

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Roberts, John G.: Files

Folder Title: JGR/President's Health
(3 of 5)

Box: 43

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

ening of the bonds of friendship between our two countries. Mrs. Eisenhower joins me in sending you warm regards.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: Chancellor Adenauer's message follows:

*His Excellency
Dwight D. Eisenhower
President of the United States*

In this moment of departing from the United States, my thoughts and all my best wishes are with you, dear Mr. President. I am happy in the assurance that your recovery is making rapid progress. The talks which I have had with you and Secretary of

State Dulles have enhanced my consciousness of the profound fundamental community of our views and opinions. The other fruitful opportunities for exchanging ideas with key figures have shown me that this community has a broad and secure foundation in the public mind. Let me thank you sincerely also on behalf of those with me for the hospitable and memorable days.

Yours very devoted.

KONRAD ADENAUER

130 ¶ Exchange of Messages Between the President and Prime Minister Nehru of India Concerning the Postponement of His Visit.
June 25, 1956

[Released June 25, 1956. Dated June 24, 1956]

My dear Mr. Prime Minister:

I have just received and read your gracious message. I have been eagerly looking forward to a visit from you and the opportunity it would give of personal talks between us. While my convalescence proceeds according to schedule and I may take a brief trip to Panama toward the end of July, I cannot be entirely free of doubt as to whether my recuperation will be far enough advanced by July 7th to have the kind of talks which we both had in mind. I know that you would not want to come here

merely for a round of official ceremonies. For your visit to be worth your while there should be assurance that we could have frank and perhaps even somewhat protracted talks, such as we have promised ourselves. That might well be possible for me by July 7th, but I cannot now be certain of this, and I know that you yourself cannot let the decision wait until the last moment.

Under all the circumstances, I am inclined, with truly deep regret, to adopt your considerate suggestion that your visit to the United States be postponed until there can be complete assurance that it would have the character which we both had in mind. I hope that the delay will not be for long and that you will, at your convenience, suggest another date. This I assure you is meant as an urgent invitation.

Again thanking you for your good wishes and for your kindly consideration, I am, with high personal esteem,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: The message from the Prime Minister of India follows:

My dear Mr. President:

I have been much gratified to learn of the continuing progress of your recovery from your recent illness, but feel that the programme of our personal talks should not impose an additional strain on you during your convalescence. I am most anxious that this should be avoided, and suggest therefore for your consideration that my visit to the United

States might be postponed. I had been looking forward greatly to the opportunity of personal talks with you, but I think it still more important that no undue strain should be placed upon you in the coming weeks which might in any way retard your progress to full recovery. I send my warm personal regards and best wishes for your speedy and complete restoration to normal health.

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

These messages were released at Walter Reed Army Hospital.

your presence in the United States. The warm response which your visit elicited here was a reflection of the strong friendship which we feel toward the Argentine Republic, as well as an impressive tribute to you personally. You may take pride in the impression which you created in the United States as the vigorous leader of a determined and forward-looking nation.

I welcomed this opportunity to get to know you and to learn at first hand your views on matters in which our Governments have a joint and continuing interest as partners in the community of free nations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: President Frondizi's message follows:

I depart from the United States with a spirit overflowing with the emotions experienced during my stay in your great country. Permit me to express again my most sincere gratitude for the courtesies shown me during the course of the trip which I have just completed, the recollection of which will, for so many reasons, remain always with me. These have been days of true American brotherhood, the

beneficial results of which for the promotion of friendship and constructive solidarity among the nations of the continent will be made increasingly evident with the passage of time.

I extend my most sincere wishes for the happiness of the American people and for the personal well-being of their illustrious leader.

ARTURO FRONDISI

The messages were released at Thomasville, Ga.

29 ¶ The President's News Conference of February 10, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT. I should like to speak for a moment about Secretary Dulles.

As you know, he has applied for a leave of absence from his duties for some weeks to undergo a real physical check-up and for repair of a hernia.

I can't tell you how disappointed I am to know that he has had to go in the hospital, but how pleased I am that he has finally recognized that he just must do this. I have long urged him to do it.

But, because of the fact that I believe he is the most valuable man in foreign affairs that I have ever known, I believe that every clear-thinking man in the United States—I didn't mean to use "man" specifically; man and woman—any clear-thinking man or woman in the United States would pray for his early recovery and his complete restoration to

vigor and health so he can get back on the job. America needs him and I think each one of us needs him.

I believe his performance over 6 years has been remarkable, a brilliant one, and I think it's almost a miracle that he hasn't had to go for a longer period of rest and healing than he is now undergoing.

The next thing I wanted to mention was this disaster in St. Louis. I believe the reports so far showed about 17 killed and about 300 people hurt as a result of this tornado. Mr. Hoegh has got his OCDM man on the job in St. Louis. He's got disaster experts on the way there. All the departments of Government have been alerted to giving every possible assistance to the mayor and to the local authorities. As of the moment, at least, the hospitals are capable of taking the injured in and caring for them, and there seems to be no danger that the matter cannot be handled locally and with such support as can be given, both money-wise and facilitywise, from the Federal Government, and handled as well as such sad things can be handled. At least they are on the job, every one of them.

That's all.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, could you size up the picture regarding Berlin from the standpoint of the Western allies, in the light of Mr. Dulles' latest report to you yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would think, Mr. Arrowsmith, there is very little to add to his statement. As he came back, he made the statement at the airport, and he told that he detected a greater unified purpose among the Western allies, their firmness in their purpose of enforcing their rights and not accepting the theory that the Soviets could abandon their agreed responsibilities and transfer them to officials or to the GDR.

Now I think that the points he made speak for themselves, and I don't think there is much to add to it.

Q. John Hightower, Associated Press: Mr. President, do you think that Mr. Dulles' illness would in any way delay the preparation for possible negotiations with the Soviet Union, or delay the negotiations themselves?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, not so far as I know. Of course the doctors don't make any exact predictions as to when a satisfactory return to his health will be achieved. But there has been suggested, for example, a foreign ministers meeting between the Soviets and some of the West-

ern allies. That would take some preparation. There has been no agreement.

I believe the Russians themselves are more concerned, Mr. Khrushchev is concerned, in a head of government meeting, as he calls an informal and without an agenda type. Well, that would take still a great deal of preparation.

Actually, I think that Mr. Dulles is very hopeful that after he has the operation over, that he will get more time to do a little thinking at leisure about some of our European problems than he does normally here, badgered as he is by all kinds of requests for statements and speeches and going abroad and all the chores of the day. I think he is hopeful that he is going to get to think more about it, and I would really believe there would be no delay whatsoever in this kind of negotiation.

Q. J. F. Ter Horst, Detroit News: Mr. President, there has been a growing impression, or at least reports around the country, that in the course of the pursuit of normal military intelligence the U.S. planes sometimes play fox and hounds along the Turkish border in order to cause Soviet interceptors to scramble, and that therefore, or thereby, we can gain some knowledge of their preparedness and their procedures.

Was the plane that was shot down, our plane that was shot down last September, on such a mission?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I will answer the first part of it very specifically: the orders are very strict on this matter. Now occasionally there are errors in navigation and sometimes there are storms and things of that kind; once in a while we believe there are false radio signals that will take a plane out of course. But any thought of playing fox and hounds, as you call it, to cause scrambling is contrary to orders.

Actually, I have forgotten now the limit, but I established it personally, sometime back a couple of years ago, and I am sure that this happening is accidental.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Can you tell us what progress is being made on that new committee you mentioned in your state of the Union address——

THE PRESIDENT. You mean——

Q. Mr. Brandt: ——on social trends. It's getting mixed up with Mr. Nixon's committee, I think.

THE PRESIDENT. No, it is not to be mixed up. It is sharply differentiated.

Actually, what I'm doing is to find the man who is capable of heading such a committee and who has the time to do it. I have had three or four in mind, and one is coming to see me in a day or so. I am pushing as hard as I can; but again, like it was in the assembly of the Civil Rights Commission, these things are not easy, to get exactly the right personnel you want.

Q. Harold R. Levy, *Newsday*: There are reports that the State Department's recommendation that Mr. Labouisse be appointed the Director of the ICA were, in effect, vetoed by Mr. Alcorn on political grounds.

Would you tell us, sir, what role the national committee plays in the selection of appointees?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I'll tell you one thing: no one has got a right to veto or attempt to veto any selection I may make for appointment to any office.

Now, in every vacancy that occurs, we try to find a man that can fill it adequately, and with credit to himself, as well as to benefit the Government.

It is undoubtedly true, and everybody knows, that political considerations come in; but they are, so far as I'm concerned and have always been, secondary in the making of appointments to the good of the Government. The idea that someone can veto my selections, well, I would think they would be very bold, more bold than I'd think if they'd try it.

