to enlighten and influence their congressional representatives:

1. We met with Congressmen, most of whom were unaware of the key punitive sections of the proposed bills, and explained to them just why we objected to these sections.
2. We urged our members to contact their Congressmen and voice their feelings on such antilabor measures.
3. We sought wherever possible to bring about personal meetings between Congressmen and their constituents for discussions of the merits and demerits of the pending bills.

Our methods resemble nothing so much as your own when you urge, as you have repeatedly, that your readers contact their Congressmen and demand severe new labor reform laws, and they are no more sinister and no more "dirty" to quote from your editorial.

We are using the most fundamental of the democratic processes: Let your Congressman know how you feel about something he is going to vote on. If informing our own members of the activities and voting records of their Congressmen is unfair pressure then there is not an important segment of American business that is not equally unfair, because this is standard procedure. If, as *Life* magazine wrote, Speaker RAYBURN himself offered to campaign personally on behalf of any one in Congress who feels that his chances of reelection have been endangered by my activities, then we are certainly justified in campaigning for what we believe to be right.

In closing, to attribute to me so much power—as our editorial does—is absurd and unrealistic. The opposition arrayed against the other labor spokesmen and myself consists of an almost limitless army of lobbyists, lawyers, and public relations experts,

backed by inexhaustible money and resources of every kind, all of them under direct orders from the enemies of labor to stop at nothing until organized labor as we know it today is destroyed forever.

Yours truly,

SIDNEY ZAGRI,
Legislator Representative.

85165 JCB
Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon,
Reports Overwhelming Passage by
House of Representatives of Federal
Employees Health Bill and States Views
for a Strong Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure for me to report that the House of Representatives this afternoon passed S. 2162, to provide a health benefits program for Government employees, by an overwhelming margin of 381 to 4. Our bill earlier had passed the Senate on July 16 by a similar overwhelming vote of 81 to 4.

As chairman of the Insurance and Health Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I must confess that there are important differences between our Senate passed bill and the bill that passed the House of Representatives this afternoon.

One of the important differences between the two versions of the bill is with respect to the Advisory Council which has the duty of advising the Civil Service Commission regarding the administration of the Federal employees health benefits program. In this connection, it is worth emphasizing that Government employees are paying at least 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Mr. President, so that the Senate may be fully aware of the importance of the Advisory Council and the issue involved, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *Record*, correspondence I have received from the American Hospital Association.

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

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION.

Washington, D.C., August 20, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The attached copy of our letter to Senator JOHNSTON expresses our particular concern with respect to the House version of the bill providing health insurance to Federal employees.

We urge that the Senate insist upon the inclusion of the Advisory Council to insure that the program is administered in a fully effective manner.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,

Associate Director,

American Hospital Association.

[Enclosure.]

siles, atomic weapons and vast land armies, the risk of total destruction becomes much greater than in 1939. How can one say that the old fatalities have vanished when new and worse ones have taken their place?

The argument, in short, is that although the protagonists in the drama may have changed, Russia eclipsing Germany and China taking Japan's place as aggressors and instigators, the same conditions of international rivalry, competitiveness, imperial pressure and naked force exist today as they did in 1914 or 1939 and it is only a matter of time before they erupt once more into universal war.

These risks cannot be minimized. There are obvious ways in which communism is more truly formidable than Hitler's Germany could ever be. In Russia it is based upon a solid established state power that has carried its people through a vast expansive revolution, not upon a power-drunk lunatic Nazi party able only to plunge the nation into total war within 7 years of seizing the apparatus of government.

The Soviet Union commands vast space and resources equal to America's and has determined to mobilize a larger percentage of them for the instruments of force. All around the world, communism has a policy and an appeal—based on its own rapid industrialization—that can catch the imagination of peoples struggling to modernize their States. Such an appeal was utterly closed to Hitler with his racial nonsense of Aryan superiority.

China, too, by the vastness of its population and the prestige of its traditional Asian predominance, must act as an influence of incalculable power, provided it can demonstrate communism as a quick path to growth in overpopulated territories. The Communist powers are thus much more truly formidable than the Nazi explosion, just as, to give but one analogy, the imperial Confucian state of China—for all its bureaucratic despotism—had a lasting power denied to the marauding Mongol conquerors of the Asian steppes.

Yet it can be argued that the very formidableness and rootedness of communism put its threat and pressure in a very different category from the plunging aggressions of 1914 and 1939. As the revolutions become consolidated, their leaders are in some measure acquiring a mood of conservatism or at least of conservation. There can be no doubt, for instance, that Mr. Khrushchev is serious in his determination to catch up with American living standards—although, after his American visit, he may find the road longer than he thought—and the Chinese Communists no less serious in their aim of surpassing Western European production within a decade.

