SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Rev. Albert J. Kondy, D. D., pastor of the University Hills Baptist Church, of Denver, Colo., offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Father of all mankind, we come to Thee this day to thank Thee for the blessings given to us as a people and a nation—blessings perhaps out of proportion to the contributions which we have made to Thee and Thy kingdom.

We pray that Thou wilt forgive us the mistakes of the past and wilt give to us a new vision of a world made smaller through given wisdom. Let us know the spiritual counterattack that will cause men to take God seriously, for we know that science and technology are not enough. Cause us to know that the destiny of the world is in the hands of those statesmen who can interpret faithfully the commands of an Almighty God.

This place, this day, where cross the crowded ways of life, we invoke Thy blessing upon the Senate. We pray for guidance of all its Members as they face the tasks assigned to them.

This place, this day, wilt Thou place Thy hand of strength, wisdom, and guidance upon Vice President NIXON. Give to him health, dignity, and poise to lead in the deliberations of the day.

For the President of our United States, we pray for health, strength, wisdom, and Thy ever-present guidance in both his private and social life and in leadership of a nation undivided under God.

In the quietness of this moment, let there be peace in the lives of all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 6, 1958, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1958,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on February 7, 1958, signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2920) to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Karl L. Larson;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Alfred Hanzal;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebart;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Dr. Royal W. Williams;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of William F. Kempe;

H. R. 3210. An act to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels;

H. R. 3770. An act to rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 5161. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine A. Work;

H. R. 6069. An act for the relief of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey;

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6660. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the Tuscaloosa lock and dam on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam;

H. R. 7052. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for appointments of cadets from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7200. An act for the relief of the estate of Isa Hajime;

H. R. 7591. An act for the relief of Anton N. Nyerges;

H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Margie C. Stewart;

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky; and

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it stand in recess until Thursday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICAL AND SPACE EXPLORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair makes the following appointments to the Special Committee on Astronautical and Space Exploration, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

From the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIDGES.

From the Committee on Foreign Relations: Mr. GREEN and Mr. WILEY.

From the Committee on Armed Services: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SALTONSTALL.

From the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BRICKER.

From the Committee on Government Operations: Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. MUNDT.

From the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. HICKENLOOPER.

From the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations, ex officio, Committee on Appropriations, Mr. SYMINGTON.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the reading of Washington's Farewell Address in the Senate this year, pursuant to order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, be on Friday, February 21.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the order of the Senate of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

January 24, 1901, as modified with respect to this year by the order just agreed to, the Chair designates the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Friday, February 21, 1958.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under the rule be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR LAUNCH TO JAMESTOWN CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department proposes to transfer a 40-foot motor launch, with engine, to the Jamestown Corporation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the calendar year 1957, no reservations were made from appropriations for lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, COURTLAND UNIT, BOSTWICK DIVISION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, KANSAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by the Courtland unit, Bostwick division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Fourth Guam Legislature, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMISSION ON MENTAL ILLNESS AND HEALTH

A letter from the Director, Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, Cambridge, Mass., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Joint Commission, for the year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 10

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to allow the passage of any legislation authorizing pay-as-you-go television.

"Whereas appearing before Congress at this time are persons interested in passing pay-as-you-go television legislation; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation would result in unwarranted control of all television broadcasts, untold harm to certain advertising businesses, and most of all, a cost of billions of dollars a year to the American taxpayer; and

"Whereas on February 6, 1958, a hearing is taking place before a committee of the House of Representatives and said hearing has as its members certain Congressmen from West Virginia: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That the Congress of the United States should be urged to reject legislation which will result in untold expenditures to the people of West Virginia and the United States and that the legislation for pay-as-you-go television be defeated as an attempt to control the airways of our country and to profit unjustly at the expense of the average taxpayer; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates send attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to milk price supports

"Whereas Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture has announced his intention on April 1, 1958, to lower the dairy price support to 75 percent of parity; and

"Whereas such action will result in a reduction of income to our Nation's dairy farmers of $250 million at a time when many are already facing grave economic conditions; and

"Whereas California dairy farmers receive 40 percent of their income from milk on the basis of factory milk prices and the proposed lowering of supports will reduce dairy farm income in California by more than $7 million in 1958 with the reduction affecting 40 percent of the milk supply produced in California; and

"Whereas 70 percent of dairy producers in the State would be directly affected by such a change and the resultant consequences would also seriously affect the other 30 percent of the producers in this State; and

"Whereas since 1954 dairy farmers at their own expense have greatly increased programs of research for new outlets and engaged in trade promotion of dairy products and the dairy industry and allied organizations have worked out a program of self-help for the dairy farmer; and

"Whereas legislation is now being proposed for consideration by Congress which would to a large extent eliminate the dairy farmers' problems: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture be respectfully memorialized to withhold putting into effect any change in the existing dairy price supports until such time as the United States Congress has had an opportunity to study the problems of the dairy farmers and to consider and act upon proposed legislation to solve these problems; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress representing the State of California."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Glendora, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds to improve the Walnut Creek system for the control and conservation of flood waters for Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of R. K. Little, of Danville, Ill., relating to deficit spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by the convention of the Utility Co-Workers' Association, of New York, N. Y., relating to income-tax revision, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to increase the amount of total indebtedness that may be incurred by the Territory of Hawaii, in order to facilitate issuance of bonds for the acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of public-school buildings in the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American College of Chest Physicians, of Chicago, Ill., signed by Murray Kornfeld, executive director, relating to Presidential disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 so as to allow the State's supervisory agencies to approve or disapprove proposed mergers of State chartered banks