Q. Edward P. Morgan, *American Broadcasting Company*: Mr. President, from the school aid legislation that you sent up to the Hill yesterday, some people have concluded that you have decided that it's more dangerous to unbalance the budget now than to run the risk of more inadequately educated citizens later.

Could you discuss this dilemma with us in the context of determination between difficult fiscal values and human values?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am not so sure that you can differentiate. The human values in America are not going to be promoted unless we are sane and sensible in our fiscal policies. I know of nothing that could injure the great population—174 million people—we have got than to

allow budgetary process to get out of control, fiscal measures going loosely, in such way that just inflation would absolutely be inevitable.

Of course we recognize the national need for better education, but also I am firmly committed to the idea that the primary and basic responsibility in these matters rests with the communities and with the States. The only thing that I think the Federal Government should do is to try to inspire or help them on the basis of need, and where need can be proved. Then I think the national benefit to be obtained out of having an educated citizenry overrides a mere matter of some dollars, particularly if you are trying to do it correctly, not by supporting education all over our country but to inspire and where necessary assist the localities to do their job.

Q. Frank Holeman, *New York Daily News*: Sir, a group of private doctors associated in humanitarian work is trying to get a Navy hospital ship out of the mothballs on the west coast for a mercy mission into Southeast Asia.

Sir, how would you feel about such a project?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think the project—I have read about it in all its details in a number of reports—I think it's a wonderful thing to do. I don't know of any better way in which you could bring to many thousands of people, many millions, the concern of the United States in humanitarian things.

Now, the only thing that I know is still in question is whether or not this matter has yet been financed by these private interests in the way that they think it should be and the way they believe they can. Once that assurance is there, the Navy will have the ship ready for them, I assure you.

Q. Robert C. Pierpoint, *CBS News*: From reports that we get, sir, Premier Khrushchev seems rather anxious to have you visit the Soviet Union. I was wondering, first of all if you think that might be a useful trip for you at this present time, or would you prefer to have him visit the United States, perhaps?

THE PRESIDENT. You say that it appears that he would like for me to come there.

Did you read the speech in which he suggested that I might come, and what he had to say, particularly about the United States as a whole, its

leaders, and some of the language he used to describe us as a nation—and others, even more than myself? ¹

I would think that certainly I would have to wait for some more official type of, and more, let us say, persuasive kind of invitation than that.

Q. Charles E. Shutt, Telenews: The Congress, in passing legislation or proposing it, especially in the housing and airport fields, have put in for more funds than you have allocated in your budget. There is much speculation on the Hill, sir, that you may make up this deficit by cutting your foreign aid funds. Would you comment on that possibility, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say this: if there was any intention of increasing expenditures in this area at the expense of mutual security, then I'd say I could think of no policy that was more destructive of America's vast interests in the world than that one.

If there is any item that I know of that is calculated to give to each of us as a citizen of America the greatest possible return, it will be that mutual security appropriation. And the idea that this kind of proposition is to be advanced because of the known reluctance of America to indulge in a program that has been classified as giveaway, if that is the idea on which we are working, well, then I say that statesmanship is beginning to get of a very low order.

Q. Carleton Kent, Chicago Sun-Times: Mr. President, in 1956 an expression of interest by you swung the Republican convention to San Francisco.

The Republican National Committee is in the process of choosing the 1960 site now. Do you have any favorites this time?

THE PRESIDENT. As a matter of fact, I start off questioning your

¹ Earlier, on February 6, the Press Secretary to the President released the following statement at Thomasville, Ga.:

Premier Khrushchev's invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union occurred in a lengthy speech which contained very hostile references to United States' leaders. It seems strange that Premier Khrushchev, if he really welcomes a visit by the President, would extend it in such circumstances.

The President has no present plans to make such a visit—in fact he hasn't received any invitation, except through the reports of an off-hand invitation extended in a political speech.

Ever since he has been in office, President Eisenhower has always made it clear that he was willing to go anywhere in the world if, by so doing, such a visit would serve the cause of peace. Should future developments suggest that a visit to the Soviet Union—or anywhere else—would serve to advance this cause, then it certainly would be considered.

premise, Mr. Kent, because I may have expressed that preference, I don't recall; but I'd think my reaction would have been: "That's an awful long trip to make out to the convention."

Certainly, so far as the next convention is concerned, the matter is completely within the hands of the National Committee. So far as I am concerned, I would not think it either desirable or useful to express any preference myself.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, Portland (Maine) Press Herald: Mr. President, the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee complains that some of our more recent top ambassadorial appointments have not been first rate. It is often complained by the State Department that Congress does not allow sufficient pay and allowances so that any but wealthy men can afford to take the top jobs.

What have you found in relation to that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mrs. Craig, it is perfectly clear that—I don't know whether they are the top jobs, but the more expensive jobs cannot possibly be taken by anyone except individuals of considerable wealth.

I think most of us here have visited some of those embassies, and you see the staffs of assistants and servants, some hired locally but others carried over; they couldn't possibly be paid out of the allowances that the Government now permits.

However, I do say there are other posts in this world that I think are just as important, and they are filled by career people, merely because they are not so expensive. There are certain places that we have just made up our minds that no one but a career person can ever go there, and we hope that they won't get so expensive that they can't do it.

I really believe that we should increase our percentages of career people just so far as it can possibly be done.

Q. Lloyd M. Schwartz, Fairchild Publications: Mr. President, the Labor Department is reporting this morning that unemployment is up around five million. I wonder if you feel that this is a level that we have to live with for a while, or whether there is a chance for marked improvement in the spring months?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, first of all it's not above five million, it's 300,000 below five million.

Secondly, I don't for one minute accept that as a satisfactory level of unemployment.

Now, in the month of January, unemployment went up 616,000 which is really less than seasonal factors would normally compel. In addition, though, there were 200,000 more employed this month of January, and I am sure that the ratio of the unemployed to the labor force went down, even in January, about 1/10 of a point, from 6.1 to 6. So, I believe thoroughly that we are going to have a pickup as the year goes on. There are certainly areas in which it is much more slow than we should like, any of us would like, but this is sort of characteristic of recoveries. They come, they get spotty, and here and there things look fine; and in others, they are not so good. But I say this, never with any level of that kind could you say that you should be happy with it or content with it.

Q. Frank van der Linden, Nashville Banner: Sir, you had a meeting this morning with Senator Cooper from Kentucky, and that gives rise to two questions. The first is, have you managed to persuade Dr. Welch of the University of Kentucky to stay on the TVA Board; and the second one is, have you decided who will get the vacancy on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals?

THE PRESIDENT. Well—[laughter]—my answer to the second one is a very simple one: that when I have named that man it goes to the Senate before I make any public announcement. So that will come out just as quickly as it goes to the Senate.

Now the other one is this: I don't know whether we can persuade Dr. Welch to stay longer, but I would say this: I would very much hope that he would; and if I knew what considerations could influence him, I would use them.

But actually, however, I believe he has to go back soon to the university or he has lost a very favorable position in his retirement opportunities. I think it would be a very serious question for him.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post: Mr. President, some people are worried because they say Russia's economy is growing much faster than ours.

Now you have taken your stand against what you regard as excessive Federal spending in order to ward off inflation.

What do you think, sir, of the argument that we ought to switch the emphasis and step up Federal spending and so—stimulate the growth of our economy?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, people apply this in many ways to all sorts of programs.

Right now, our GNP is about \$453 billion, that's its rate. Procurement and services we get from the Government are about \$54 billion; this is something on the order of 12 percent of that GNP; certainly it is not the decisive part. Therefore the expansion of your spending policies and the deleterious effects compared to the advantages that you get by \$2 or \$3 billion more expenditures in a 453 billion-dollar GNP seem to me to be completely overbalanced in favor of frugality and thrift and keeping your dollar sound.

I can't emphasize too often that millions and millions of people are living today in the security that their pensions offer them for their old age. If those pensions are going down in value each year by so much amount—as a matter of fact, from nineteen hundred and, I think, it was forty, I have forgotten the exact year, but at any rate in recent years our dollar has lost half its value—if that continues, that kind of thing, it is going to be disastrous for our kind of economy and for the welfare of our people. The expansion of your economy is not going to come out of that kind of spending. The expansion is going to come from the incentives that we give to our people for working hard, using their brains and keeping what they can earn as much as possible, so they spend their money themselves. That's the kind of economy we have, and not one where we can take off 2 or 3 billion and put it in and make it really a healthier affair. I just don't believe that the benefit, if any, to be gotten from such an expending program, compared to the bad effects of deficit spending today, would have any weight with us at all.

Q. Andrew F. Tully, Jr., Scripps-Howard: Sir, people are always speculating about your state of health. Could you tell us in any detail, sir, how you are feeling these days?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't have much time to think about it. But I think I'm in good shape; the doctors say so, and I don't know who else should worry so much about it—[*laughter*]—as the doctors and myself.