Russia certainly and China possibly have the resources and the elbow room for such a heroic transformation, provided they also have peace. Whatever their theoretical Marxist beliefs about the ultimate victory of world communism, there is no doubt about the immediate goal and that is internal development and consolidation. No wild talk of conquest, no open boasts of taking over the Ruhr—as Hitler once boasted of appropriating the Ukraine—spur the Russians on to believe in easy wealth at others' expense. The great theme is the work, ingenuity and sustained effort needed at home to show the superiority of communism to an admiring world.

For the same reason, there seems no immediate likelihood of direct Communist aggression in the world at large. Communist agents may be active, local leaders wooed, arms, aid, and trade dispatched, Communist technicians ordered to remote capitals. But Soviet troops do not march into Kirkuk when General Kassim shows signs of

checking local Communist activity. There is no Soviet airdrop on Ghana if Dr. Nkrumah excludes Communists from all positions of trust. Most paradoxical of all, Soviet aid to the Aswan Dam continues while President Nasser keeps his local Communists in jail.

In other words, the Russians and the Chinese will exploit all the possible openings for Communist influence—but exploit them short of open conflict. This is tiresome, difficult, and dangerous for the West. But it is not fatal.

Today there is only one tactic from which the world cannot recover—the tactic of direct aggression. The Communists tried this once—in Korea. The instant answer of force with force has discouraged them from repeating the hideous experiment. In fact, one can argue that the most profound reason for believing that 1959 is not 1939—or 1914—is that today the democracies have avoided the appeasement of the 1930's which led Hitler on from violence to violence; and the Communists on their side have enough rational grasp to see what the Nazis never saw, that violence leads to only one conclusion—in the words of Marx, "to the common ruin of the contending parties."

But if these are reasons for hope, they are none for complacency. Every reason for believing that the fatality of 1914 and 1939 can be avoided depends upon vigorous and sustained Western policies—upon a united Atlantic front, upon expansive international economic policies in the free world which permit Soviet aid and trade to be absorbed without creating any dangerous absorption into the Communist economic web, upon an undeviating determination to maintain equality of strength and to let the Communists understand that determination.

Yet can one maintain today that these conditions of safety and survival are all realized in practice or that they are even fully understood? We have to recognize that our policies are still marked by improvisation, impermanence, and inadequacy. We may no longer be involved in cutthroat national competition in the West. But neither are we engaged on a systematic attempt to work out what are the appropriate forms of permanent, supranational association in the atomic age.

The initiative that has brought France and Germany closer together has so far driven France and Britain further apart. Western Europe is in danger of new economic divisions and the common purposes of a possible Atlantic community are hardly spelled out. There is little sign that the Western nations regard themselves as the nucleus of a lasting and cooperative international order coherent and purposeful enough to challenge the Soviet aim of a Communist world.

Because of this central uncertainty, the economic policies of an expanding world society are neither widely understood nor even partially practiced. The extreme severities of the prewar business cycle may have been overcome, but the kind of steady upward thrust in the mature economies—which alone can secure world growth under other than Communist auspices—has not been secured or even formally sought. Twice in the last 7 years sharp falls in Western activity have canceled—by way of lower export incomes—all the benefit derived from Western aid to the less developed areas. Aid itself has been viewed as a stopgap measure for containing the Communists rather than as a long-term strategy for insuring stability in the troubled post-colonial world where bounding populations, pressing on unmobilized resources, threaten economic decline.

And the periods of stagnation, which greatly increased pressure to reduce budgets and cut public expenditure, have helped to whittle away the effectiveness of Western defense. We may not be the flabby, irresolute

weaklings of the 1930's. But there is no secret about Russia's growing preponderance in both missiles and conventional arms and equally there is no genuine urgency in the West to redress the balance.

In short, every policy which hopefully distinguishes the present from the despairs of the past has about it some note of weakness—inadequacy of scale, uncertainty of purpose, a quality of impermanence and indecision, a sense of reacting to others' pressure, not of boldly seeking the initiative ourselves. We may have done very much better. But are we doing well enough?

There should be no discouragement in this question for we have it in our power to give the proper answer. The postwar world has already shown—with the Marshall plan, with colonial independence, with foreign aid, with the Korean struggle, with the movement toward European unity, with the American involvement in world affairs—that the Western Powers have recovered a capacity to think and act freshly which seemed totally absent between the wars.