"Whereas the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, known as Senate bill 1451, has already passed the United States Senate and now is being considered by the House Banking Committee of the United States Congress, which bill would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act pertaining to State chartered banks, so as to place control over mergers of such banks in the Federal Reserve Board for State member banks and in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for State nonmember banks; and

"Whereas the power to approve or disapprove mergers of State chartered banks has historically been with the State banking supervisory agencies of the respective States; and

"Whereas the passage by Congress of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, as is now proposed, would result in further deterioration of the powers of State banking supervisory agencies by the encroachment of Federal agencies in administering supervision over State chartered banks; and the dual banking system will be another step along toward completely federalizing and centralizing the banking system as we know it today; and

"Whereas there has been no proof submitted that the State banking supervisory agencies in the various States are not capable and fully qualified to pass judgment on proposed merging of State chartered banks; and

"Whereas the State board of bank control has done an outstanding job of regulating State chartered banks in South Carolina and the passage of said bill would seriously limit their authority and further restrict States rights: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representative concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend section 23 of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 so as to allow the State supervisory agencies in the respective States to retain the authority and power to approve or disapprove the merger of any State chartered banks; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Members of Congress from the State of South Carolina be requested to do all within their powers to achieve the amendment of section 23 of the act so as to leave the merging authority of State chartered banks in the control of the respective State banking supervisory agencies; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House of Representatives and to each Senator of the United States Congress from South Carolina."

THE SO-CALLED INDIAN POINT 4 PROGRAM—LETTERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have recently received two letters from citizens of Austria, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, urging that our Government adopt a program for the American Indians which may permit them to retain and develop their reservations if that is their desire, and not compel them to relocate elsewhere, which may result in unfortunate worsening of their living conditions.

Each letter advocates the adoption of the so-called Indian point 4 program, elaborated by the National Congress of American Indians. These letters have been sent to me by the Reverend Father Peter John Powell, chairman of Indian work of the Episcopal diocese of Chicago, who felt that they reveal the international concern over our American policy in respect to Indians. I believe it will be of interest to the appropriate committees of Congress that for many years there have been circulated in Europe adventure stories by Karl May concerning American Indians, which have no doubt had their part in developing this familiarity and sympathy with the plight of American Indians.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that these letters may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAZ, AUSTRIA, *December 28, 1957.*

To a Senator or a Representative of the Nation of the United States of America.

DEAR SIR: With your permission some Europeans write a letter to you. It is not of personal character, but it concerns an American people—the natives of America, the Indians.

We know that in January 1958 the American Congress will decide about the adoption of a program which is very important for the future of the Indians of the United States of America. We mean that the Indian point 4 program, elaborated by the National Congress of the American Indians, intends to maintain the last homelands of the American natives, their so-called reservations. We know that the Indian reservations in many cases are the most neglected districts of the United States. We are informed about the fact that the Indian Bureau tries to better the fate of the Indians by the relocation program, that is through giving to the poor inhabitants of the reservations the opportunity to emigrate to the American cities. But for our feeling this is not sufficient. It would not be sufficient for a foreign people, but not at all for the oldest inhabitants of the Americas. There are many peoples round the world, who need relief for the bettering of their neglected countries, and America has developed a widespreading help program, and gives relief to these countries that they can develop themselves and nourish their native inhabitants.

Perhaps you may be surprised and astonished that Europeans come to you to beg for the Indians. We—i. e., Austrians and also Swiss—know what your Nation has done for us. We know that without the American relief in the last years our country would not have been able to overcome the consequences of the last devastating war. We are very thankful to America and to her citizens, who offered so much to unknown citizens of other countries. But we feel all the more sensitive that the natives of America should receive less from helpful citizens of the United States of America. Today after the end of the colonial period of the world it is a matter of honor of the great powers to treat the oldest inhabitants of their countries honorably, and to respect their native rights, and also the rights guaranteed to small groups by the international rights, above all their self-determination, and it is the will of the Indians themselves, expressed by their representation, their National Congress, to keep their reservations, and to develop them.

Although the press in all countries is silent, and no daily or monthly reports on the silent struggle of the American Indians for their existence, many peoples in many countries are aware of it. And these peoples appeal to the magnanimity and the honor of the Americans, and beg now the Members of the American Congress to adopt the Indian point 4 program, and to give the Indians—these famous and all over the world well-known peoples—the requested relief for developing their reservations.

For: Heidy Schenk; Ludwig Patsch, Dipl.-Ing.; Josef Höck; Anton Haider; Rudolf Zilli; Hans Slama; Gottfried Schwarz.

Yours respectfully.

List of the signed: Dr. Gertrude Hafner, Schillerstrasse 46, Graz, Austria; Dr. Karl Hermann, Ruckerlberggasse 22, Graz, Austria; Dr. Hans Käfer, Schillerstrasse 46, Graz, Austria; Dr. Josefine Doswald, Glacisstrasse 5, Graz, Austria; Dr. Erich Moerth, Elisabethstrasse 12, Graz, Austria; Gottfried Schwarz, Eggenberg-Allee 46, Graz, Austria; Heidy Schenk, Roseneggweg 6, Lucerne 2, Switzerland; Ludwig Patsch, Dipl.-Ing., Taborstrasse 11 B, Vienna II/27, Austria; Josef Höck, parson, Itter, Tyrole, Austria; Anton Haider, Pettnau 42, Tyrole, Austria; Rudolf Zilli, Bergmanngasse 22, Graz, Austria; Hans Slama, Cand. Chem., Körblergasse 61, Graz, Austria.

INTERESSENGEMEINSCHAFT DEUTSCHSPRECHENDER INDIANERFREUNDE,
Frankfurt/M., December 21, 1957.

The Congress of the United States of America, Washington, U. S. A.