Q. William Knighton, Baltimore Sun: Mr. President, you have spoken out against the third term amendment. Had there been no third term amendment, would you now be considering in your mind running for a third term? [*Laughter*]

THE PRESIDENT. First of all, I don't believe I ever spoke out against it. I said this—since I have never made a deep study of this thing, because what was the use—from my viewpoint, I said I thought on balance it was an unwise amendment.

However, there were so many people whose fears are very real that somebody who would get hold of the kind of military force we now have, get hold of it and use it as an instrument of establishment of centralized or dictatorship form of government, I would think that I could argue pretty well on either side of this one.

Let me point this out: our whole history, from the beginning, from 1787 until 1953, has been one of almost defenselessness in military forces. You remember—I realize I cover so many years now in a military career, but it was not too many years ago when the whole strength of the Army, including the Air Force, was 118,750. We would go down to the Congress, and I have sat in front, helping my bosses with the data, we'd ask for \$50,000 more for something we thought was just terrific; and it would be cut off.

Now, even after World War II, we found this same trend had started in. And it started not as just a matter of congressional economy or of the Executive's economy, it's what America felt. We hoped that the United Nations were going to solve our problems. So this political policy that you ask about, I think has been sort of a concomitant with our military policy, because everybody knew there wasn't enough military, really, to go into control of the country.

Now, this is no longer true, and it might alter thinking.

The answer to your last question is "no."

Q. John R. Gibson, Wall Street Journal: In the past, in talking about inflation, you have said that you felt that if it got bad enough the people of the country will probably demand some sort of economic control. Have you or your advisers seen any hint yet that this sort of sentiment is building up in any fashion now?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it's quite clear over some months now that prices have been remarkably stable. Actually we had this one period here, following '55, that we ran up about 6 percent. But over the past 6 years it's been stable, very stable compared to what much of our history is; and in the last 10 months, or something of that kind, prices have shown a very, very great stability.

Now this therefore tends, I think, to influence us to avoid looking ahead as far as we should. I believe as we look ahead there are many factors that demand that we use every bit of influence, of every kind of leadership there is available in the press, in different organizations, business and

labor organizations, and in Government to keep this possibility off our immediate future. We must keep it back.

I am sure that the whole population would, if this thing got too bad, demand some kind of controls; this I would deplore with everything I have.

Q. Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News: In view of Mr. Dulles' leave, do you plan to devote more of your own time and energy to the conduct of foreign affairs?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, if I do, something else is going to suffer because I don't know of anything that I give as much time to, every week and every day, as I do to foreign affairs. Actually, I don't know of any Cabinet officer that I give half the time to that I do to Secretary Dulles; and if I go into any more personal conduct of the thing, then I am going to have to neglect a few other departments, that's sure.

Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Eisenhower's one hundred and fiftieth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 10:31 to 10:59 o'clock on Tuesday morning, February 10, 1959. In attendance: 217.

30 ¶ Remarks at the 17th Annual Meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

February 11, 1959

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to meet with the representatives of the rural electrification systems. I salute you and those you represent for a job well done.

I understand there has been a little advance billing here about my alleged views on matters of interest to you. Well, I am here to set forth my views accurately and frankly, in what I believe to be your own interest as in the interest of our country.

We all know that when the REA was born, less than 11 percent of our farms had central station electric service. And today, of course, you know that 95 percent of our farms have central electric service. Your record of meeting loan repayments on time or ahead of schedule is outstanding. Your achievements have encouraged the growth of both rural residences and rural industries.

243 ¶ The President's News Conference of
September 28, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT. I realize, ladies and gentlemen, that in the last few days the public and the press have been mostly preoccupied with questions of international import. But during this entire period, so far as I am concerned, there has always been in the back of my mind, and the subject of many conversations and discussions over the phone and otherwise about an important domestic problem, the steel strike.

As we start this conference, I want to read a little statement that I have written this morning on this matter:

"I have this to say to you today on the steel strike."

Incidentally, for your benefit, there will be the usual copies outside.

"I am not going to try to assess any blame, but I am getting sick and tired of the apparent impasse in the settlement of this matter, and, I think, so are the American people.

"Free collective bargaining—the logical recourse of a free people in settling industrial disputes—has apparently broken down.

"The long delay in coming to a reasonable agreement has already had a noticeable effect on our economy. Now, with negotiations abandoned, the prospects become serious for every individual in the Nation.

"This morning I shall not discuss specific governmental action but I tell you this: so far as governmental action can be brought to bear on this matter, I am not going to permit the economy of the Nation to suffer with its inevitable injuries to all. I am not going to permit American workers to remain unnecessarily unemployed. There are 500,000 steel workers out of jobs. There are 160,000 other workers in industry affected by the strike who are not receiving salary checks. This figure will continue to grow.

"This is an intolerable situation. It must not continue.

"It is up to both sides, labor and management, to recognize the responsibility they owe to our Nation and settle their differences reasonably and promptly. I shall use every conceivable personal and official influence available to me to break the impasse."

That is my statement, and I am ready for questions.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, could you give us a general evaluation of your talks with Mr. Khrushchev, and

tell us specifically whether the renunciation of force mentioned in the communique means that Mr. Khrushchev now has withdrawn any Soviet threats or ultimatums with respect to Berlin?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, to have a little bit of outline, because this is a very involved subject, I think I had better try to keep straight on the track in this way:

First of all, I want to thank the American people. I think their restraint and their conduct on the whole was a credit to them. And if there is a better understanding on the part of Mr. Khrushchev of our people, of their aspirations, of their general attitudes about international questions, and particularly about their desire for peace, then that has been done by the American people.

I invited Mr. Khrushchev, as you know, to come here so that we might have a chance to discuss some of the obvious reasons for tensions in the world, and particularly between our two countries, because of the outstanding unsettled matters.

I did not ask him here for substantive negotiations, because those are impossible without the presence of our associates. But I thought that, through this visit of his and through these conversations, possibly I think as I have said to you before, some of the ice might be melted.

Now, if any of this has been done, again it's due to the American people; and I make special acknowledgements to the Mayors, Governors, the local officials who carried so much of the responsibility for making these visits possible, and for directing so many of the activities necessarily involved.

With respect to one other point, I think this: I think the American people have proved that they have an enlightened outlook toward these international problems; that they have got the strength in their own beliefs and convictions to listen to the other man politely, attentively, although reserving to themselves a right to oppose bitterly any imposition upon themselves of some of the practices, the beliefs, and convictions that are proposed and supported by another ideology; that they came through this with a very much better understanding, and proving that they themselves are very sophisticated, and if not sophisticated, let us say enlightened and understanding in these matters.

Now, the Chairman and I discussed the Berlin question at length. As you know, no specific negotiations can be carried out in such question as this without our allies, but you will have read the communique which

brings up this point and says that negotiations are to be reundertaken, after making proper arrangements, in the aim to get a solution that will protect the legitimate interests of the Soviets, the East Germans, the West Germans, and above all, the Western people.

Over and above this, we agreed, in addition to what the communique said, that these negotiations should not be prolonged indefinitely but there could be no fixed time limit on them. I think that's perfectly clear and plain; and since it was the agreement of two individuals, I think that I should not attempt to go further in expounding on that point.

Q. Robert C. Pierpoint, CBS News: You seem to have a cold, sir. I was wondering, these have been very difficult and trying times for you, how have you borne up under this burden?

THE PRESIDENT. I think I have borne up all right. But you know, I think that I came back with the beginnings of a cold from Europe, and I always have trouble with bad colds. And with this kind of activity, with all the medicines the doctors can prescribe, and what sedations everybody takes for himself over and above what the doctors prescribe—*[laughter]*—I've done nothing, but I'll tell you this: if I can get 5 days out in the desert somewhere, in the dry desert, I am going, quickly. *[Laughter]*

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev has given his version of why you are postponing your trip to Russia. He spoke of the grandchildren making the decision. What is the actual reason for—

THE PRESIDENT. I assure you there is no sinister or no ulterior motive behind it. This has been a rather trying period, the last year, and we have both set up for ourselves rather large and full schedules. He is going to China, for example, the day after he gets back to Moscow. I have Mr. Segni here on Wednesday; I have the Ministers from the old Baghdad Pact here within a week; I have the President of Mexico I'm very anxious to have some long talks with; I have a number of heads of state coming along. It just looked like too much to put these things all together and get some of the other things that we want to do. So, I was personally the first one that said, "Well, maybe in the spring," because we were talking about the weather in Moscow and the temperature right now, how quickly it's going to be very bad, and how soon you could have snowstorms that would probably limit travel. Finally,

you know, he said, well, he thought that would be very fine; and then is when he got in to the grandchildren, and what he told was perfectly true—they, the grandchildren, seemed to make this decision. [Laughter]

Q. Felix Belair, New York Times: Mr. President, can you tell us if the general subject of China arose during the talks and in what context?