Anyone who grew up in the thirties could be conscious only of doors closing, of lights failing, of the forces of violence and unreason steadily gaining the upper hand. Today there need be no such sense of fatality. The field of action open to the Western Powers over most of the world is limited only by their vision, their resolution, and their generosity. No nagging economic limitations stand in their way provided they maintain their growth. New nations, no longer hampered by political dependence, are ready to cooperate with them in new ways to satisfy their hopes and needs. It is a world of change and movement and aspiration from which the rigidity and the claustrophobia of the prewar system have been blasted away.

For all the terrors and horrors of the last 20 years, their outcome is not a repetition of disaster but a new world of opportunity. We may still lose it. We may shirk its risks, we may miss its possibilities. But this is not a matter of fatality or iron destiny. It is at last a matter of free choice.

Good Lobbying Should Be Encouraged

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD a copy of the letter that Sidney Zagri sent to Life magazine in answer to the charge that he had used improper lobbying techniques in presenting the Teamsters Union position on labor reform legislation.

I observed Mr. Zagri's lobbying techniques and discussed them with many of my colleagues. Mr. Zagri is a constituent of mine and I was interested for that and other reasons. To date I have heard only vague charges such as the one in Life's editorial and a recent article in Time magazine that his techniques were other than proper. These rumors have been unsubstantiated.

I am quite disturbed at this constant attack on lobbying by all sides. The attack on lobbying and lobbyists is an improper technique in itself to pass or defeat legislation. These attacks have

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1959.
The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Senate Post Office and Civil
Service Committee, Senate Office Build-
ing, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: We have fol-
lowed with great interest the development
of legislation to provide health insurance
for Federal employees and their families.
In our testimony before the House commit-
tee, we endorsed and urged the committee
to adopt S. 2162 substantially as passed by
the Senate because we felt it was a very
desirable bill and in the best interest of the
people for whom you were striving to pro-
vide protection.

We are greatly concerned with certain
aspects of the bill which has now been
reported out by the House committee. One
of these, we believe, is of such significance
to the effectiveness of the legislation in ac-
tually meeting health needs that we feel
impelled to call it to your attention in the
hope that action may be taken to remedy
the situation.

The House version of the bill provides for
an Advisory Committee which does not ful-
fill the purpose of the Advisory Council as it
was provided for in the Senate bill. The
proposal in the House is for a committee
limited to employees and their representa-
tives, with no participation by individuals
experienced and knowledgeable in health
matters. This omission, we believe, is the
more serious because the agency responsible
for the administration of the program is
itself not a health agency and is not ex-
perienced in the development of health pro-
grams and services.

It is our belief that a major point to be
kept in mind is that the legislation deals
with the health of Federal workers and their
families. The proposal has serious health
implications quite apart from the financial
and administrative aspects, as important as
these are. These health implications, of
course, will be seriously affected by the man-
ner in which the bill is administered. Be-
cause of the number of people involved and
the prestige of the Federal Government,
moreover, the manner in which this program
is administered is likely to have an impor-
tant effect on the provision of health ser-
vices and the development of the health
prepayment movement throughout the
country.

There are within the Federal Government
several agencies and individuals widely ex-
perienced and highly skilled in health mat-
ters. We believe the best interest of Fed-
eral employees would be served by providing
assurance in the legislation that the advice
of such persons will be considered by the
administrators of the program. Further, in-
asmuch as the health services to be pro-
vided will be rendered in civilian facilities
and by civilian health personnel, it would
be well to utilize also the advice and con-
sultation of knowledgeable individuals from
the civilian health field. We believe the
purposes can best be served by requiring in
the legislation that an Advisory Council be
established with representatives selected
from among the agencies of the Federal
Government operating health programs,
such as the Army, Navy, Air Force, Public
Health Service, and the Veterans' Adminis-
tration; and further, that at least one phy-
sician active in the private practice of medi-
cine and at least one civilian hospital ad-
ministrator be included on the Council. In
addition to these above representatives, it is,
of course, essential that there be adequate
representation of Federal employees them-
selves as the consumers of the services.

We would recommend further that a pro-
vision be made for at least quarterly meet-
ings of the Advisory Council and for publi-
cation of all recommendations.

It will be noted that we do not recom-
mend that the carrier organizations be rep-
resented on the Council. It is assumed that
the administrators will have day-to-day con-
tact with the carrier representatives. Such
persons, however, will not be in a position
to function in the same manner as would
the members of an Advisory Council.

We cannot state too strongly the need for
the administrators of this program to be re-
quired to meet with and to consider the ad-
vice and recommendations of individuals ac-
tive in the provision of health services as
provided for in the Advisory Council out-
lined above.

We urge, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate
insist upon the inclusion of an Advisory
Council which will make an effective con-
tribution to the administration of the pro-
gram.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director,
American Hospital Association.