GENTLEMEN: Many Europeans, being very much interested in the fate of the North American Indians, are alarmed by the Public Law 280 and the "termination bills" (H. Con. Res. 108) by which all special services to Indians, granted to them in solemn treaties, will be terminated. This also concerns, we learn, the reservations, the last land left to the Indians from their whole continent.

We know that in this case, termination means extermination. As the Indians know, so also do we: When their land is lost the Indian race will disappear. Shall we have to feel ashamed again of what the white is doing to the Indian? The Indian, after having been robbed of his country, has been pushed on to the reservation, and now the white, envious of what the ground might hold, has started to push the Indian out of his reservations, calling it termination.

We are afraid for the Indians on the reservations who have no means of support and insufficient education to get a job that will pay today's living wage, and we are also afraid for the Indians who by the relocation plan come into industrial centers without sufficient knowledge of the white man's ways.

We know that the Indians, living in one of the richest countries of the world with the

highest standard of life, are a neglected minority, the worst fed, the worst housed, the poorest of all Americans, as poverty stricken as the poor of Asia and Africa.

We learned that the National Congress of American Indians has issued the Indian point 9 program which has been called a plan of positive action to alleviate the present poverty, lack of education, and the present ill health, but it has been shelved.

Now the Indians have elaborated a point 4 program which will remove many evils from which the Indians are suffering today, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, that will be presented to Congress in January 1958.

All the undersigned persons, members of our society in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Holland, are soliciting in the name of Christianity, of humanity, and of justice to accept, in accordance with the laws of the U. N., this American Indian point 4 program.

Yours very respectfully,

M. Müller-Fricken, A. and W. Khale, K. and H. Engel, H. and A. Kitz, W. and L. Bertsch, G. and H. Dönges, W. and F. Weissenseel, W. and M. Bischof, A. and G. Eckel, L. and M. Plöger, W. Diehl, Hartmut Jungius, Karl-Heinz Tauscher, Dr. Gertrude Hafner, Dr. Josefine Doswald, Prof. Dr. Karl Hermann, Dr. Hans Käfer, Inka Burhenne, Herbert Klanert, Adolf Kurzweil, Eduard Engleder, Manfred Sprintz, Ingrid Wiedenhöfer, Marianne Dürr, Werner.

(The original signatures are in the office in Frankfurt am Main.)

YOUTH HONOR DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Illinois Moose Association in behalf of its 154,000 members, urging that October 31 of each year be designated as Youth Honor Day. I hope that this proposal may be given consideration by the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOLIET, ILL.

Whereas the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator from Illinois, has indicated his interest in the Moose Youth Honor Day plan; and

Whereas it is desired that the benefits of the Youth Honor Day plan be made available to all youth and communities in America, through Congressional designation of October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Moose Association, representing the 154,000 members of the Loyal Order of Moose in this State, expresses its appreciation to Senator DOUGLAS for his interest in this youth service plan of proved effectiveness; and be it further

Resolved, That Senator DOUGLAS be respectfully requested to lend his fullest support and initiative in securing formal adoption by the United States Congress of a resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day throughout the length and breadth of our Nation.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the executive committee of the Illinois Moose Association in regular meeting on January 25, 1958.

WARREN H. NORTH,
President.

Attest:

ALBERT J. KUMFERT,
Secretary.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS—RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Local 1802, United Textile Workers of America, of Sanford, Maine, relating to increased social-security benefits.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The membership of Local 1802, United Textile Workers of America, 202 Main Street, Sanford, Maine, adopted the following resolution at a recent meeting:

"Whereas a very serious condition now exists for all recipients of social security benefits. The actual value of their payments is decreasing, due to the constantly increasing cost of living, to a point when it becomes impossible for them to purchase the most modest of necessities to enjoy a decent living standard without going into debt; and

"Whereas due to the rapid increase of unemployment amongst older workers, due to automation, factory liquidations and the refusal of many employers to hire older personnel who have been forced to leave their former occupations through no fault of their own: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this union do everything possible to help correct these abuses and make a request of Congress, through our duly elected representatives, to consider and approve changes in the present social security program that will provide the following:

"1. An increase of 10 percent on all payments currently being made.

"2. Hospital and surgical care for retired persons.

"3. Changing of retirement age to 55 years for women and 60 years for men."

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE—RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, at their meeting held January 31 of this year. I feel this resolution should be called to the attention of my colleagues here in the Senate, because the city council requests that Congress adopt legislation designed to improve the economic conditions in agriculture.

This resolution, adopted by the city council of the largest city in the State of Minnesota, certainly indicates that the economic welfare of our Nation's farmers is reflected in the economic status of our larger cities.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to the unemployment situation in the Minneapolis area as affected by the difficulties in the field of agriculture

Whereas unemployment in railroad shops, farm equipment factories, and other industries in Minneapolis is seriously affecting the welfare of its citizens and the economy of the area; and

Whereas to some extent the unemployment is related to the difficulties being experienced in the field of agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we request the Representatives and Senators in the Congress from Minnesota to exert their best efforts to secure expeditious legislation designed to alleviate and improve the agricultural situation, thereby reflecting improvement in other economic areas;

Further, that the city clerk be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member of the House and Senate in the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed January 31, 1958.

GEO. W. MARTENS,
President of the Council.

Approved February 4, 1958.

