

companies \$100 million a year, since they would know in advance where to ship their oil and could cut inventories elsewhere. In one way or another, almost every aspect of human activity is affected by the weather, affected in terms of actual costs of operation.

How can satellites increase the accuracy of our forecasts? One way is by observing and mapping variations in the earth's cloud cover. We know that clouds reflect back into space 10 to 12 percent of the sun's heat which otherwise would reach the earth's surface. Since it is this heat that warms the atmosphere and powers the terrestrial heat engine that gives us winds and storms, variations in the cloud cover have a profound effect upon our weather. But we do not yet know how, when, and to what extent these variations occur.

The primitive experiments now underway, such as the many cloud photographs taken by the satellite Tiros, indicate that we are on the threshold of unimagined advances in our knowledge of meteorology. In the long run, increased understanding of climatic trends may prove more important than improvements in day-to-day forecasting. Man's earthly environment changes constantly. After all, New York was in the grip of an ice age probably not more than 20,000 years ago, hardly any time in geologic terms.

We do not yet know, although we should, what will be the ultimate effects on our environment of the simple activity of burning up the earth's fossil fuels—coal and oil—and discharging the resulting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Improved knowledge of meteorology has an enormous bearing on mankind's welfare in the future.

Astronomy offers another example of how space activity can pay off in terms of scientific research. Satellite-borne telescopes, outside the earth's atmosphere, will show the heavens with new clarity. From these studies, it seems likely, we shall learn not only much about the origin and character of the universe, but also new information about the basic physical processes of things about us.

Finally, space exploration will extend to the moon and planets. The first steps will be taken by placing a man in orbit around the earth and bringing him back—Project Mercury. A suborbital test flight is imminent, probably before the end of the year. Then will come visits to the Moon made by unmanned craft equipped with instruments to study their targets as they circle them, and radio their findings back to Earth. Next will come unmanned vehicles that can be landed, made to gather samples of the surface, and relaunched to return to earth; and, at length, manned vehicles.

No one can predict just what the material payoff will be, but as John A. Johnson, General Counsel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has said:

"It is the thought of man being projected into a totally alien environment, whether in orbit about the Earth, or standing for the first time on the Moon, or preparing to land on another planet, that makes the whole business the most exciting enterprise of our age."

Certainly, landings of instruments on the moon to relay back information will be possible within 3 or 4 years. But to take man out, to give him protection, to equip him for useful work, and to return him is a project that will require at least a decade.

The foreign affairs problems in the scientific space field are fourfold. First, there is the need for international cooperation in tracking and communicating with space vehicles. Not only must there be observation stations in different countries around the globe but there must be agreements to clear specific radio channels for space use.

Second, there must be agreements for the exchange of data received from satellites, and of the codes whereby they can be "read."

Clearly, scientists of a nation cooperating in the collection of data will want to share in their interpretation.

Third, scientists of nonlaunching nations must be given access to space. Agreements permitting them to use facilities aboard space vehicles for their own experiments are necessary if we are to avoid envy and hatred—and if we are to advance science by drawing upon the best men, regardless of nationality.

Fourth, international agreement on the biological decontamination of space vehicles is of the utmost importance. If there is life on other planets, even in the most elementary forms of viruses or bacteria, it is vital that it be identified without any confusion introduced by bringing earthly forms of microorganisms.

Fortunately, international scientific cooperation in space dates from the very beginnings of space activity, under the International Council of Scientific Unions, in the organization of the International Geophysical Year. It is being continued in the work of a worldwide group known as the Committee on Space Research (Cospar), which held its first international symposium on space science in Nice in January of this year.

The United Nations, too, is working in this field through its Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The first U.N. International Conference on Outer Space is to be held sometime next year. Out of these discussions can come intelligent planning for the necessary steps toward international cooperation and agreement.

These are some of the payoffs that we can expect from a solid program of space research. Without international controls on the use of space, however, the possibilities for good will become sources of serious international tensions—possibly even of space war.

For the moment, we have a period of respite while nations develop new and more sophisticated forms of space activity. We must hope that the nations use it for serious discussions leading to agreements that will enable space research to exploit its existing opportunities and benefit all mankind to the full.

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SPACE ACT (H.R. 12049)

The proposed amendments to the Space Act involve three principal areas of change, relating to (1) patent provisions, (2) organization, and (3) indemnification.