Benson-Eisenhower Corn Program Pro- duces New Headaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the
following article appeared in the August
issue of the Iowa Farm and Home Reg-
ister published by the Des Moines Sunday
Register. This article shows clearly that
Iowa farmers do understand agricultural
economics a lot better than the Depart-
ment of Agriculture officials who have
claimed that lower supports and no con-
trols would adjust supplies in line with
demand, and it shows what is happening
under the Benson-Eisenhower corn pro-
gram. You will also notice the great con-
trast between the interviews in this arti-
cle and those widely publicized interviews
recently conducted by Sam Lubbell.
While I am sure Mr. Lubbell's intentions
were good, he obviously did not know
enough about farming to conduct an in-
telligent interview of farmers. The re-
porter, Mr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, knows
how to interview farmers, and this article
shows that Iowa farmers do know what
kind of a program will work better. It
contributes to an understanding of what
Iowans are doing and saying about the
corn situation, and it is timely in view
of our increasingly serious farm problem:

WHAT IOWANS ARE DOING AND SAYING ABOUT
THE BIG CORN CROP

(By GLENN CUNNINGHAM)

The prospect of a bumper corn crop in
Iowa from the largest acreage in history poses
an acute storage problem for farmers. Bins
and cribs on many farms are already filled
with corn from previous years.

Linked closely to the storage situation are
several other serious and perplexing problems,
among them the probable price of corn at
harvesttime, the question of future livestock
programs, and what to do with the corn once
it is in storage.

The price of corn at harvesttime is any-
body's guess now, but with an alltime record
crop in prospect, some of the folks in the big

producing areas expect to see new crop corn
sell for as little as 65 cents a bushel.

However, with Government controls abol-
ished and all corn grown this year eligible
for price support, many farmers are already
moving to buy or build additional storage
to avail themselves of Government price
protection.

With hog and beef cattle numbers at rec-
ord levels and the prospect of lower prices
for meat animals in the months ahead,
farmers are in a quandary as to future feed-
ing programs.

Although a few of the in-and-outers are
now getting back into hog production, most
farmers seem to feel that this is no time to
expand any feeding operations.

The tendency seems to be toward a gen-
eral policy of "holding the line"—contin-
uing feeding programs at about the same level
as in the past, with some shifting to cheaper,
plainer feeder cattle to lessen the risk.

Those who have been out of hog produc-
tion and who are now getting back in are
finding it advantageous from the standpoint
of low-priced brood sows. And they're
guessing that low hog prices won't last too
long.

The demand for storage facilities of all
types—and for driers and drying equipment
from farmers who harvest their corn early
to prevent field losses—is at an all-time high
for this early in the season.

The government is encouraging farmers
to build additional storage, the county ag-
ricultural stabilization and conservation
(ASC) offices making 5-year loans to help
farmers purchase or put up the facilities
they need.

Walter Bradley, implement dealer at Al-
gona, says many farmers are just now start-
ing to take care of their corn and other grain
on their own farms, that in the past they
have relied too much on elevators in town.

"Many farmers just now are realizing
that government-financed storage of their
grain has built tremendous elevators," he
says. "They've decided to capitalize on the
situation and put up their own storage and
get the government storage fees themselves
on grain they resell."

A landowner in the Cylinder area bought
14 steel storage structures from Bradley's
firm. Each structure will store 1,700
bushels—a total of 23,800 bushels of corn.

Managers of ASC offices in northwestern
Iowa say they are getting many inquiries
about Government loans for acquiring addi-
tional storage. There has been a big increase
in corn acreage in this area.

The trend seems to be to permanent-type
storage, and a big boom in construction of
silos on farms where they are feeding cattle.
More and more farmers are picking corn
early and storing high-moisture shelled corn.

George Damman of Sanborn and his
unmarried sons, Bob, 27, and Glenn, 25, who
have 700 acres of corn this year, are buying
40,000 to 50,000 bushels of new storage and
a second drier this year. They use a picker-
sheller, pick early and dry the corn.

W. H. Holiday, ASC manager in Clay Coun-
ty (Spencer) said in late July that his
office already had made several storage fa-
cility loans and that he expected a lot of
temporary storage—such as snow fence
cribs—to be built to help handle this year's
crop.

"I haven't yet seen a poor field of corn,"
Holiday said. "A lot of the corn was shoot-
ing tassels by July 10, which is quite early.
The crop looks as good as in 1948 but, of
course, it isn't in the crib yet."

Art Rohwer, ASC manager in O'Brien
County (Primghar) estimates that there is
a 30-percent increase in corn acreage in
O'Brien County this year and that yield
prospects are the best since 1948.