P. KENNETH PETERSON, *Mayor.*

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CLAY COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Clay County, Minn., relating to flood control, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we the board of county commissioners have examined the attached data; and

Whereas flood conditions in the area outlined are causing severe damage to property and crops; and

Whereas we have numerous requests from property owners and residents of the area for aid in solving drainage problems; and

Whereas we have observed that such conditions are increasing due possibly to the increase of lands under cultivation and the use of modern equipment for constructing private drainage projects; and

Whereas as a result of the aggravated conditions, drainage ditches in the various drainage systems have become inadequate and flood waters are without sufficient outlets; and

Whereas drainage systems Nos. 56, 14, 45, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 were constructed at various intervals over a period of many years, each as a separate drainage project, and apparently without consideration for future developments; and

Whereas it is now apparent that all of the above numbered systems should be coordinated and combined into one system; and

Whereas the county of Clay, State of Minnesota, is without means, financial or legal, to undertake such a project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Clay County, That we do hereby request the proper governmental agency be designated to proceed with a study and survey of the area involved, in order to ascertain the needs and to provide recommendation for the solution to the problem and that thereafter proper funds be immediately made available for a project to coordinate all of the above systems as one project; be it further

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Clay County, Minn., That a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator from Minnesota; Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota; and Hon. COYA KNUTSON,

United States Representative in Congress from the Ninth District of Minnesota.

Passed at Moorhead, Minn., this 4th day of February 1958.

C. A. McEVERS,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Clay County, Minn.

Attest:

WINTON D. JOHNSON,
County Auditor.

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, MO.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have recently received a resolution from the Common Council of the City of St. Joseph recording its opposition to the enactment of H. R. 8525, the Harris-O'Hara natural gas bill.

I think I speak for the majority of the people not only in St. Joseph but all over Missouri in opposing this bill. I fought against a similar bill in the past and will continue to do so to the extent of my ability.

On behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and myself, I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 47169

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of St. Joseph recording its opposition to the enactment of H. R. 8525, commonly known as the Harris-O'Hara bill, and urging the Congress of the United States to defeat said legislation

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States of America a bill entitled "H. R. 8525," commonly known as the Harris-O'Hara bill; and

Whereas this bill for all intents and purposes exempts the natural-gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas if said bill were to be passed, the natural-gas consumers could expect an increase in their rates; and

Whereas the enactment of this bill would cause an overall increase in natural-gas rates of $500 million per year; and

Whereas such an increase in natural-gas rates to the consumer would be detrimental to the residents of the city of St. Joseph: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of St. Joseph, Mo., does hereby go on record in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 8525, commonly known as the Harris-O'Hara bill, and urges the Congress of the United States to defeat said legislation.

Approved:

STANLEY I. DALE,
Mayor.

Adopted February 3, 1958.

GARTH LANDIS,
President of the Common Council.

Attest:

WALTER T. WELSH,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 5. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1275).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 6. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities (Rept. No. 1276).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

(See the remarks of Mr. HAYDEN when he reported the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2752. A bill to amend section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to modify and improve the procedure for submission to the Attorney General of certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether such disposals would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws (Rept. No. 1277);

H. R. 6182. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof (Rept. No. 1279);

H. R. 6623. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Massachusetts to the Woods Hole Yacht Club (Rept. No. 1280); and

H. R. 8795. A bill to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (Rept. No. 1281).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1538. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes (Rept. No. 1278).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 8794. A bill to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions for admissions to certain musical performances (Rept. No. 1283).

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 1282)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I submit the committee's eighth annual report to the Senate. As has been the case in all preceding years, this summary of our activities has the unanimous endorsement of all members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the charitable contributions made by a corporation which may be allowed as a deduction where all or part of such contributions are made to educational institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3255. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 3256. A bill for the relief of Taufic Deoud Gebran (also known as Taufic G. Dawd) and his wife, Hanne Elias Wehby Deoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3257. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. KERR):

S. 3258. A bill to amend section 305 (f) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3259. A bill to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as the same are amended, to provide for an increase in the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3260. A bill to amend subparagraph (c) of paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act of July 1, 1902, to provide that the license tax imposed by such subparagraph on owners of passenger vehicles for hire in the District of Columbia shall apply in future license years to vehicles with a seating capacity of nine passengers or more; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3261. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3262. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 3263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first $1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; and

S. 3264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS BY CORPORATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to increase the amount of the charitable contributions made by a corporation which may be allowed as a deduction, when all or part of such contributions are made to educational institutions.

The objective of this measure is to encourage large corporations to do their part in helping rescue American education from the present financial crisis so dramatically brought to the Nation's attention by recent activities of the U. S. S. R.

While most corporations have not taken advantage of the present provision which permits them to disburse up to 5 percent of their net income to eleemosynary institutions, a few have done so. These would be willing to give more, if the law were amended, as this measure proposes, to allow contributions up to 10 percent.

According to Treasury Department statistics published in 1956, the net income of all corporations for 1953 was $39 billion, with gifts amounting to $494 million, or 1.25 percent. Five percent of that figure is nearly $2 billion; and 10 percent, as proposed in my new bill, would be $3.9 billion. This is a vastly greater sum than anything contemplated in the administration's education bill; and I feel this plan should be given every support, along with other Federal education programs.

In giving corporations and private business this greater opportunity to contribute to the solution of our educational problems, the bill also presents a challenge to those who have not yet taken advantage of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code in this respect. If those in this segment of our American economy fail to come forward with generous contributions for educational purposes, they will have no further cause to resist the expansion of Federal grants-in-aid for education in the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3254) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the charitable contributions made by a corporation which may be allowed as a deduction where all or part of such contributions are made to educational institutions, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to help two of the great private philanthropic institutions of Washington, D. C., the Georgetown University Medical Center and the Columbia Hospital for Women, in meeting increased construction costs.

These two organizations, Mr. President, come under the provisions of the Hospital Center Act, and by its terms they match, on a 50–50 basis, funds provided by public sources for capital construction. When the original estimates were made, no one could foresee the extent to which the inflationary pressures of the past few years would raise the cost of the building programs contemplated.