THE PRESIDENT. To this extent, yes: it was raised, but the discussion was largely confined to this: a statement of our respective views which, you know, are diametrically opposed on almost every point; and it was agreed that it would be unprofitable to try to raise the China question in the matter of, you might say, the philosophy of action.

Now, he did, because of course our concern about prisoners and so on, suggest that he might find it possible as a friendly gesture, not because he feels he has any right to interfere in those things, to bring up the matter of our five prisoners we've been so concerned about.

Q. William J. Eaton, United Press International: Sir, do you plan to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to halt the steel strike, or do you plan to invite industry and union leaders to the White House?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I said that I didn't want to discuss this morning any proposed governmental action.

Actually, I am hoping to see a number of my own people, people that have been involved in this thing all the way through, today, discussing possible developments.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press International: Mr. President, could you tell us, or give us some estimate as to when you anticipate a summit conference?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I can't guess. I can't guess because, first of all, I will report to all of my interested associates everything I can think of on this visit I just had, and I will seek their reactions. I wouldn't want to make any guess now, because there were just two of us talking and neither of us tried to fix any real time.

Q. Garnett D. Horner, Washington Star: Do you feel, sir, that the conditions you have previously mentioned for going to a summit conference have now been met or still are to be met in further negotiation?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say, for myself, this: the conversations have, so far as I am personally concerned, removed many of the objections that I have heretofore held; but again this is a matter for negotiation and consultation with our allies. And, as I say, the progress made—I can

say that we have to consider, as long as we are going to negotiate, that there is progress because we are not on an impasse.

Q. E. W. Kenworthy, *New York Times*: Could you tell us what Premier Khrushchev indicated he was prepared to do in the matter of on-site inspections, the number of on-site inspections and the composition of the control post personnel in policing a nuclear test ban?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I should make it quite clear, not only in answering your question but others that might be of that similar import, we couldn't possibly bring up among ourselves these detailed questions. It takes a long time to have a conversation, double the time that it does us because we don't have an interpreter; so this matter of composition of control posts and their numbers and the technical equipment and so on that would have to be used, those were not discussed at all.

Q. Charles H. Mohr, *Time Magazine*: Can we take it, sir, that your agreement that there is to be no fixed time limit on the negotiations over Berlin also means that there can be no fixed time limit on our occupation rights there, and our access rights to that city?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course there can be no fixed limit. We do say this, all of us agree that this is an abnormal situation, all the world does.

Here is a free city, sitting inside a Communist country, and a hundred and ten miles from the Western Germany of which it feels it is a part. Therefore, the only way you can get a solution is by negotiations that will probably take some time. We agree that these would not be unnecessarily or unduly extended, but we did say there is no fixed time to which they are limited.

Q. Mrs. May Craig, *Portland (Maine) Press Herald*: Mr. President, will you clarify for us the situation in regard to the credits the Soviets want, the money they still owe us, and will you need amendment of the law before you could give them more credits?

THE PRESIDENT. I had Secretary Dillon take the details of this question up with the Soviet delegation.

Now, he can give you most of the details. There is this about it: Mr. Khrushchev himself said they were ready to discuss the lend-lease matter and settlement, both sides expressed a desire for greater trade under proper conditions; but just exactly to what extent these are to go and what can be done now under the law, you will have to discuss with Secretary Dillon.

I can't quite go into all those details, but I will say this: I took Mr. Khrushchev, as you know, on several helicopter rides. He said his own Government had already, and for a long time, opposed his riding in such an instrument. But he said that he is interested in the purchase of one exactly like I used, and I believe he said he is going to ask Mr. Dillon to be his representative in seeing whether he cannot do so.

Q. Andrew F. Tully, Jr., Scripps-Howard: Sir, what did you think of Mr. Khrushchev?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, he is a dynamic and arresting personality. He is a man that uses every possible debating method available to him. He is capable of great flights, you might say, of mannerism and almost disposition, from one of almost negative, difficult attitude, to the most easy, affable, genial type of discussion.

I think that the American people sensed as they went around that they were seeing some man who is an extraordinary personality, there is no question about it.

Now, I thoroughly believe that he is sure that the basic tenets of the socialistic, or communistic, doctrine are correct. He has made great dents into the original concept of this doctrine. For example, he very definitely stated that he had made much better use of the incentive system in the Soviet economy than we. He knows all about our taxes and all the rest of it, but he talks in terms that if you do a better job you get a better house. He talked about some of the things they are providing for their people who really perform. So, in a number of ways, he shows how the application of the doctrine has been changed very greatly in modern usage in the Soviet region.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post: Mr. President, to use your phrase, do you think that you and Mr. Khrushchev did melt some of the ice around East-West relations and if so, how much?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I'd say this: the most that could be done here, Mr. Folliard, is a beginning.

I think that there are a number of people close to him that are quite aware of some of the problems that come about unless we do melt some ice. For example, he himself deplored the need for spending so much money on defenses. We tried, between ourselves, to talk for a little bit about our comparative costs, therefore how we could calculate just exactly how much of our wealth is going into these things that are, after all,

negative and sterile and purely defensive. Well, this was an interesting exercise, but of course we got nowhere except his continued insistence they're just too expensive, we must find better ways.

The same way with the individual whose name I forget exactly, the man who was talking to Mr. McCone—well, Mr. McCone's opposite number. He pointed out their effort to develop this program of peaceful use of atomic energy; he said we must do it together because it is just too expensive for one country alone.

So, in a number of ways you find, if the ice isn't melted, an awareness on their part; not only the one that great wars are unthinkable, that's in the background, but in many ways, detailed ways, they are finding out we just have to do something that's a little bit more reasonable than what we have been doing.

Q. Charles W. Roberts, *Newsweek*: Sir, the most important of the three preconditions for a summit that we've made now seems to be the removal of threats to Berlin. I know you touched on that in the first question, but I wonder if you could indicate to us whether the Chairman did promise to ease the pressure or remove pressure somewhat.

THE PRESIDENT. I think the statement I have read answers your question; the reason that I don't want to say any more, we agreed exactly on that statement and I'm sure that he himself will make it, corroborate it. But to go further can be putting words in somebody else's mouth, that I don't think is fair.

I personally think that the question is answered right there: there is no fixed time on this. No one is under duress, no one is under any kind of threat. As a matter of fact, he stated emphatically that never had he an intention to give anything that was to be interpreted as duress or compulsion.

Q. Warren Rogers, *New York Herald Tribune*: When Mr. Khrushchev talked to your grandchildren, sir, did he tell them that one day they might live under communism?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think—no, I know he didn't. I think one of them might have thought he's old enough to know what he might have been saying. But he didn't; no, as a matter of fact, on the contrary, this was the kind of heartwarming family scene that any American would like to see taking place between his grandchildren and a stranger.

Q. James B. Reston, *New York Times*: Mr. President, Mr. Khru-

shchev used the phrase, talking about disarmament, "the strictest comprehensive control of disarmament."

I wondered two things: first, did he apply that to all disarmament or only to the total disarmament scheme he laid before the U.N.?

THE PRESIDENT. He said constantly, in talking about disarmament, "I want you to study the proposal I made." He did not add anything in the way of details to me. I did point out to him that we had allies, that we had made comprehensive plans and proposals of our own in the past, that Britain had just proposed another one in the United Nations, and that at this moment I had a very comprehensive committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Coolidge studying our whole past history in this matter and trying to discover whether we had anything new.

But in details of exact degree of strict control, I didn't go into it at all.

Q. Mr. Reston: Could I just get off one other point on that?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Reston: Did you try to indicate or set any goals that you would try to cut your budgets, for example, in the military field?

THE PRESIDENT. No. As a matter of fact, the reason I avoided budgets is a very simple one, because I don't believe there is any comparison of budgets between countries where everything is directed, and where costs really cannot be compared.

But I did say this: no nation could be more anxious than ours to get rid of some of this burden as long as we could with security, and with justice and honor, do it.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. Khrushchev told us that his system would beat ours. Have you any plans to make the American people aware of their responsibility for their freedom?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I would say this: I don't know how I can do this in terms of a plan; but I certainly was impelled, by some notes I made during these last 3 days, that every time I talk I am going to try to bring home to the American public the individual responsibility of the citizen.

As a matter of fact, I had to send out a message this morning, I forget on what group it was—"Know Your America Week," I believe that's it—and I said the American's rights and privileges are going to be maintained only if he exhibits a commensurate responsibility of his own to their maintenance—that is, self-discipline.