"When you throw the gates open (abolish-
ment of corn acreage controls) and offer a

support price of \$1.04 a bushel and say to the farmers, 'Raise all you want to,' that's what they did," says Rohwer.

Jake Peelen, ASC chairman in O'Brien County, says he doesn't know what is going to be done with all of the corn, but that the best thing would be to feed it to livestock and convert it into meat.

"It takes about 7 pounds of corn to make 1 pound of meat," he points out, "but to raise meat a farmer needs a profit. And hogs right now are losing money for farmers who raise them."

Olaf Twedt, Estherville, has purchased 200 brood sows and is buying 1,000 feeder pigs—his first venture in swine in the last 10 years. He and a son-in-law farm 900 acres.

Twedt, who owns additional land which is rented out, says the Government made a mistake in dropping corn acreage controls and making price supports available on all corn grown, regardless of the acreage planted.

"You had less corn raised under acreage controls when supports were restricted to those who complied with planting allotments," he says, and advises:

"Restore controls and increase the support price for those complying."

Some farmers blame Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson for the avalanche of corn which is coming.

"What will we do with corn?" comments George Bentley, 53, a farmer near Onawa in the Missouri river bottom. "That's Benson's problem. And it looks like he will have plenty of it to look after."

Joe Dewaele, 46, a neighbor, agrees with Bentley that there is little likelihood of greatly increased livestock feeding because of the price situation and uncertainties of feeding profits.

Near Goldfield, another farmer, Stanley Sampson, 36, says, "Hog prices are getting down to where there's no profit in raising them." Sampson's father, Steve, 70 and retired, says hogs should bring \$18 to provide a fair profit.

Earl Gollhefer, of the Charter Oak Grain Co. at Charter Oak, says a lot of corn is fed in his area, where the trend is to earlier harvesting and storing of chopped or ground high-moisture corn in silos for feed.

He says most of the crop looks good now but that some late-planted corn may need extra time—2 more weeks—before frost to mature.

Everett Halstead, Ida County extension director, says farmers are buying steel bins—for shelled corn—and other types of permanent storage for ear corn, all equipped with air ducts and fans for artificial drying or for keeping corn in good condition.

Halstead says it is difficult to understand why some farmers are going into the hog business with prices moving slowly downward and the prospect of heavy hog marketing for many months ahead.

Virgil Rohlf, ASC manager at Algona (Kossuth County), says the big increase in corn acreage there this year is on the 38 percent of the county's farms which complied with allotments when they were in effect.

"The 1959 crop looks wonderful," he says. "It looks like 100 bushels per acre." He predicts that new corn will sell for as low as 75 cents a bushel during harvest.

Rholf and members of the county ASC committee—Richard Anderson of Ledyard, George Wolf of Algona, and Andrew Fangmen of Bancroft—agree that the trend in that county is toward raising more beef cattle and fewer hogs.

Concern over the big volume of old corn reserves and the big crop in prospect is expressed by Kenneth Reed, a young farmer who lives in Kossuth county near the Minnesota border.

"It's quite a worry," he said, "and it isn't right the way it's being done now. The price is down on hogs and there are an awful

lot of cattle and hogs being fed. Nobody knows what's likely to happen."

George Eden, Reed's brother-in-law living southeast of Swea City, says, "We're set for a tremendous amount of corn, and I'm afraid it simply means more surplus for the Government. I'd like to see a lot of it made into alcohol to be mixed with gasoline.

"I hope the fellows feeding cattle don't get discouraged."

The Kossuth County ASC already has arranged 20 Government loans for financing more grain storage for farmers. And in late July there were three or four farmers a day in the office inquiring about storage facility loans.

Alvin Rasmussen, near Burt, and Johnie Tobin, near Swea City, express concern over the uncertainty of livestock prices. Rasmussen quit cattle feeding when feeders got high, is fearful of starting feeding again.

Tobin, a swine producer, says he sold brood sows recently for \$36 a head, compared with \$80 a head last year. He abandoned plans for raising fall pigs because of lower prices.

"I was planning on four farrowings a year," Tobin says, "but after prices kept slipping, I sold my sows. As it is, I'm not going to quit raising hogs, but I'm not going to hit it too heavy."

Another Kossuth County farmer, who asks that his name not be used, has this to say:

"Ninety percent of the farmers feel like I do. It's not the time to jump in or expand. And there'll be some cutback on hogs."

This farmer, who feeds cattle and raises around 150 pigs a year, predicts that the Government will eventually get a lot of the corn being produced this year, but that more and more corn will be stored a long time on the farm.

Max Soeth, former State ASC chairman and now vice president of the Emmet County State Bank at Estherville, says the present Government plan of price support for all corn raised won't work.

