

American way of life. This is what we hold out as a goal before many Americans. I think he is to be commended for it.

But I say that experience has shown that Mr. Henry Luce, the husband of the nominee, has evidenced consistently, and almost from month to month, the same lack of objectivity and the same lack of judgment which I fear are characteristic of the nominee.

I will not gild the lily. We know that Time magazine started as a weekly news magazine. Many years ago it was converted into a journal of plutocratic opinion, and as such it distorts the facts of American life week by week and month by month, in support of policies—no doubt honestly held by its publisher—which, in my judgment are detrimental to the best interests of the United States, policies which came very close, no more than a month ago, to getting us into what might well have turned into a revolution in Bolivia, or perhaps a war. Our diplomacy was held up to scorn over a large area of Latin America. Why? Because of the desire to make a "slick chick" wisecrack in a widely read magazine published in Spanish throughout Latin America, and repeated in the English edition.

We know what happened to the China policy which Mr. Luce advocated. At the time there were those who thought that was an indication of lack of objectivity and lack of judgment. I hope we are not to have a repetition in Brazil of the situation which occurred in Bolivia, under a Latin American policy which would carry with it equally disastrous results.

On the 19th of March of this year I had occasion, as shown on page 4588 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to insert in the RECORD an article by a very able reporter on the Providence Journal-Bulletin. This article was an effort to analyze Time magazine in an article which was subsequently printed in the New Republic. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the excerpts from that article which appear upon that page in the RECORD. I read the concluding paragraph, which is a quotation from the late William Allen White:

I think on the whole, sooner or later, the American people do get the truth. But they often get it when it is cold potatoes and does them no good.

I say it with deep regret, but I do not believe that the affiliations of Mrs. Luce and the attitude of mind of her husband—again, no doubt honestly held, because he thinks that is the way to do things—are very helpful to the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore I am reluctantly compelled to vote against confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be our Ambassador to Brazil, on the ground that the record shows that she does not have the necessary experience, objectivity, or judgment, and that her relationship with the Luce newspaper empire is, in my judgment, likely, if not certain, to hurt the status of the United States in the country to which she seeks accreditation.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so long as there will be no more speeches on the nomination of Mrs. Luce today, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

#### MODIFICATION OF REORGANIZATION PLANS NO. II OF 1939, AND NO. 2 OF 1953—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 25)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 144, "An act to modify Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953."

The bill provides that, in the approval and disapproval of loans, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) shall not be subject to the supervision, direction or other control of the Secretary of Agriculture. In all other respects the functions and activities of the REA would be exercised within the Department of Agriculture under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary.

Were S. 144 to become law it would mark a major retreat from sound administrative policy and practice. Twenty years ago the REA, then an independent agency, was by reorganization plan placed within the Department of Agriculture and under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary. The President, in his message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939, said that the proposed reorganization was for the "sole purpose of improving the administrative management of the executive branch."

That action of 20 years ago accords entirely with the later finding of the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch that:

There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent of that of his superior.

Because S. 144 violates this sound injunction I am compelled to disapprove it.

Moreover, there is nothing in the recent history of the REA which affords

any basis for concluding that the best interest of the agency or the public would be served by removing the Administrator's loan-making authority from the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The REA since its inception has moved steadily in the accomplishment of its mission. When the agency was established, only a small percentage of the Nation's farms had central station electric service. Today 96 percent of our farmers have such service and about one-half the increase has been provided by REA financed facilities.

In the past 6 years the REA-financed systems have made their greatest progress. Loans of more than a billion dollars have been made in this period, nearly half as much as was loaned by the agency in the previous 17½ years of its existence. Power sales have more than doubled since 1952, loan delinquencies have been reduced to the vanishing point and the net worth of electric borrowers has more than tripled. Plant investment for these systems has more than doubled in the past decade. The REA telephone loan program, authorized in 1949, has resulted in loan approvals which now total approximately \$500 million and modern dial telephone service is rapidly being extended to the Nation's rural areas.

The REA has been working well and progressing efficiently under the existing administrative arrangements. The change in those arrangements proposed by S. 144 would be contrary to the public interest.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 27, 1959.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a copy of the message of the President was made available earlier today to Members of the Senate. Now we have heard read to the Senate the veto message relating to Senate bill 144.

I say most respectfully that the message does not get to the heart of the proposed legislation. The proposed legislation did not deal with the number of loans that had been made or the amount of the loans, or the purposes for which the loans had been made. The bill was directed toward one thing, and only one thing, namely, the possibility of political interference in the granting of loans by the Rural Electrification Administration through the Secretary of Agriculture. The legislation was directed toward the commitment, which had been given by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, at the time the Reorganization Plan of 1953 went into effect, that if any changes were to be made in the administrative structure of REA and its relationship to the Department of Agriculture, the appropriate committees of Congress would be notified prior to those changes being made.

Those changes were made. The committees were not notified. The promise and the assurance of the Secretary of Agriculture were not fulfilled, and the fears of many Members of the Senate, expressed at the time of the adoption