I think this applies again to the steel strike—all of us to think of it, get a proper judgment of our own, and really make these contending parties—again I say I am not assessing blame, but they've got to remember the country and what it stands for, freedom and human dignity. And we are going, one of these days, to have to look at this problem very, very earnestly if we are not by our own carelessness to damage our system.

Q. John Scali, Associated Press: Mr. President, when we move into these new negotiations on Berlin, could you tell us whether we will be guided by the same standards and principles that we had before, namely, that any solution must guarantee allied rights there, and protect the freedom of the West Berliners?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't guarantee anything of this kind, for the simple reason I don't know what kind of a solution may finally prove acceptable.

But you must start out with this: the situation is abnormal; it was brought about by a truce, a military truce, after the end of the war—an armistice—and it put strangely a number of free people in a very awkward position.

Now, we've got to find a system that will be really acceptable to all the people in that region, including those most concerned, the West Berliners.

Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Eisenhower's one hundred and seventy-second news conference was held in the Executive Office Building from 11:05 to 11:29 o'clock on Monday morning, September 28, 1959. In attendance: 288.

Shortly after the news conference was concluded the Press Secretary to the President issued the following statement in response to queries by the press:

The President, of course, did not mean

that the freedom of the people of West Berlin was going to be abandoned or that allied rights were going to be surrendered by any unilateral action.

What he was referring to was that he could not now give in detail the ultimate solution of the Berlin question. Any agreement must be acceptable to the people of the area, including the most concerned—the people of West Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany.

244 ¶ Remarks at Annual Meeting of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. *September 28, 1959*

Mr. Chairman, Governors, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a real privilege and pleasure to extend again to the Governors of the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the

directed that this program be vigorously pressed forward.

The specific plan and details involved in this transfer, including provision for continuation of military missile programs now assigned to the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, will be ready to lay before the Congress when it reconvenes.

NOTE: This statement was released at Augusta, Ga.

267 ¶ The President's News Conference at Augusta, Georgia. *October 22, 1959*

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning. Please sit down.

Merely because I thought I should come to a press conference in this unusual place, you are not to assume that I have any startling news to bring. As you know, I had established or scheduled a conference on Wednesday, and then when I decided suddenly, for my own convenience, to come down here, I thought it was only fair to carry out the chore that I gave myself. So that's the reason I am here this morning.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press International: Mr. President, the Russian Ambassador to Paris says this morning that you have proposed a summit conference late this year, and that Mr. Khrushchev agrees. Now the British also seem to favor the idea of an early summit, and the French want to wait till spring. You have been in touch with the allied leaders recently, and today could you give us your position on this situation? Specifically, do you want a pre-summit Western meeting in the next few weeks, and do you think the big summit conference should be held this year?

THE PRESIDENT. I think the word "proposed" is not quite correct. I stated that I would be ready at any time from now on to go to a Western summit because I thought, preceding any meeting with the Soviets, there should be again an examination of our several positions together, so that we could have position papers, they are called; we want them coordinated.

Now I said I was ready to go any time from there on, and I said thereafter I would be ready to go to a major summit meeting—that is, with the Soviets—whenever we could all agree that we had a chance to study and get ourselves all prepared. In other words, I was thinking we could do this by the end of the year. But it was not a proposal, it was a state-

ment of my position. That still remains my position. And I agree, as time is slipping by, the longer we postpone a Western summit, which I do think is necessary, why then that would have some effect on pushing back any other that we might agree upon, and might have some effect on the date that we might agree on.

Q. Charles Roberts, *Newsweek*: Sir, before General Medaris announced his intention to resign, he said that we are straddling the issue of whether we are competing with the Russians in space. I wonder if our position is that we are competing with the Russians, and if we are, if their recent successes in launching luniks and probes into space indicate that we must spend more money in this field in our next budget?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you open a big subject with a lot of questions along with it. Here is a thing that has been studied ever since 1955 on a very urgent basis. I need not go again into the history of missile development within the Military Establishment, and the launching of at least our interest into the outer space field. But as early as 1953 or '54, we began to get the recommendations of certain scientific groups, and then I established my own, under Dr. Killian, which reported early in 1955. From there on, missiles and space vehicles began to take first priority in both defense and, you might say, in scientific research affairs.

Where we got into the outer space field was through the International Geophysical Year, if you will recall. Dr. Waterman was the one that proposed this to me, and we went into the Vanguard proposal.

Well now, as time went on, we began to do very well in the missile field. Now there was one reason that we could do pretty well in the missile field, and fairly early; it was this: we were ahead, it seemed clear, of anybody else in the development of efficient and still very powerful bombs. This meant that we did not have the same power in our engines or in our boosters that was required if those warheads had not been so efficiently designed and built.

So we have developed and we now have operational ICBM's. Therefore we have the certainty, the fact, that starting in 1955 until this moment we have done—our scientists have done—a remarkable job in bringing this about. But since we had no great interest at that moment in putting heavy bodies into outer space, we were going along with the engines or the boosters that were capable of handling our Thors, Jupiters, and Atlases—that kind of thing.

As the space exploration studies went further, it began to be obvious that we needed big boosters for this particular thing. We started, I believe, three projects—three routes, you might say—towards their designing. I think the scientists have come pretty well to the conclusion that one of these shows more promise than any other. The team that has had more experience in this field than any other is that headed by Dr. von Braun, a very brilliant group of scientists which was brought together by the foresight and the wisdom of the Army, in the original sense. They have done largely the work that they want to do for the Army. The Pershing, one of those other small items on which they have been working, has been largely completed. They are the ones now that we are looking for to get and develop this big booster.

But this great booster is of no present interest to the Defense Department. Its interest is in NASA, and that's the reason that we have decided to take this very competent team of scientists and this facility—the ABMA—and put it into the space department so that it can get the kind of booster that it needs.

Now, this statement that we are straddling as far as competition with the Russians is concerned: I don't know exactly what it means. I know this: we have established, and it has been published at least in outline, a program of space exploration; and Dr. Glennan has pointed out some of the major things we want to do. Our plan is a positive one, and I see no reason for thinking of it merely as competition with somebody else. It is something we intend to do.

And just one point about this transfer of ABMA I might point out is this: there are two separate facilities there. One of them is the Army Ordnance Center, I believe it is—Army Ordnance Research Center, some such thing. The Army projects stay right there, and their contacts and their coordination and the help that they get from the space agency will be no less than it has been before. Such little items, some finishing touches that remain on Redstone or one or two other programs, will be completed.

But at the same time, Dr. von Braun and his group are going over to the NASA because, I say, the big booster has its primary place in space exploration and not in our missile program.

Q. Art Barriault, National Broadcasting Company: Is any effort being made, sir, to retain General Medaris perhaps in a civilian capacity?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, as a matter of fact, I really don't know. I haven't seen his reasons for wanting to retire, but I understood, just a few days back, from the Army, that he was quite content and happy. I don't know exactly what his disappointments or his disagreements are, and I would like to hear them.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, Chicago Tribune: Mr. President, this is on the steel strike. Where do you think the major blame lies for this strike going on so long? And secondly, from the standpoint of the Government and the public, do you think the Taft-Hartley Act has proved adequate to deal with strikes of this kind, or do you think some other legislation is necessary?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think that Taft-Hartley has a very brilliant history, therefore I could say I do not believe it is necessarily good or adequate legislation. But on the other hand, I am not so sure that additional legislation is going to do exactly what we want.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we want: we want a growing and expanding economy, with fairness to everybody. But we don't want to try to control this or direct this by Government. And if we come to the point that we believe through the medium of controlling prices or any other compulsory type of action, then I believe we have hurt ourselves very badly.

Now as of the moment, I had no recourse except to resort to Taft-Hartley. Indeed, I am so concerned after 97 days of this strike as to what is happening to our country, that I have made a little memorandum. Mr. Hagerty will have some copies for you. It's just a short memorandum, a recitation of the brief facts of what has happened.

I put it this way: I don't think Taft-Hartley is necessarily presenting any cure for this thing. I believe that self-discipline, the setting up by all of us as our standard the welfare of the United States of America, is the only thing that ever will do it. Because if we can't settle our economic differences by truly free economic bargaining without damaging seriously and threatening to damage seriously the United States, we have come to a pretty pass.

That's the reason I said, on the day I asked the Attorney General to go and seek this injunction, it was a rather sad day for the United States.

Q. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post: Mr. President, you have promised Premier Khrushchev to go to Russia next spring. Would it be possible for you to carry out that commitment and also attend a summit—

that is, the big summit conference—in the spring? I have another thought in mind, sir, as I understood your earlier statement, your position still is that a big East-West conference should be held earlier than next spring?