He proposes a back-to-grass plan similar to one used during the early years of Government crop-control programs. Under this plan, there would be a higher support price on corn and a farmer would be required to reduce corn acreage a certain percentage. He would receive a Government payment for seeding such land to grass.

AFL-CIO Interview with Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Khrushchev Visit to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the upcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev is creating a wide variety of reactions among our citizens throughout the country.

These include strong views both for and against the visit. The predominant feeling, however, appears to be that—now that the invitation has been extended and accepted—the American people should back up the President and create the climate that will enable the best results to be obtained from the exchange visit between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss various aspects of the Khrushchev visit on the AFL-CIO broadcast "Washington Reports to the People." I ask unanimous consent to have the interview printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN OF WISCONSIN, RADIO AND NEWSPAPER NETWORKS OF THE AFL-CIO

Question. Senator WILEY, do you feel the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit this country is a good idea?

Senator WILEY. Overall, I feel the upcoming visit has possibilities for positive accomplishments; at the same time, there are dangers. On the positive side, the visit can (1) correct a few of Mr. Khrushchev's misconceptions about this country; (2) confirm our peaceful intentions; (3) emphasize the unity of the country behind its leadership; (4) give the Soviet leader a real knowledge of the high standard of living of Mr. and Mrs. Average America; and (5) again emphasize that, although our policies are peaceful, we will not be pushed around.

Globally, I would hope that the Khrushchev visit would not be interpreted as a sign that we are "going soft" on communism.

President Eisenhower—the standard bearer of our policy—has made a decision that, in his judgment, will best serve the interests of our security and world peace. The American people—in a united, bipartisan manner—I believe should now give full support to that decision.

Question. Do you have any real fears of Mr. Khrushchev's personal safety while he is in this country?

Senator WILEY. Naturally, I believe that all necessary security precautions should be taken. There are a great many people—particularly from Poland, Hungary, and other captive nations—who deeply resent, and understandably so, the Premier's being invited to this country.

For the public—and our allies—it should be made abundantly clear that the invitation does not demonstrate approval of communism, or of Communist tactics, that have resulted in international tensions and dangers to peace.

As a whole, however, I am confident that the Nation will act in a mature and responsible manner.

Question. Senator WILEY, do you feel that the American people might expect too much from such a visit?

Senator WILEY. No. The years of the cold war, I believe, have conditioned our people to the Soviets' hard policies. As a result, we don't expect any magical, overnight change in Soviet programs.

Question. Do you think the exchange of visits might lead to a summit meeting later on?

Senator WILEY. The decision for a summit meeting—as I have stressed before—rests squarely on President Eisenhower. As the President has stated, such a decision would—and should—be based upon whether it would make a constructive contribution toward easing tensions and resolving East-West differences.

The Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits may or may not make a contribution toward justifying a summit conference.

Question. Do you think that the Khrushchev trip might succeed in altering some of his misconceptions of conditions in the United States?

Senator WILEY. Yes. As a matter of fact, I believe it would be worthwhile—to the degree possible—to plan his trips and contacts to achieve this objective.

at any insurance thereunder on any employee shall cease upon his separation from the service or twelve months after discontinuance of his salary payments, whichever first occurs, subject to a provision which shall be contained in the policy for temporary extension of coverage and for conversion to an individual policy of life insurance under conditions approved by the Commission.

"(b) If upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee retires on an immediate annuity and (1) his requirement is for disability or (2) he has completed twelve years of creditable service, as determined by the Commission, his life insurance only may, under conditions determined by the Commission, be continued without cost to him, but the amount of such insurance shall be reduced by 2 per centum thereof at the end of each full calendar month following the date the employee attains age sixty-five or retires, whichever is later, subject to minimum amounts prescribed by the Commission, but not less than 25 per centum of the insurance in force preceding the first such reduction. Periods of honorable active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States shall be credited toward the required twelve years provided the employee has completed at least five years of civilian service.

"(c) If upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee is receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act because of disease or injury to himself, his life insurance may, as provided in subsection (b), be continued during the period he is in receipt of such benefits and held by the United States Department of Labor to be unable to return to duty."

"(e) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall take effect as of August 17, 1954, except that (1) they shall not be applicable in any case in which the employee's death or retirement occurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and (2) nothing therein shall be construed to require salary withholdings for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. 2162 file

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE'S HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2162) to provide a health benefits program for Government employees, with Senate amendments to the House amendment, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

In lieu of subsection (a) of section 7 insert:

"(a) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this Act, in addition to the contributions required by paragraph (3), shall be 50 per centum of the lowest rates charged by a carrier for a level of benefits offered by a plan under paragraph (1) or paragraph (2)

of section 4, but (A) not less than \$1.25 or more than \$1.75 biweekly for an employee or annuitant who is enrolled for self alone, (B) not less than \$3 or more than \$4.25 biweekly for an employee or annuitant who is enrolled for self and family (other than as provided in clause (C) of this paragraph), and (C) not less than \$1.75 or more than \$2.50 biweekly for a female employee or annuitant enrolled for self and family including a nondependent husband.