The invitation for bids for the alteration and additions and improvements of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum were $1,140,166 above the amount available under the present approved project. $570,083 is required to increase the Government's grant, 50 percent of the cost of making such alterations and additions. This amount completes the alterations and additions for Columbia Hospital. The revised grant base will be $2,857,165. The present grant base is $1,717,000. To accelerate construction, the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum advanced from its funds an additional $271,000 to make possible the installation of air conditioning and elevator modernization, making a total construction cost now underway of $1,988,000.

The Georgetown University Medical Center alterations, additions, and betterments to bring this hospital constructed under wartime conditions under the Lanham Act, requires an additional sum of $401,200. This completes the project. The present estimated cost of the Georgetown University Medical Center is $5,737,000, of which amount $1,720,000 has been supplied by funds granted under the District of Columbia grant-in-aid program, authorized by the act of August 7, 1946, as amended. The additional sum to complete the alterations and additions to the Medical Center at Georgetown University, is $802,400, 50 percent of which would be provided by the funds authorized by this amendment.

The total amount authorized for both Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in-Asylum and Georgetown Medical Center makes possible the completion of medical and teaching facilities at these institutions as presently planned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a joint letter dated February 7 addressed to me by the Reverend T. Byron Collins, S. J., plant administrator of the Georgetown University Medical Center, and Dr. A. W. Kenner, medical director of Columbia Hospital, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3259) to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as the same are amended, to provide for an increase in the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities to private agencies in the District of Columbia, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, is amended by striking out "$39,710,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40,730,000."

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1958.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Herewith the legislative draft proposed for additional funds for Georgetown University Medical Center, $450,000, and Columbia Hospital, $570,000; a total of $1,020,000. These funds are needed to complete the construction projects of both Georgetown University and Columbia Hospital presently filed with General Services Administration and approved by them as meeting the eligibility requirements of the Hospital Center Act.

The justification of the specific amounts requested is filed with General Services Administration and will be available to support this application for additional funds. We do not believe the District Commissioners will object since both projects increase medical service to the District.

T. BYRON COLLINS, S. J.,
Georgetown University Medical Center Plant Administrator.
A. W. KENNER, M. D.,
Medical Director, Columbia Hospital for Women.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CARROLL, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, FULBRIGHT, HILL, JACKSON, KENNEDY, O'MAHONEY, SCOTT, SMITH of New Jersey, and THURMOND be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3194) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business, introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 30, 1958. I hope more Senators will wish to join in cosponsoring this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SPACE ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 5, 1958,

The name of Mr. PROXMIRE was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3233) to provide for the initiation and support of an inner and outer space study, research, and development program for peaceful uses in commerce and industry which shall include, but shall not be limited to the assimilation, gathering, correlation, and dispersal of information and knowledge relating to, among other fields, weather and communications obtained from rocket ships, satellites, space vehicles and other such

media, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH on February 5, 1958 (for himself and Senators MANSFIELD, HILL, SPARKMAN, CARROLL, HUMPHREY, and MORSE).

DESIGNATION OF YEAR 1960 AS "VISIT U. S. A. YEAR"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the next time it is printed, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] be added as consponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year," introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 30, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address delivered by Senator FULBRIGHT before Reserve Officers Association, in Washington, D. C., on February 8, 1958.

By Mr. THYE:

Address delivered by him on subject The Crossroads for Agriculture, delivered before 21st annual meeting of the Minnesota-Iowa Swine Institute at Austin, Minn., on February 6, 1958.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address entitled "Prospects for Peace," delivered by Senator SMITH of New Jersey before the New Jersey Farm Bureau in Trenton, N. J., on January 27, 1958.

By Mr. GREEN:

Award for distinguished State service given to Senator PASTORE by the American Traffic League, and statement made by Senator PASTORE upon his acceptance of the award.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Correspondence between himself and President Eisenhower on recalling and reassigning Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr., to duty in the missile program.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee I plan to begin hearings early in March on all housing legislation referred to the subcommittee. At this time it is impossible to announce the exact date of the hearings, but such announcement will be made as soon as the exact date can be determined.

All interested persons who wish to appear or to present statements for the record should request such an opportunity from the staff director of the housing subcommittee, Mr. Jack Carter, room 15–A, Senate Office Building, telephone number: Capital 4–3121, extension 6348.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY COMMITTEES ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC WORKS ON RELATIONSHIP OF RIVER AND OTHER WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF UNITED STATES, SOVIET RUSSIA, AND RED CHINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at 10 a. m., Monday, February 17, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works will hold a hearing in room 224 of the Senate Office Building dealing with the relationship of river and other water resource development programs of the United States, Soviet Russia, and Red China.

A committee print of a memorandum of the chairman to the members of the committee was published on December 20, 1957, copies of which I think are still available from the chief clerk of the committee.

Arrangements have been made to have witnesses who are familiar with water developments appear at this hearing. Among the principal witnesses will be the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army. The Senator from Louisiana will report his eyewitness observations of irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and other public-works developments which were made during his recent tour of Soviet Russia, including Siberia.

The Senator has already made an address upon the floor of the Senate dealing with this subject. His tour through Soviet Russia, including Siberia, is undoubtedly the most extensive one that has been made by any Member of Congress, and he will come to the committee equipped with the knowledge gained from personal observation of the conservation of water programs which are being carried on there.

As I have said, it will be a joint hearing of the two committees, and all members of both committees are invited to attend and to send suggestions to me, if they care to do so, with respect to any witnesses they would like to have called.

I am making arrangements to invite the Federal Power Commission, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce, so that they all may attend as observers or as participants, as the case may be.