THE PRESIDENT. No I don't—this is what I said, Mr. Folliard: I think that a Western summit must precede any other. And then I think that one of the purposes of the Western conference will be to thrash out just what we should do, as to timing and subjects and our approach, and the positions we take. I want to be very careful, always, to avoid the appearance even of trying to dominate any of our allies. These allies are important. They are equal partners. And so I cannot state things before you as decisions and "We are going to do that." They are matters that we have to discuss and see whether we can agree.

Now whether or not I could make a trip that would comprise both, let us say 7 or 8 days of a summit conference, and then 6 or 7 days of going around Russia, this would be quite long, and would be a time, you know, during which the Congress is in session.

Now normally, Congress, even if they passed any bills, if there were no emergencies of any kind, domestic or otherwise, would hold up bills so as to avoid embarrassment. But it would be quite a long time to stay away at one time.

Q. Mr. Folliard: To follow that up, is it conceivable, Mr. President, that a big East-West summit conference might be held in Russia about the time you went there?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't know. The only thing I know about it, every time we have looked for a new spot, we come back to the things of the hotel accommodations and the technical apparatus that is always needed for simultaneous translation and all that sort of thing. So nearly always we go back to Geneva. I would personally have no objection to going anywhere. I have said this time and again so you people get tired of it. I would go any time and anywhere.

Q. Felix Belair, *New York Times*: The Development Loan Fund in Washington has indicated that any future credits granted by it to recipient governments in underdeveloped areas should be expended on materials or equipment within the United States. It has also indicated lately that this policy, if it is a policy, might be made to apply to other foreign aid agencies. I wonder if that would not mark a rather noticeable departure from your past policy?

THE PRESIDENT. We have always tried to make loans and grants on a basis that was free and where the recipient country could go and shop around, except in the case of one agency; that is the Export-Import Bank, which by law is required to make its loans requiring materials and machinery and things of that kind that were under such study 'be bought here.

Now I don't believe for an instant that we can make this law apply to the Development Loan Fund and everything else exclusively. I have said and it has been, I think, stated by one or two of my associates, we are going to make it a little less free. This is not a turnaround, a reversal, or going in another direction. It is simply to point out that when we are making this money available, it's dollars that's being made available; and where it is feasible and reasonable, we want that money to be spent here. It's not the abrupt reversal that your question might imply.

Q. Carleton Kent, *Chicago Sun-Times*: Mr. President, could you discuss with us your reasons for seeming to prefer an earlier summit meeting rather than a later one, as the French apparently do?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say this: I think an early Western summit would be very desirable. If you take four countries like Britain, France, and Germany—they would be there part of the time at least—and ourselves, there are bound to be important subjects come up that are viewed differently by each country. This takes a very great deal of study and work, and finally agreement, at the very head of government level.

Now I would prefer always, as I have told you people often, to do these things by diplomatic means, and then finally get head of government agreement. But fashions have seemed to change a little bit.

Now where you do have a dictatorship, there is only one man can make the decision, and although he can delegate as he chooses, it seems to be not popular with dictators to delegate too much. Therefore, if you are going to make agreements that are useful, I mean general and important agreements, with the Soviets, you are almost compelled to do it with the head of government. This means the Western heads of government must be coordinated among themselves, otherwise it would just be a Donnybrook.

Now I have no strong feelings exactly when the second one should be done. I said I would go there and make my proposals at the Western summit and we would talk it out and see what we should do. But I

wouldn't predict any particular moment for the meeting with the Soviets.

Q. Paul F. Healy, New York Daily News: Sir, either as President or a TV viewer, do you have any strong feelings on rigged quiz shows?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I am one of those that never saw them. So my interest has grown only as I have seen the reports in the papers. I think if it was done, it's a terrible thing to do to the American public. But I have made inquiry right away, and so far as I can see, up to this moment, the executive branch of the Government has had no responsibility or even no place to do anything. I have asked the Attorney General and one or two others to look into it. So as I say, my interest didn't develop until after I found out that there was apparently something a little questionable about the whole matter.

Q. Mr. Healy: You don't see any need for Federal regulation of any kind?

THE PRESIDENT. I would say this: I see no power in the executive department. This would be censorship. This would be a political agent. Now you do have the FCC; I am not so sure what their field would be here, but it's one thing that I think the Attorney General is studying for me. But not for executive department action.

Q. William H. Y. Knighton, Jr., Baltimore Sun: Mr. President, how's your cold?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, actually, almost 3 years ago I contracted a bronchitis which finally seems to have developed and become chronic. And so every slight cold has sort of a multiplied effect on me; consequently, I seek the warm weather and sun. [*Laughter*] However, you can't always be lucky on weather, and I am taking that rather philosophically. But it's really become a chronic condition, and when I went to California, to have an acute cold and flu attack on top of it, the reason becomes rather troublesome. So I take every day I can to get in the sun.

Q. Lou Harris, Augusta Chronicle: Mr. President, the National Cotton Council has petitioned the Department of Agriculture to invoke section 22 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, because of what it believes is the increasingly large amount of importations from foreign countries in the textile field. Of course 3 years ago this agreement was worked out with Japan.

Do you anticipate, sir, that there is going to be any effort to work out a similar agreement with Hong Kong, Formosa, India, Pakistan?

THE PRESIDENT. The only thing I can say about those things is this: you get these reports, and instantly they go into the hands of the technical experts. A great deal of struggle goes on as to what should be done, because whenever you help somebody, you always seem to be hurting someone else. But finally, after all the technical studies are made and go through different types of organizations, it is brought to me to study; and that is always a tough decision to make.

I would say this: the last thing I heard—I am talking now with both foreign and domestic experts in the field—they said that they thought the situation was improving rather than deteriorating.

Q. Marvin Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, we just want to make sure we understood you. Did you speak of an acute cold and flu attack?

THE PRESIDENT. I said an acute cold when I went to California, and that on top of a chronic bronchitis I said is annoying. I did have an acute cold then.

Q. Mr. Arrowsmith: Didn't you say something about a flu attack, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. I called it flu. Whether the doctor did or not, I don't think I ever asked him. [Laughter] Any time I feel as badly as I did that time, I call it flu, that's all. [Laughter] But as I say, my difficulty is a chronic bronchitis, which didn't originate until after my operation. I don't think it has any connection, but then is when it started—in 1956.

Q. Felix Belair, Jr., New York Times: Mr. President, just to perhaps quiet speculation on the point, can you conceive of a Western summit meeting without France's participation?

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, I wouldn't think so, no. Anything else?

Q. Russell Jones, CBS News: Sir, Mr. Khrushchev is reported to have backed the Chinese in taking Quemoy by force if necessary. Do you think this fits in with his conversations with you in this country and his expressed desire for a summit meeting?

THE PRESIDENT. I think I reported this before, but I am not sure. When the subject of Red China was brought up between Mr. Khrushchev and me, there was no further discussion other than the statement of our two separate positions. And it was then agreed only one thing, which was there was no sense in pushing the discussion any further because our viewpoints were so far apart.

On the other hand, I notice that as quickly as he went out to China,

he made one or two speeches in which he put forth the generalization that all international disputes should be solved by peaceful means, in negotiation.

Now I think that both China and Russia argue that the Formosa-Red China dispute is from their viewpoint an internal one and not international. But after all, I believe there are 42 or more nations—I forget how many, but a great number of nations—that recognize the independence of Formosa, so I think certainly the rest of the world would take it as a threat to international peace.

Q. Marvin L. Arrowsmith, Associated Press: Mr. President, may I ask another question?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Q. Mr. Arrowsmith: In connection with your remarks on Taft-Hartley, do they indicate that you are thinking about asking for new legislation when Congress comes back?

THE PRESIDENT. Not at this moment, for this simple reason. I am still hopeful that these people, both sides, will awaken to their obligations to the United States. I really believe, like I do in one or two other subjects, that punitive law, or law requiring compulsion against peoples' respected rights, is going to worsen the situation rather than better it.

Now, on the other hand, if people will not exercise the self-discipline that the whole concept of free government implies, then indeed this is going to be a time when we all have to study and see just exactly what may be done. Because we cannot allow the country itself to be damaged unconscionably.

Q. Robert H. Fleming, American Broadcasting Company: Have you heard anything from the Chinese Communists about the American fliers?

THE PRESIDENT. Nothing recent—nothing recent. It's one of those matters that is kept always on the agenda, and you make inquiry whenever you can; but we have heard nothing.

Q. Charles Roberts, Newsweek: If I may ask another question, I would like to return to the space situation. Do you plan to ask for more money in your next budget for space exploration?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have forgotten—was it 590 last year?

Q. Mr. Roberts: I couldn't tell you, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Well—listen, why aren't you informed a little bit? [Laughter] As I recall, it became 590; I think they cut out about 68

measures, though still insufficient in scope, have been agreed upon. Operation Pan America has a common objective that is both generous and deeply realistic.