Analysis of the key issues involved fails to uncover any persuasive reasons for pressing for Senate action on these amendments during the current session.

One fact is of overriding importance. A new President will take office on January 20, 1961—less than 5 months from now. The next President could well have different views as to organization and functions of the military and civilian space programs. Any changes in the Space Act at this session will have little or no effect on the space programs during these next few months, but could restrict the freedom of action of the next President.

PATENT PROVISIONS

The Space Committee has received approximately 100 letters from corporations and patent lawyers, urging acceptance of the patent provisions of the House bill. Several Members of the Congress have notified the committee that they wish to testify in opposition to any such action to change existing NASA patent provisions.

Senator O'MAHONEY has informed the committee that his Judiciary Subcommittee is surveying patent policies of all Government agencies, preparatory to possible action to establish a uniform patent policy for the Government as a whole.

The following factors would affect any attempt to act on the patent provisions during the current session:

1. The proposed changes are controversial. The House appointed a special subcommittee which spent months on the problem. Senate action would also require considerable time for committee hearings and committee discussion. Floor debate on committee proposals would unquestionably be extensive.

2. It has been alleged that the present patent provisions deter corporations from seeking NASA contracts. However, this agreement appears to be largely based on theoretical considerations and hearsay.

In recent months, industry has demonstrated increasing interest in getting NASA contracts.

3. There is obvious need for a more uniform governmentwide policy on patents. Since NASA is operating successfully under existing patent provisions, it would appear logical to defer any changes in the law until they could be related to a uniform governmentwide patent policy.

ORGANIZATION

Last year, a subcommittee of the Senate Space Committee, with Senator SYMINGTON as chairman, held hearings on governmental organization for space activities. All the witnesses unanimously recommended against changes in the Space Act, on the ground that existing problems and deficiencies could best be solved by administrative actions taken under existing law. Despite this unanimous testimony the executive branch requested certain changes in the Space Act at the beginning of this session.

The following factors would affect any attempt to act on organization changes during the current session:

1. Although the House passed a bill along the lines requested by the administration, there has been no conclusive testimony as to the need for the changes. The record fails to show a single specific illustration of anything which should be done but which cannot be done under the existing Space Act.

2. The House bill would abolish the National Aeronautics and Space Council. Without passing judgment on whether this is desirable, such action clearly is not urgent, since the Space Council has met only once this year—on January 12, 1960. No meetings have been held since the President recommended abolition of the Space Council, and the Acting Executive Secretary of the Space Council has stated that no future meetings are planned.

3. The House bill would abolish the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee (CMLC) between NASA and the Department of Defense. This already seems to be an accomplished fact, however, since there has been no sign of any CMLC activity since the resignation of its Chairman, Mr. Holaday, on April 30, 1960. No successor has been appointed.

4. The House bill would establish an "Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board" to take the place of CMLC. NASA, Department of Defense, and Bureau of the Budget recommended against statutory creation of such a Board. However, Dr. Glennan has testified that such a Board was being created by administrative action. This clearly demonstrates that there is adequate authority under existing law for the establishment of any coordinating groups or mechanisms considered necessary or desirable.

5. The House bill includes a provision (the McCormack amendment) which states affirmatively that: "The Department of Defense shall undertake such activities in space, and such research and development connected therewith, as may be necessary for the defense of the United States."

The administration objects to this language and advocates only including a disclaimer provision to the effect that: "Noth-

ing in this act shall preclude the Department of Defense from undertaking such activities involving the utilization of space as may be necessary for the defense of the United States."

The arguments pro and con are frankly fuzzy. As a practical matter, any policy disputes between NASA and the Department of Defense would be resolved by the President, which is exactly what is contemplated by existing law.

INDEMNIFICATION

Early during the first session of the 86th Congress, NASA and the Department of Defense submitted separate but identical proposals for authority to indemnify all contractors against unusually hazardous risks involved in space and military programs. The Armed Services Committee felt that no action was needed on the Department of Defense proposal. Because of the close interrelationship, no action was taken on the NASA proposal.

At the beginning of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, NASA requested authority to indemnify only contractors engaged in research and development contracts against unusual risks. It was pointed out that the Department of Defense has possessed such statutory authority since 1952.