The feeling is that the hearing, which we hope to conclude in 2 days, will be most informative and rather important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to me by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs designating me as chairman for the conduct of the joint hearing.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
January 31, 1958.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We have before us Senate Resolution 248 under which the Senate on January 23 instructs "that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works hold joint hearings on the facts and circumstances * * *" as to the relationships of certain water developments. As a sponsor of this resolution, along with ourselves and others, we know you are quite familiar with this matter on which there has been previous correspondence and which our committees desire to pursue.

It is our belief that we might promptly discharge our responsibility under the resolution by holding the joint hearings in February under your experienced guidance. This is, therefore, a request that you accept the chairmanship of these joint committee hearings, arrange for and convene them as you deem best, and also see that "the report of their findings to the Senate during the current session," as called for in the resolution, is available. We earnestly hope we may have early confirmation of your acceptance of this responsibility.

Consider the facilities of the committees at your disposal in discharging this task. Let us also report that Senator KERR, along with ourselves a sponsor of the resolution, has expressed continuing interest and is, therefore, designated as a specific representative of the Public Works Committee to serve in these hearings. Chairman HAYDEN, prior to the passage of the resolution, reported that the interest of the Appropriations Committee would be represented by Senator ELLENDER.

Senator ANDERSON, also a sponsor of the resolution, reports continuing interest, and regrets his activities on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy preclude his presiding, but not his attendance, at hearings under Senate Resolution 248. Senator JACKSON has also expressed his desire to assist in developing this matter. We feel all members of both committees will assist in this joint task under your skilled chairmanship.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

DISTRESS IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the more vital segments of the Nation's economy is in serious trouble. I refer to the mining industry, in which unemployment is rampant, due to foreign competition which is threatening not only the economy of the Nation, but also the national security.

As has been pointed out on this floor upon numerous occasions recently, domestic tungsten mining is at a complete standstill. Scores of lead and zinc mines have shut down, and those still operating are on a short workweek.

Copper mining is rapidly reaching the same dire situation because of foreign-produced copper being sold in the United States at a price several cents a pound under the cost of production in our domestic mines. An article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on January 4 sharply pinpoints the situation facing our domestic copper-mining industry. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 24, 1958]

BELGIAN CONGO COPPER PRODUCER CUTS PRICES; QUOTES FALL AT LONDON—DEALERS OFFER METAL IN UNITED STATES AT 23⅛ TO 23¼ CENTS A POUND; SCRAP REDUCED ONE-FOURTH CENT

The price of copper in world markets continues to sag.

Yesterday, the large Belgian Congo copper producer, Union Minere du Haut Katanga, cut its price by 1.15 cents a pound to 21.55 cents a pound at New York and Antwerp, the lowest in many years. The Belgian Congo producer last cut its price by 0.225 cents a pound to 22.70 cents on January 9. The current price for Katanga's output reflected previous declines in the metal's price in London.

But copper quotations on the London Metal Exchange yesterday slumped almost three-eights of a cent a pound to the equivalent of 20⅝ cents, another new low since free trading was resumed in August 1953. The British price is now 4⅜ cents below the United States producer price of 25 cents, and 3⅜ cents a pound under the 24-cent United States custom smelter price.

Copper trade sources figure that copper can be bought in London and shipped to the United States at a delivered Connecticut Valley price of about 22½ cents a pound, after including such costs as freight, insurance, commission, and a premium for refined wire bar shapes that would be purchased; that is roughtly 2½ cents lower than the United States producer price and 1½ cents under the custom smelter quotation.

Dealers were reported to be offering refined copper at prices ranging from 23⅛ to 23¼ cents a pound.

The price of scrap copper was reduced by one-fourth cent a pound to 17¾ cents for No. 2 copper wire scrap. This is equivalent to about 23¼ cents a pound for the refined copper processed from the scrap that will be available for delivery about 3 months from now.

In Chile, workers at the copper mines are exerting pressure against the 10 percent production cut recommended recently by the government's copper department. They said they fear that despite assurances given both by the big American-owned Chilean mining companies and Chilean authorities the cut will lead to layoffs.

From Santiago, Chile, comes word that Chile's President Ibanez and Mine Minister Emilio Ganzalez met with the protesting copper mine workers. A statement issued after the meeting said that the workers had asked for a revision of the 10 percent production cutback policy and that the president and the mine minister had assured them all steps would be taken to avoid feared unemployment.

The Chilean workers contend Chile, with low-cost production, can weather the current continued decline in copper's price. They also allege that many foreign companies have been increasing their production capacity during the last two years.

REGISTRATION BY THE HOLDERS OF GERMAN BONDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, somewhere in the United States there exists a large part of $15 million to $20 million, waiting to be claimed by its rightful owners. I am referring to money which is invested in German dollar bonds issued by 92 companies during the late 1920's.

During the days of the Nazi government in Germany, these bonds were defaulted, and were declared valueless. However, under a 1953 agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, the bonds are now being registered and validated. Holders of these bonds are now able to get cash or new securities. However, the bonds must be registered before August 31, 1958.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a group of these bonds, as samples. Now that the bonds have been validated, they are good.

The cash settlements, in a number of cases, have netted the holders of the $1,000 bonds, including their coupons back to 1933, as much as $2,100. The settlements generally yield to the holders of these validated old bonds between $1,500 and $2,100, either in cash or in the form of new securities.

The reason why I call this matter to the attention of the Senate is that a large part of the $15 million or $20 million worth of unredeemed bonds is held by American citizens, who either have forgotten that they hold the bonds, or have not as yet become aware of the fact that the issuers are now settling.