"(2) For an employee or annuitant enrolled in a plan described under section 4 (3) or (4) for which the biweekly subscription charge is less than \$2.50 for an employee or annuitant enrolled for self alone or \$6 for an employee or annuitant enrolled for self and family, the contribution of the Government shall be 50 per centum of such subscription charge, except that if a nondependent husband is a member of the family of a female employee or annuitant who is enrolled for herself and family the contribution of the Government shall be 30 per centum of such subscription charge.

"(3) There shall be withheld from the salary of each enrolled employee and the annuity of each enrolled annuitant, and there shall be contributed by the Government, amounts (in the same ratio as the contributions of such employee or annuitant and the Government under paragraphs (1) and (2)) which are necessary for the administrative costs and the reserves provided for by section 8(b).

"(4) There shall be withheld from the salary of each enrolled employee or annuity of each enrolled annuitant so much as is necessary, after deducting the contribution of the Government, to pay the total charge for his enrollment. The amount withheld from the annuity of an annuitant shall be equal to the amount withheld from the salary of an employee when both are enrolled in the same plan providing the same health benefits.

After section 13, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 14. (a) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized to appoint in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, an officer who shall have such functions and duties with respect to retirement, life insurance, and health benefits programs as the Commission shall prescribe. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grade.

"(b) The rate of basic compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission shall be \$19,000 per annum."

Renumber section 14 as section 15.

Renumber section 15 as section 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I direct the Members' attention to a statement which I made on the floor of the House when this legislation was approved by the House on September 1. I wish to reemphasize the fact that when the bill was referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee after having passed the other body, it was unworkable and did not carry out the

intent of providing equitable benefits for all Federal employees.

After diligent study and lengthy hearings, our committee amended the Senate bill in order to provide legislation which is workable and which provided benefits for all Federal employees. The fact that the other body has agreed to the House language is further proof of the success of our efforts.

The chairman of the committee and myself worked for a number of days following our hearings and developed the draft which upon my motion was approved unanimously in our committee and the House also approved it overwhelmingly.

The three amendments which the Senate has made to this legislation do not relate to the basic proposal and I am prepared, therefore, to support these minor amendments, the effect of which is to—

First. Make certain that the minimum amounts for the health plans provided for in the House bill will be available for the purpose of such plans over and above the 3 percent for reserve and 1 percent for administration.

Second. Makes a grade GS-18 position available if and when the Commission decides to combine the administration of the life insurance, retirement, and health benefits programs.

Third. Adjusts the salary of the Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission in line with what we have already done with administrative assistant secretaries of the several departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of our committee I am asking the unanimous consent of the House to take up S. 2162 which provides a health benefits program for Federal employees. House agreement will send the measure on its way to the White House, where I am sure it will be approved.

This bill represents the culmination of efforts of a number of years on the part of many Members of both Houses of Congress. I particularly would like to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing the bill to our committee in the form in which it was voted out unanimously, as well as our ranking majority Member, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and other sponsors of health benefits bills. Through their efforts and the work of the entire committee and the committee staff, a bill was developed which I believe represents general consensus of opinion developed during our detailed hearings on this complex problem. We wanted to be sure that the health program we approved would in fact be the kind of a program which would meet the various requirements of the 2 million Federal employees who are expected to participate voluntarily.

17994

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 1

Briefly, these are the major provisions:

The bill makes basic and extended health protection available to 2 million employees and their families—some 4.5 million individuals—with the Government contributing 50 percent, but not less than \$1.25 or more than \$1.75 biweekly for a single employee and not less than \$3 or more than \$4.25 biweekly for an employee and family, subject to certain special exceptions.

No physical examination is required, a separated employee may convert coverage to a private plan without such examination, and no one is excluded because of race, sex, health status, or—at first opportunity to enroll—age.

There is free choice, to suit each employee's needs, among four health plans—a service plan, such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity plan, such as certain insurance companies offer; any one of several employee organization plans; and a comprehensive medical plan on either the group-practice or individual-practice prepayment basis. A wide range of hospital, surgical, medical, and related benefits will be provided, and both service and indemnity plans must have at least two levels of benefits.