While the Department of Defense has had authority to indemnify research and development contractors (but not production contractors) since 1952, this authority has never been exercised. This authority is meant to cover disaster situations that could involve hundreds of millions of dollars. As a practical matter, it is hard to conceive any Government agency trying to make any such settlement except after presentation of all the facts to the Congress, particularly since no funds would be available for any such huge expenditures. In the event of demonstrated need, appropriate legislative action could be taken promptly, on the basis of actual facts rather than hypothetical conjecture.

For this reason, the proposed indemnification authority appears to provide little more than an acknowledgment that the Government will stand behind any defense contractor for any claims arising out of unusually hazardous risks in research and development contracts. Clearly, the space program will not be affected by deferring action on this proposal until the next session of the Congress.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is in the Chamber. I am informed that he desires to offer to a bill now on the calendar certain amendments which would deal with the housing situation, so as to prevent certain programs from being shut down when they expire at an early date. Will the Senator from Alabama tell us how long he thinks it will take to consider the extension amendments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would not require any time more than to make a mere explanation; and I think the explanation could be simply this: The amendments will be the identical provisions lifted from the housing bill which the Senate accepted, which are noncontroversial, and which, I think I can say, are clearly nonpartisan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] leaves the floor, I should like to ask him if he is agreeable to the suggestion made by the Senator

from Alabama, to take three noncontroversial provisions from the housing bill as passed by the Senate, and to consider them as an amendment to another bill, so that the House may act before the program expires.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; if I may have 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to state his view?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I am a member of the committee and am very much interested in housing. Like the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I have been apprised of the whole situation. I am quite prepared to coincide with it, but I should like to have 5 or 6 minutes in which to interrogate the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me, since we have been over this ground many times before, and the amendments are acceptable to the administration, that we have 10 minutes on a side. I should think that would be enough.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to have 5 or 6 minutes. The Senator from Illinois knows why. He and I have discussed the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what assurance is there that only those items will be dealt with by amendment? What will prevent other amendments from being offered to try to embody what is in the original bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have canvassed the situation with respect to Senators who had intended to offer other amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the majority leader, what will be his position if an effort is made to expand the efforts into fields which are not contemplated by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want to pass judgment unless I had seen some of the proposals. However, I believe the Senator from Alabama would be within his rights to move to table them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as it relates to housing, if the Senator from Ohio means other provisions in the omnibus housing bill, I recognize the realities of the situation. The Senate passed a good housing bill. I think all of us will agree to that. But we know we do not have a chance to get that bill through Congress. There are three housing programs which need immediate attention. First, the FHA title I, home repair and improvement program will expire in a few more days; second, the college housing loan program has no funds, and, third, the community facilities loan program for needed public facilities for small towns and cities is out of funds. Perhaps it is worthwhile to note that the President requested funds for the third program I mentioned. The amendment I offer relates to these three programs only. We consider them to be noncontroversial. I certainly would oppose the bringing up of any other amendments, and I would move to table them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would have to oppose any other amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when

the measure relating to housing amendments is called up, there be a limitation of debate not to exceed 15 minutes on a side, the agreement to be in the usual form.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree thoroughly with the Senator as to the program. I question the propriety of the agreement. We had an agreement the other day which did not then provide for amendments. With all respect, that is what we ought to be doing. I shall not object to this request. Does not the majority leader feel, nevertheless, that he should provide for the possibility of other amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not. If other amendments were proposed, the whole matter would be opened up, and everything we now have would be destroyed. The House has to act, and we know that these are the three things we want to have passed.

Mr. JAVITS. There will be nothing to stop any Senator from submitting an amendment anyway. There would not be any time to discuss amendments. I am perfectly willing to agree to the proposal. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPROVED TELEVISION SERVICE AND SCHEDULE OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION HEARINGS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and particularly the Subcommittee on Communications, has been working for a number of years on the problem of bringing television service to smaller communities. Extensive hearings have been held by this committee. In fact, my subcommittee held field hearings in five States in the West, last year, on this very subject. A report, entitled "The Television Inquiry—TV Service for Smaller Communities," was issued in December 1958.

Proposed legislation in the form of a measure regulating community antenna television systems was reported by this committee, and after extensive debate has been recommitted to the committee, for further study.

In addition, a specific bill, S. 1886, relating to certain authority relating to television boosters was passed by the Senate and the House, and has now been signed into law.

It is heartening to note that the Federal Communications Commission has moved promptly to exercise its new authority, recently voted by Congress, to regulate certain rebroadcasting activities.