After the bonds were defaulted in the mid-1930's, most holders forgot about their existence. Many of the original holders have, of course, long since passed on; and the bonds have undoubtedly become part of estates. After 1941, the bonds were recorded in estate accountings as worthless. Where heirs have held on to the bonds, and remember that they have them in their possession, they are now in the happy position of receiving money or new securities, if they take prompt action in registering and validating the bonds.

Since registration of these securities for validation started, on September 1, 1953, the Validation Board has received $144,079,400 principal amount of the bonds, of which it has validated close to 99 percent. Bonds which were held within Germany or certain other western European countries were accepted as valid by the Finance Ministry or were validated by German examining agencies and courts. Thus far, a total of approximately $250 million principal amount of the bonds has been accounted for, since the London agreements were signed.

Since August 31, 1956, under the terms of the validation agreement, holders of the securities have been required to explain their failure to register the bonds, and to satisfy the Validation Board that they are not grossly negligent in their failure to register before August 31, 1956. According to the Validation Board's last annual report, some 800 registrations were received between August 31, 1956, and August 31, 1957, accompanied by explanations concerning the failure to file on time.

The German estimates, which are now believed to be quite accurate, indicate that there were in legitimate circulation approximately $267 million, more or less, in principal amount. Consequently, we may say that between $15 million and $20 million principal amount of these bonds are still to be accounted for.

Last Friday, the Department of State, cooperating with the Validation Board in New York, sent a letter and announcement for bulletin boards in all banks in the country, using the mailing list of the Federal Reserve Board. The notices call attention to the urgent necessity for registration.

I ask unanimous consent that the notice be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT TO HOLDERS OF GERMAN DOLLAR BONDS—VALIDATION PROCEDURE WILL TERMINATE ON AUGUST 31, 1958

Holders of German dollar bonds of the issues listed below, who have not yet registered them for validation, are urged to do so before the deadline, August 31, 1958. While more than 90 percent of these bonds have been registered, quite a number are still held by persons who have forgotten them or who have not learned that such securities are now valuable when validated.

A careful search is urged of old files, trunks, estate papers, envelopes labeled "worthless securities," wherever there is reason to believe that the person who used such files or receptacles may have invested in foreign bonds. These bonds were issued in the United States between 1924 and 1931, are printed in the English language and were issued in $1,000, $500, and some $100 denominations.

HOW TO REGISTER YOUR BONDS FOR VALIDATION

1. Get a registration form from your bank, broker, or dealer in securities or from the validation board for German dollar bonds, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. Use a separate registration form for each issue of bonds you are registering.

2. Submit a sworn statement explaining why the bonds were not registered before September 1, 1956.

3. Fill out the registration form and forward it with your bonds to the depositary named below.

Send or present bonds of the following issues with registration form to J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., 23 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.:

1. German external loan 1924 (Dawes loan), 7-percent gold bonds, due October 15, 1949.

2. German Government international loan 1930 (Young loan), 5½-percent gold bonds, due June 1, 1965.

3. Prussia, Free State of, external loan of 1926, 6½-percent sinking fund gold bonds, due September 15, 1951.

4. Prussia, Free State of, external loan of 1927, 6-percent sinking fund gold bonds, due October 15, 1952.

Send or present bonds of the following issues with registration form to the First National City Bank of New York, Corporate

Trust Department, 2 Wall Street, New York 15, N. Y.:

5. Baden, consolidated municipalities of, 7 percent external sinking fund gold bonds, due January 1, 1951.

6. Bavaria, free state of, 6½ percent serial gold bonds, external loan of 1925.

7. Bavaria, free state of, 6½ percent external 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due August 1, 1945.

8. Bavarian Palatinate Consolidated Cities, Germany 7 percent external serial gold bonds.

9. Berlin, city of, 6½ percent 25-year sinking fund gold bonds, municipal external loan of 1925, due April 1, 1950.

10. Berlin, city of, 6 percent 30-year external sinking fund gold bonds, due June 15, 1958.

11. Berlin City Electric Co., Inc., 6½ percent 25-year sinking fund debentures, due December 1, 1951.

12. Berlin City Electric Co., Inc., 6½ percent 30-year sinking fund debentures, due February 1, 1959.

13. Berlin City Electric Co., Inc., 6 percent 25-year debentures, due April 1, 1955.

14. Berlin Electric Elevated and Underground Railways Co., 6½ percent 30-year first mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, due October 1, 1956.

15. Bremen, state of (free Hanseatic city of Bremen), 7 percent 10-year external loan gold bonds, due September 1, 1935.

16. Brown Coal Industrial Corp. "Zukunft" 6½ percent sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, series A, due April 1, 1953.

17. Central Bank of German State & Provincial Banks, Inc., 6 percent first mortgage secured gold sinking fund bonds, series A, due August 1, 1952.

18. Central Bank of German State & Provincial Banks, Inc., 6 percent mortgage secur d gold sinking fund bonds, series B, due October 1, 1951.

19. Central Bank of German State & Provincial Banks, Inc. (German provincial and communal banks consolidated agricultural loan), 6½ percent secured sinking fund gold bonds, series A, due June 1, 1958.

20. Cologne, city of, 6½ percent 25-year sinking fund gold bonds—due March 15, 1950.

21. Consolidated Hydro-Electric Works of Upper Wurttemburg, 7 percent first mortgage 30-year sinking fund gold bonds, due January 15, 1956.

22. Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts (Konversionskasse), 3 percent dollar bonds dated July 1, 1936, due January 1, 1946.

23. Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts (Konversionskasse), 3 percent dollar bonds dated June 1, 1937; no fixed maturity date.

24. Dortmund Municipal Utilities, 6½ percent 20-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, due October 1, 1948.

25. Duisburg, city of, 7 percent serial gold bonds, due November 1, 1945.

26. Dusseldorf, city of, 7 percent external serial gold bonds.

27. Electric Power Corporation 6½ percent first mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, series due March 1, 1950.