Its first practical step will be the joint preparation of an assessment of the needs and of the economic problems of Latin America, in order that concrete measures be undertaken to fight the underdevelopment that plagues so many regions of this New World. I am sure, Mr. President, that a close consideration of the proposals presented within the framework of Operation Pan America by all the participant States will be of the highest value for the work of the newly formed Commission. The problems of development and those of the preservation of the democratic freedoms are inseparably welded together.

In the fervent hope of a thorough continental understanding, I pray God for your personal happiness and for the security and ever increasing greatness of the noble American people.

JUSCELINO KUBITSCHEK

The President authorized the Secretary of State to establish the Committee

on November 14, 1959. A White House release of that date, announcing the President's action, states that the Secretary had named as members Ambassador Walter J. Donnelly, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, G. Kenneth Holland, O. A. Knight, Charles A. Meyer, and Dr. Dana G. Munro. A report by Dr. Eisenhower following his 1958 tour of Latin American countries, released January 4, 1959, had recommended the establishment of such a committee.

On December 3 the White House announced that the President had met with the members on that day on the occasion of the Committee's inaugural meeting. The release states that the President told the committee members that their meeting was a reflection of the deep interest among the people of the United States in the affairs of the American Republics, and that his meeting with them on the eve of his departure to several countries of the Old World reflected his own interest in the New World and his faith in the future of the inter-American system.

288 ¶ The President's News Conference of December 2, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT. Good morning.

There is one short statement I have to make.

For some time, we have been in the process of negotiating a new treaty, revised treaty with Japan; and, it is a matter to which we attach the greatest interest. Mr. Kishi, who is one of the men that the Government as well as I personally admire very much, is coming to visit this country probably in January, and any questions remaining at that moment of course would be taken up then.

So, while there have been some questions presented to me about this matter, until the thing is completed I will not be making any statements about it. However, Mr. Hagerty will have a little statement for you that really relates what I have just said, but in slightly more amplified form.

Q. Merriman Smith, United Press International: Mr. President, in

connection with your forthcoming trip, I would like to ask a slightly legalistic question.

Under law, you have the sole authority for the final determination of using nuclear or thermonuclear weapons in event of an emergency. Now, you will be quite some distance from the country during this trip. Have you made any arrangements or are such arrangements feasible where you leave such authority with someone in this country, or would you have to execute such a decision if it became necessary, overseas?

THE PRESIDENT. No, there is no arrangement that puts the President's authority in anybody else. Such decisions that I have to make, though, are of such a character and are kept in such terminology they can be executed from any position and by a simple message that could be delivered instantaneously.

Q. Ray L. Scherer, NBC News: Could you tell us, sir, if you sense any particular feeling, particular sense of mission as you embark on this rather large tour?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I've been thinking and talking about this so long that I may be repeating myself.

I think that we can conclude, from all of the reports that come to us from abroad, that there is a great deal of doubt remaining in the minds of many people, and including our friends, allies and other friends, as to America's real sincerity in pursuit of peace. We have tried to emphasize this point in every possible way, through diplomatic contacts, through speeches of the Secretary of State, myself, and others, and still it doesn't seem to come through.

Now, I have relatively few months left, and I decided to make an effort that no President ever was called on before to make. I do feel a compulsion to visit a number of countries, and through them hoping to reach many others, and tell them exactly what I believe the United States is trying to do: that our basic aspiration is to search out methods by which peace in the world can be assured with justice for everybody.

I want to prove that we are not aggressive, that we seek nobody else's territories or possessions; we do not seek to violate anybody else's rights. We are simply trying to be a good partner in this business of searching for peace—which means, in the long run, searching also methods in which we, the independent nations together cooperating, can find a better life for all of us; and that means politically and materially.

This is what I'm trying to do, and such prestige and standing as I have on the earth, I want to use it. As long as my other duties do not prevent me from doing so, I'm going to work on this in every possible way I can.

Q. William McGaffin, *Chicago Daily News*: Mr. President, could you tell us whether you have received the Sigma Delta Chi Freedom of Information Reports; and if so, what was your reaction to them, sir?

THE PRESIDENT. You will have to describe them. There are too many reports for me to remember them by title.

Q. Mr. McGaffin: Well, sir, the reason I asked is that Mr. V. M. Newton, Jr., the chairman of the committee that prepared the reports, says that he sent them to you twice, but he feels that you have not personally seen them, or you would not continue in the belief that you have repeatedly expressed about secrecy in Government during your administration.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think I'll have to see the report and give you an answer, because I simply can't answer on something that I can't recall the contents of.

Q. Charles W. Roberts, *Newsweek*: Sir, last July the committee studying foreign aid under General Draper made a recommendation to you that the United States should assist those countries with which it is cooperating in economic aid programs, on request, in the formulation of their plans designed to deal with problems of rapid population growth. This was generally interpreted as a recommendation that this Government should distribute birth control information on request. I wondered what your reaction to that report was, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. I cannot imagine anything more emphatically a subject that is not a proper political or governmental activity or function or responsibility.

This thing has for very great denominations a religious meaning, definite religious tenet in their own doctrine. I have no quarrel with them; as a matter of fact this being largely the Catholic Church, they are one of the groups that I admire and respect. But this has nothing to do with governmental contact with other governments. We do not intend to interfere with the internal affairs of any other government, and if they want to do something about what is admittedly a very difficult question, almost an explosive question, that is their business. If they want to go to someone for help, they will go unquestionably to professional groups,

I wonder if you could discuss and explain to us how, in such a moment in history, the defense budget does not need to rise but can stay relatively stable over a period of 2 or 3 years?

THE PRESIDENT. I think that the first thing is this, since you are going from one defense system, largely, to another, particularly in this matter of deterrent: there is an old saying—what is it—“Be not the first by which the new is tried, nor yet the last to lay the old aside.” Now, that’s what we’re doing.

But if you want to have a really expensive thing, stop everything now that we’ve been doing and then just put a tremendous hysterical urge about the business of getting something new. Now you will really have, to my mind, a bad answer and an expensive answer.

As we are finding that our Atlas is operational, and is operational, and it comes into this picture, it is only natural that there is shown less concern and less cost in the matter of developing newer and better and bigger airplanes, faster, higher-flying, and so on.

Now, we do not quit that entirely. As you know, the B-58, on a moderate program, is to be completed; and there is an R and D program going on, on one that’s even bigger. So we do not feel ourselves within just a matter of 2 or 3 or 4 years completely dependent upon the missile, until we’ve got these missiles perfected to the point where we think that the deterrent itself needs nothing else.

Q. Mr. Mohr: Would that protection include hardening their bases?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, on that, that’s a technical question that no one knows really the right answer yet. I think this: there will be certain types of them that will require, oh, I mean will be much better off if you harden the bases; and I think that it will not be as expensive as we once thought. But there will be other types that still will be in what you might call unhardened bases.

Q. Sarah McClendon, El Paso Times: Sir, I wonder if you think this is a proper matter for you to give your attention to.

Your Attorney General is reportedly presently investigating an affair whereby the Midwestern Gas Transmission Company is going to make about \$16 million profit at the expense of the Midwestern consumers for bringing gas in from Canada.

Now, my colleague Joe Huttlinger has discovered whereby the Federal Power Commission had set the rates for this, then they were visited

not to governments. This Government has no, and will not as long as I am here have a positive political doctrine in its program that has to do with this problem of birth control. That's not our business.

Q. Laurence H. Burd, *Chicago Tribune*: Mr. President, as you are about to undertake this trip, can you tell us how you feel as to health; and second, do you or your doctors or your family have any qualms about the heavy physical exertion that this strenuous trip will require of you?

THE PRESIDENT. I think it's only natural that any man's family begins to think that he is probably here and there taking on a load that he shouldn't; but I think so far as my doctors are concerned—3 days ago I had again my regular monthly examination—they say I'm capable of doing it. And I think that I am as fit as I possibly could be at my time of life to do this thing.

Of course, it demands real resistance to fatigue; but I think I'm capable of carrying it on, and also without losing the last vestiges of what I once thought was a good disposition. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mrs. May Craig, *Portland (Maine) Press Herald*: With increasing agricultural surpluses, increasing food prices to the housewife, decreasing returns to farmers, do you have any new farm solution in mind?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't say, Mrs. Craig, that I've got a new solution. I believe that for 7 years we've been trying to work on something that's better than we've had, but we have had very little success in finding a formula acceptable to the Congress, that would have been passed by the Congress, to bring about these better conditions.

Actually, our agriculture has become so completely dependent on what Government does, what political action is, that already I think it is too far or too definitely under governmental control. It's too much of a dependent.

There have been a number of ideas brought to me; I've got them now under study by the Agriculture Department. I will have an agricultural program which I hope will do something to free agriculture from its complete dependency, or almost complete dependency upon Government, and make it more prosperous.