The legislation was signed by the President on July 7, 1960, as Public Law 86-609. It permits the FCC to authorize unattended operation of TV translators and also to grant licenses for such devices, even though they had been constructed without prior FCC authorization.

Within 3 weeks after such legislation was approved, the FCC adopted rules to provide for the licensing of VHF and UHF translators under modest technical requirements designed to minimize the hazard of harmful interference from these low-power devices. The new FCC rules provide a reasonable period of time for existing unlicensed stations to comply with the new regulations. During this interim period, temporary authorizations will be issued for the operation of these devices.

On August 22, the FCC dispatched a team of experts in its broadcast, field engineering, and legal units into centrally located cities in the Western States, to meet with TV booster operators and to advise them how to obtain interim authority for continued operation while preparing to convert to new

low-power VHF translator authorizations. The Commission is to be commended for taking the initiative in rendering this public service to the operators of these installations, many of which are located in small, isolated communities. In most instances the operators are unfamiliar with the legal and technical requirements of the Commission.

At these meetings the FCC experts explained the purpose of the new legislation and gave technical advice and assistance to such operators in filing applications for temporary authorizations under the new procedures. State and national representatives of TV repeater groups are also cooperating with the FCC staff in these meetings.

The revised schedule of meetings is as follows:

City	Place	Date	Time
Prescott, Ariz.	Public Service Co. auditorium	Aug. 23	9 a.m.
Denver, Colo.	State capital, senate chamber	Aug. 24	1 p.m.
Casper, Wyo.	Townsend Hotel	Aug. 25	11 a.m.
Miles City, Mont.	Elks Club	Aug. 27	11 a.m.
Great Falls, Mont.	DeMolay Youth Center	Aug. 29	11 a.m.
Wenatchee, Wash.	Regional library	Aug. 30	11:30 a.m.
Salt Lake City, Utah	State capitol, Governor's board room	Sept. 1	9 a.m.
Redmond, Ore.	Westminster Hall	do.	1 p.m.
Pocatello, Idaho	City hall	Sept. 2	11 a.m.
Grand Junction, Colo.	KREX-TV auditorium	do.	1 p.m.
Rapid City, S. Dak.	(Mr. Larry Owens, chamber of commerce, to arrange place of meeting.)	Sept. 3	2 p.m.

NEW FARM PROGRAM NEEDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, despite the fact that the Eisenhower administration has poured more than \$40 billion into its agriculture programs, the economic plight of the Nation's farmers continues to worsen. At the same time, Government warehouses are bulging at the seams with surplus farm products that flow in endlessly.

If our present Republican farm program should continue to be followed, there is every likelihood that the situation will continue to deteriorate. The unfortunate Eisenhower-Benson policies have proven, beyond a doubt, that this Republican administration is unable to cope with the problems facing the American farmer. No wonder Vice President Nixon recently publicly dissociated himself from the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies.

In 1952 President Eisenhower promised 100 percent of parity. The parity ratio is lower today than at any time since 1940. During the last 7 years, this administration, under the guidance of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, has reduced parity drastically on every basic farm program in existence except for tobacco and wool, which has been maintained at roughly 110 percent. Of course, people produce wool in Secretary Benson's State and in other Western States.

FARMERS' FLIGHT WORSENS

From 1952 to 1959 farm income dropped 35 percent, and the farmer's share of the food dollar decreased by 19 percent. American farmers last year received \$11 billion less for their products than they did in 1951, while consumers paid \$7.4 billion more for these same food products.

At the same time, farm distress sales went up 27 percent; surpluses increased by 636 percent; farm debt rose by 43 percent; and the farmers' production expenses soared 15 percent.

In 1958 the income per person on the farm was approximately half the income per person off the farm.

With production costs rising and prices for farm products declining, the producers of our country's food and fiber, caught in this cost-price squeeze, are finding it increasingly difficult to operate.

The much-heralded Eisenhower soil bank program has proven a dismal failure. Farm income has dropped; prices have skyrocketed; surpluses have become unmanageable. As a result, the family farmer is virtually disappearing from the American scene. More than 3 million persons have been driven from the farm since 1952.

It is easier for the farmer to put his land, or at least his most unproductive acres, in the soil bank and take a job in the city than to struggle under Republican programs for a meager living on his farm. The great midwestern heartland of America is gradually becoming a vast economically depressed area.