The Senate amendment make these minor changes in the House-passed bill:

The minimum Government contributions in the House bill are earmarked for purchase of health plans, with small added contributions required of the Government and the employees for the 1 percent administrative cost and the 3 percent contingency reserve provided by the House bill. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission is authorized to appoint a grade GS-18 official with such retirement and health and life insurance program duties as the Commission prescribes. The compensation of the executive director of the Civil Service Commission is adjusted to \$19,000 annually, in accordance with what the Congress recently did for the administrative assistant secretaries of Government departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HODGENVILLE AND LARUE COUNTY, KY., AND THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL

(Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Hodgenville and Larue County, Ky., on their participation in the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial this year.

The birthplace of Lincoln is located near this enterprising town whose fine officials and citizens have taken a great part in the celebration of this outstanding event. The progressive, cooperative

spirit which prevades this splendid little community and with which its kind and hospitable citizens are imbued has prompted them to be significant participants in this event of national importance and magnitude. Their unselfish dedication to this cause elicits the admiration of all who love our country and its great leaders.

The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace Land Corp., of Hodgenville, Ky., devised a brilliant and imaginative plan by which the section of the Lincoln birthplace farm not owned by the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park—the name of which is now officially changed to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace—is being released to schools, historical societies, prominent citizens, and individuals for their private ownership as historical heirlooms. It is a family keepsake, if you please, that can and will be handed down from generation to generation through the family so fortunate as to own its precious soil. In the words of the corporation:

This property has been divided into square foot sections to allow as many as possible to share in this wealth of American heritage . . . a treasure with national significance which can be passed from generation to generation with a pride of ownership second to none.

The truth of this is borne out by the fact that the deed which was issued to me, giving me actual fee simple title to 1 square foot, in section No. A-202-Parcel A, of the original Lincoln birthplace land, is now framed and hanging in a prominent place in my office here in Washington.

These planners are to be congratulated upon their wisdom and foresight in finding such a unique and interesting way to perpetuate the knowledge, understanding and love of Abraham Lincoln.

As their Congressman representing the Fourth Congressional Kentucky District, I take pride in giving recognition to all of those wonderful citizens of Larue County, Ky., who have had a part, large or small, during this Lincoln Sesquicentennial Year, in paying homage and tribute to the Great Emancipator. Truly it is an honor to be able to serve such "salt of the earth" people here in the House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say a few words of praise about the magnificent job that my fellow members on the National Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, operating here in Washington, have done. These members—Hon. John Sherman Cooper, U.S. Senator, Chairman; Hon. F. Jay Nimitz, Member of Congress, Vice Chairman; Prof. William E. Baringer, Executive Director; Miss Bertha S. Adkins; Hon. Leo E. Allen, Member of Congress; Victor M. Birely; Dr. Ralph J. Bunche; Hon. Frank Chelf, Member of Congress; Hon. Frank Church, U.S. Senator; Hon. Winfield K. Denton, Member of Congress; Dr. John S. Dickey; Hon. Everett M. Dirksen, U.S. Senator; Hon. Paul H. Douglas, U.S. Senator; John B. Fisher; Hon. William E. Jenner, U.S. Senator; Hon. Peter F. Mack, Jr., Member of Congress; Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry; Dr. L. Quincy

Mumford; Rev. Paul C. Reinert; Hon. John M. Robson, Jr., Member of Congress; Walter N. Rothschild; Hon. William G. Stratton; Jouett Ross Todd; Dr. William H. Townsend; Conrad L. Wirth; Hon. Ralph Yarborough, U.S. Senator—together with their modest but most able and alert staff have really compiled a record that any Commission authorized by Congress can truly be proud to possess. As a concrete example of one of its many, many outstanding achievements, the U.S. Treasury reports that it has minted and sold over four times as many of the new Lincoln penny this year as the number of the old original Lincoln penny. This brand new coin has the usual picture of Lincoln on it but there has been added on the reverse side a beautiful design of the Lincoln Memorial. I salute Hodgenville, Larue County, our Kentucky Sesquicentennial Commission, my colleagues on the Nation Commission, and all of our Lincoln historians, collectors, individuals, societies, and organizations that have helped to properly celebrate and to commemorate the 150th birthday of that Great American—Abraham Lincoln.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMMENCING DATES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8289) to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (70 Stat. 754; 5 U.S.C. 2280) is amended—

(1) By striking out paragraph (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall commence on the day after the retired employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before the survivor's death or remarriage."

(2) By striking out the second sentence in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The annuity of such survivor shall commence on the day after the retired employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before the survivor's death."

(3) By striking out the second sentence in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) death or remarriage of the widow or widower (or (2) the widower's becoming capable of self-support."

(4) By striking out the third sentence in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The child's annuity shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of