Q. Charles H. Mohr, *Time Magazine*: Mr. President, this is a moment in history in which we have to maintain a large strategic capability in manned aircraft, and at the same time paying for the increasingly expensive development of missile capability, and also an antimissile defense capability.

by Mr. Thomas Corcoran, a Democratic Party figure and attorney, who persuaded them to increase these rates.

Now, your Attorney General is looking into this and I wonder if you will discuss this with him and see if you think this is a proper matter for the whole Government to get—

THE PRESIDENT [*addressing Mr. Hagerty*]. Will you remind me to do that? [*Laughter*]

Q. J. F. Ter Horst, Detroit News: Sir, while you are gone on your trip, a lot of us will be left wondering what is going to happen in the steel dispute. We know that it has been an annoying and a plaguing problem to you, and we are wondering, sir, if you have in mind any kind of solution by law or by regulation that might bring two parties together when they cannot seem to do so voluntarily?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you didn't describe the problem quite correctly. You said it's of course annoying and plaguing to me.

This is vital to America.

Now, my interest in this is not employers and, per se, not employees except as all of them are part of America. I have tried to use every bit of influence I have had officially or personally, in this matter to get these people together. I am going again to insist publicly that they do it. I just know this: if we can't get anywhere on this thing, then finally the Government just cannot sit idly on its hands.

But, I do believe that the day that we abandon honest free collective bargaining, it is going to be a sad day for the United States.

So, it looks to me that unless they get together on a kind of settlement that is equitable to each other and absolutely in the public interest, we are going to lose—something.

Q. Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Will the foreign military assistance appropriation be included in the defense budget, and if so, has that been discussed with the congressional appropriation leaders?

THE PRESIDENT. The military section I think is; I think there has been an agreement to do it—for them to defend it next year I think. I have forgotten the details, Mr. Brandt, but I know it has been under study. I think the following year it's to go into the military responsibility, but I can't be sure.

Q. Mr. Brandt: That would be in '62, sir.

year that the United States spent less than \$9 billion, or spent just about \$9 billion for its entire expenses, was 1940. That is less than we are now paying for interest. And it seems to me that this ought to have a very significant meaning for all our people, everybody, everybody in this room that's a taxpayer, thinking about their dollars or their final pension or their final OASI payments. They are the things that are threatened, if we are not more fiscally responsible. I think we are trying to do many things that are not completely necessary; and we should kind of put them off on the shelf until we have got our fiscal system in order, and our financial system.

So for people abroad who are depending on us as the world banker, for ourselves who are hoping to keep a stable dollar, we ought to take this lesson to heart and do something about it.

Q. John M. Hightower, Associated Press: Mr. President, as you travel in these countries on your trip, and meet the leaders of the countries, do you expect to discuss with them a number of specific issues in which they are interested?

What I have in mind particularly is the problem which Mr. Nehru is having with the Chinese Communists on the border.

THE PRESIDENT. Of course I shall be glad to discuss such problems; with respect of this particular one, I don't think the issue, as far as I know, is the exact spots in which this McMahon Line is located. I don't think anyone has ever known exactly. As a matter of fact there is one road and one border of India that was, I believe, in existence 2 years before anybody except its builders knew anything about it. It's a very remote and wild region.

What is important and what is the issue is this: are nations going to settle their differences by negotiation, honest meeting, honest negotiation with each other, or are they going to move in with force and take that course in the settlement of these disputes?

Now, that is the real issue, and on that I am very much on the side of the people that say we must do it by negotiation.

So, when I go through all of these countries, there will be a number of problems. After all, there have been difficulties as we know between Pakistan and India. There are two countries in which we have great interest. All right. There has been a good beginning made through the World Bank in getting the waters of the Indus and other rivers properly stored up, divided. If this leads to the settlement of their outstanding

THE PRESIDENT. That would be '62 for the defense of this thing. Now, I would have to have looked up what our final agreement on that was because it has been one of these questions that's bandied back and forth for years. So I would think that you could get that directly either from ICA or Defense.

Q. Earl H. Voss, Washington Star: Mr. President, I have a question about nuclear tests.

I wonder if you could tell us how you think the negotiations are going in Geneva, in the light of the information last Saturday from Radio Moscow that the Russians have been creating artificial earthquakes under a lake in Siberia, and under a river there, which they picked up 250 miles away with seismic instruments.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, of course, we've got the scientists working in Geneva, and that kind of information is among the things, among the factors that they are working on. So I couldn't say a great deal about this particular incident or particular report.

We do attach not only great importance to it, but we are more hopeful about some constructive result out of these negotiations than we were a few months back when it looked like they were going to be completely abandoned.

Q. James B. Reston, New York Times: Mr. President, before you go away, sir, I wonder if you could tell us what the outlook is for the new budget, and for the resources coming in—how much has it been hit by the steel strike, for example?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, there is no question that the revenues coming in for this year of '60 are going to be reduced; and this, of course, as Mr. Stans pointed out down at Augusta in a statement, puts the achievement of the balanced budget for 1960 in a very precarious position.

I can only say this: I have had many conferences with all executive divisions and departments, trying to find ways that we can save money in '60 to make up this deficit and try still to achieve that balanced budget. It would have a tremendous effect on the economy, as I see it, and certainly upon all our friends abroad.

So, projecting that same kind of thinking into '61, I think we should strive not only for a balanced budget in '61, but that we must get some small surplus to start paying on this deficit.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you something. I think the last

things, this will be a wonderful thing because it will be done not with force, not with threat of force, by negotiation.

This applies to almost every other country in the world.

Q. E. W. Kenworthy, *New York Times*: Mr. President, a number of leading universities and colleges have decided not to participate in the Federal Student Loan Program because of the loyalty oath required. I wonder if you would give us your views on the loyalty oath and whether you would favor a revision of the law to make this unnecessary.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the law, of course, was passed by Congress; and while I didn't particularly like the one part of it, why, I, of course, had to put it in the position where it could be executed.

So far as I'm concerned, and I have stated this ever since the question was posed to me, I personally am ready each morning to take an oath that I am not a Communist and that I am loyal to the United States. I think, however, that when we begin to single out any group of citizens and say, "This is a matter of legal compulsion," I can see why they are resentful.

To my mind, anybody who is taking an oath as a citizen, when he becomes naturalized or any other time he is required to take an oath as a public servant, when he says that he is going to defend the United States and its Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, for me that ought to settle the question.

I rather deplore that universities have found it necessary to find, for the moment, a narrow dividing line and therefore keep a number of citizens out of taking advantage of the loan provisions that the Federal Government set up; but for my part, I should think that the loyalty oath, the basic citizenship oath, is sufficient.

Q. Thomas N. Schroth, *Congressional Quarterly*: Mr. President, do you plan to submit any additional civil rights proposals next year? Specifically I have two in mind: the provision for Federal voting registrars, as proposed in the September 8th report of your Civil Rights Commission; and the so-called part III provision, which would empower the Attorney General to file civil suit in all civil rights cases.

THE PRESIDENT. I have not yet had my final conferences with the Attorney General and the other people interested, but I do say that I would like to see all the parts of the bill that I submitted last year considered, and if possible, enacted this year.

Q. Marianne Means, Hearst Newspapers: Mr. President, in the interest of Latin American relations, is it possible that the United States will let Panama's flag fly beside the United States flag in the Canal Zone?

THE PRESIDENT. This is one of the points that's been talked about for many years, since for 50 years the United States has recognized the titular sovereignty of Panama. There have been numbers of problems over the years that have come about because, first, of what the Panamanians felt were injustices to them in the original treaties; and secondly, by the interpretations of treaties as revised in later years.

These last problems of the differences were under study for the last few months, and we had already agreed with the Panamanians for methods of taking another look at them and trying to see whether we couldn't meet their requirements in this matter. So there has been a very conciliatory attitude toward governments, as far as I have known, and the one question of the flag has never been specifically placed before me, no decision has ever been made about it; but I do in some form or other believe we should have visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the region.

Merriman Smith, United Press International: Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: President Eisenhower's one hundred and seventy-sixth news conference was held in the Executive Office Building

from 10:32 to 11:02 o'clock on Wednesday morning, December 2, 1959. In attendance: 261.

289 ¶ Statement by the President Concerning Treaty Negotiations Between the United States and Japan. *December 2, 1959*

DURING the past months, we have been negotiating a new treaty and other security arrangements with Japan. We attach the greatest importance to this new treaty with Japan which is being negotiated between equals for the mutual benefit and enlightened self-interest of both countries and is therefore in keeping with the new era in our relations with Japan enunciated following my talks with Prime Minister Kishi here in Washington in June 1957. The timing of this new treaty with Japan is particularly opportune since I feel it is most essential at the present juncture in international affairs for the free world to maintain its unity and strength.