Faced with discouragement on every side, the small family farmer feels that there is no longer hope in the land. Republican farm policies have made it easy for the large corporate interests and huge farm syndicates to seize our Nation's vast acres of farmlands.

EIGHT YEARS OF WEAK POLICIES

This administration has not offered us a sound farm program in nearly 8 years. Its policies have weakened the ability of the Government to aid farmers, have driven the young people from the land,

and are stifling our smalltown business communities. Must we have only huge corporate farms in our country?

Only recently, after his nomination, the Republican candidate for the Presidency admitted that both the country and the farmers need a fresh approach to the farm problem. He stated it is essential that we abandon the rigid positions of the last 8 years and adopt new leaders and new programs, not wedded to the past. We have yet to hear what his proposed new programs will be.

If the past is any indication, it might be recalled that in 1954 this same man predicted that the verdict of history will be that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been one of the best Secretaries of Agriculture in our history and that he was a friend of the farmer.

In 1956, he said that he was confident the Republican farm program was right and that if continued it would bring the farmer unparalleled prosperity.

In February of this year, the Republican candidate hailed Secretary Benson as the greatest Secretary of Agriculture in our country's history.

Now he has suddenly had a change of heart. The same Secretary of Agriculture that he hailed as the greatest in our country's history will be forced to walk the plank of political expediency if the Vice President is elected in November.

Mr. President, I must say that in this regard I agree with the Vice President. I am delighted to see him finally come around to the viewpoint the Democratic Party has taken for the past 8 years. It is always heartening to receive converts to the principles of the Democratic Party, especially one so notable as the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

But try as he may, this candidate cannot divorce himself, with a few words, from 8 years of the fantastically expensive and yet bankrupt farm policy of the Eisenhower administration.

PROGRAM COSTS SOAR

Under President Eisenhower, the cost of all Federal farm programs exceeded \$7 billion in 1959 alone. Under President Truman in 1952, his last year in office, all these programs cost taxpayers less than \$700 million—one-tenth of the cost last year under President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson.

Throughout the Truman administration, the farm program cost less than \$14 billion.

The farmer received 90 percent of parity, could pay his taxes, bills, and feed his family. The total cost of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson farm programs will exceed \$40 billion. Now the farmer is having trouble holding on to his land, much less making a living. Empty promises do not pay off mortgages.

Mr. President, there is no farm problem. It is an American problem. As long as human beings require food, anything that concerns the men who grow it concerns everyone.

It is not, nor is it going to be, an easy problem to solve. Great imagination, intelligence, skill, and foresight will be required. Most important, it will require human compassion and understanding—our farmers must no longer

be looked upon as nothing more than mere economic units. This is a human problem as well as an economic one. As such, we must have humane solutions.

Prosperity for our farmers can be brought about only by passage of good workable legislation that will boost the income of farm families, and by re-vamping our lopsided national economy into some semblance of equality between industrial workers and farmers.

During the past 6 years Congress has tried again and again to legislate toward this end. Each time it was met by the veto. With the election of a Democratic President and Congress, we can begin to take steps toward curing this nagging cancer in our economy.

Mr. President, it is not only our farmers, businessmen, and consumers who have suffered as a result of our farm policies during the past 8 years.

The hundreds of millions of people—over half the world's population—who go to sleep hungry every night have also suffered.

At the present time we have over \$7 billion of food in storage throughout the Nation. For the first time in history a Nation is faced with the problem of how to dispose of its food, while millions throughout the world are starving.

OVER \$1,000 A MINUTE

Every day of the year American taxpayers are paying over \$1.5 million rent or over \$1,000 a minute to store our surplus food products even as they spoil. Last year it was \$612 million; this year \$700 million. Who knows to what heights this cost will rise? Rats are the principal beneficiaries while human beings both at home and abroad go hungry.

Is there any better weapon for the Communist dictators of Russia and Red China to use against us than pictures of our granaries straining at the seams with surplus food?

Mr. President, our agricultural policy is a vital part of our foreign policy. Food is the universal language. It can bring us the gratitude of the peoples of the world or it can bring us their enmity. The choice is ours.

Expert dietitians tell us that it takes from 2,500 to 3,000 calories per day for an average man to carry on his daily activities. The daily per capita consumption in most parts of Asia is 1,000 calories. For these people there is little energy left for building schools, hospitals, and highways or to defend themselves and work their farms.

If we sincerely wish to establish sound democratic governments and institutions in this area and in all the underprivileged nations of the world, we must help them to help themselves.

In sharing with them the blessing of our bountiful food supply—a supply not yet really tapped—we will earn their undying gratitude and do more to further democracy and combat communism than could be accomplished with guns and tanks.

At the same time, we shall be putting to use billions of bushels of food, storage of which is paid for by taxpayers, and which is presently inexcusably going to waste.

In doing so, there is no need to upset the world produce market or to destroy existing channels of trade. This tired old argument has been constantly used by people of little imagination to defeat any real food for peace program.

Mr. President, I am speaking of feeding the hungry people of the world who today do not and cannot buy food. They do not understand world market conditions and economic statistics. They are hungry—their sole aim in life from sunrise to sunset is to scratch enough food to keep their families alive.

To feed these people and the hungry of our own Nation will upset nothing except, perhaps, the Communists who thrive on human misery.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. President, we can do this by ourselves. Better yet, we can utilize the machinery of the United Nations to distribute our surplus food to the starving millions of the world.

There could then be no change of "Yankee imperialism" or greedy self-aggrandizement. With one bold stroke—a move that would not cost us one additional dollar—we could regain the good neighbor image of America—the true image of America—painstakingly created by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, this is a time for boldness. For too long the image of America has been allowed to deteriorate through our carelessness and through Communist propaganda into that of a money-hungry, luxury-loving, over-stuffed land.

In what better way can we reveal to the world our real image and our true purposes than by offering our surplus food to the community of nations through its established organization—the United Nations?

At the same time, we will be helping to solve our farm problem and to restore dignity and prosperity to American farmers.

The mistakes of the past are over and done. Farmers will remember in November who has been for them and who has been against them. We must look to the future. As the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has said, we must establish and explore new frontiers. Next year, under leadership of a Democratic President, an all-out food for peace program may be launched as a realistic farm program will surely be formulated.

"LAND, WOOD, AND WATER"—BOOK WRITTEN BY SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all of us know of the fine constructive mind possessed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

All of us know also that he is one of the great public speakers of our time.

Not all of us know, however, that he is an outstanding author.

ROBERT S. KERR has written a very informative, a very readable, and very timely book, entitled "Land, Wood, and Water."

The title was inspired by his father, Sam, who traveled horseback from Bakersfield, Missouri, to Ellis County, Texas; and thence, with his new wife, Maggie, by covered wagon to Ada, Oklahoma, where they built a log cabin which became the birthplace of our colleague.

Senator KERR says that his parents were in search of three necessary elements to the existence of the pioneer—land, rich enough to produce their crops; wood, for the buildings and fuel; and water, clean enough for their household use—bountiful enough in the form of rainfall to produce their food, feed, and fiber.

In this magnificent book our colleague explains why the future of America and the future of the world both depend on what we do about the natural resources we possess.

Mr. President, who in our midst is more qualified to speak out on this subject?

When BOB KERR came to the Senate, he sought membership on the committees dealing with these important subjects. It did not take long for all to realize that here was a man of vision, of knowledge, and leadership in the field of natural resources.

Senator KERR now serves as chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, and in that position is bringing forcefully to our attention the need for a forthright handling of the water problem of this Nation.

By his portrayal of the lack of conservation and the excess of pollution of our water resources, he has shocked most out of their complacency and won converts to his theme of land, wood, and water.

His exposé of this situation has helped in both political parties writing vigorous action planks on natural resources into both party platforms.

As chairman of the important Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control of the Public Works Committee, BOB KERR has brought to us some of the most important legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

I refer to such acts as the Water Supply Act of 1958, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Niagara Power Act, the Upstream Flood Control Act, the TVA Financing Act, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1958 and 1960. These are only a few of the legislative monuments to this superb leader in the field of water resources.

This book will be of special interest to our Senate colleagues because although the book was published in a political year, it is singularly free from partisanship and sounds a keynote for unity.

The introduction to the book was written by our distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. He sets the tone of the book when he says: "Water must not be a partisan subject. Water policy simply does not belong in politics. Water is the indispensable resource for the people. It is not a resource for our parties or partisans. The issue of water is action versus inaction—to win or not to win."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?