28. Electric Power Corporation 6½ percent first mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, series due April 1, 1953.

29. Frankfort-am-Main, city of, 7 percent serial gold bonds external loan of 1925.

30. Frankfort-am-Main, city of, 6½ percent 25-year sinking fund gold bonds municipal external loan of 1928, due May 1, 1953.

31. General Electric Company, Germany (AEG) 7 percent 20-year sinking fund gold debentures, due January 15, 1945.

32. General Electric Company, Germany (AEG) 6½ percent 15-year gold sinking fund debentures, due December 1, 1940.

33. General Electric Company, Germany (AEG) 6 percent 20-year gold sinking fund debentures, due May 1, 1948.

34. German Atlantic Cable Company 7 percent first mortgage 20-year sinking fund gold dollar bonds, due April 1, 1945.

35. German Central Bank for Agriculture (Rentenbank) 7 percent first lien gold farm loan sinking fund bonds, due September 15, 1950.

36. German Central Bank for Agriculture (Rentenbank) 6 percent farm loan secured gold sinking fund bonds, due July 15, 1960.

37. German Central Bank for Agriculture (Rentenbank) 6 percent farm loan secured gold sinking fund bonds, second series of 1927, due October 15, 1960.

38. German Central Bank for Agriculture (Rentenbank) 6 per cent farm loan secured gold sinking fund bonds, series A of 1928, due April 15, 1938.

39. German Consolidated Municipal Loan of German Savings Banks & Clearing Association 7 percent sinking fund secured gold bonds, series of 1926, due February 1, 1947.

40. German Consolidated Municipal Loan of German Savings Banks & Clearing Association, 6 percent sinking fund secured gold bonds, series due June 1, 1947.

41. Gesfurel 6 percent sinking fund gold debentures, due June 1, 1953.

42. Good Hope Steel & Iron Works 7 percent 20-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, due October 15, 1945.

43. Hamburg Elevated, Underground, & Street Railways Co. 5½ percent 10-year gold loan, due June 1, 1938.

44. Hamburg, state of (free and Hanseatic city of Hamburg), 6 percent 20-year gold bonds, due October 1, 1946.

45. Hanover, city of, 7 percent 10-year external convertible gold bonds, due November 1, 1939.

46. Hanover, city of, 7 percent external sinking fund gold bonds, due November 1, 1959.

47. Hanover, province of, Harz Water Works 6 percent first series gold bonds, due August 1, 1957.

48. Hanover, province of, Harz Water Works 6½ percent sinking fund gold bonds, second series, due February 1, 1949.

49. Harpen Mining Corp., 6 percent gold mortgage bonds, series of 1929, due January 1, 1949.

50. Heidelberg, city of, 7½ percent external 25-year sinking fund gold bonds, due July 1, 1950.

51. Housing & Realty Improvement Co., Berlin 7 percent first (closed) mortgage 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due November 15, 1946.

52. Ilseder Steel Corp., 6 percent gold mortgage bonds, series of 1928, due August 1, 1948.

53. Karstadt (Rudolph), Inc., 6 percent first mortgage collateral sinking fund bonds, due November 1, 1943.

54. Koholyt Corp., 6½ percent first (closed) mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, due March 31, 1943.

55. Luneburg Power, Light & Waterworks, Ltd., 7 percent first mortgage 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due May 1, 1948.

56. Mannheim & Palatinate Electric Cos., 7 percent 15-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, due June 1, 1941.

57. Mansfeld Mining & Smelting Co., 7 percent 15-year (closed) mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, due May 1, 1941.

58. Miag Mill Machinery Co., 7 percent (closed) first mortgage 30-year sinking fund gold bonds, due June 1, 1956.

59. Munich, city of, 7 percent serial gold bonds of 1925, due August 1, 1935.

60. Municipal Bank of the state of Hesse, 7 percent guaranteed serial gold bonds of 1925.

61. Municipal Gas & Electric Corp. of Recklinghausen, 7 percent first mortgage 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due December 1, 1947.

62. North German Lloyd (Bremen), 6 percent 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due December 1, 1947.

63. North German Lloyd (Bremen), 4 percent sinking fund bonds of 1933, due November 1, 1947.

64. Nuremberg, city of, 6 percent external 25-year sinking fund gold bonds, due August 1, 1952.

65. Oberpfalz Electric Power Corp., 7 percent first mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, due June 1, 1946.

66. Oldenburg, free state of, 7 percent external serial gold bonds.

67. Protestant Church in Germany Welfare Institution Loan, 7 percent 20-year secured sinking fund gold bonds, due October 1, 1946.

68. Prussian Electric Co., 6 percent sinking fund gold debentures, due February 1, 1954.

69. Rheinelbe Union, 7 percent 20-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, due January 1, 1946.

70. Rhine-Main-Danube Corp., 7 percent sinking fund gold debentures, series A, due September 1, 1950.

71. Rhine-Ruhr Water Service, 6 percent 25-year sinking fund external gold debentures, due January 1, 1953.

72. Rhine-Westphalia Electric Power Corp. 7-percent direct mortgage gold bonds series, due November 1, 1950.

73. Rhine-Westphalia Electric Power Corp. 6-percent direct mortgage gold bonds series, due May 1, 1952.

74. Rhine-Westphalia Electric Power Corp. 6-percent consolidated mortgage gold bonds, series of 1928, due August 1, 1953.

75. Rhine-Westphalia Electric Power Corp. 6-percent consolidated mortgage gold bonds, series of 1930, due April 1, 1955.

76. Roman Catholic Church in Bavaria 6½-percent 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, series A, due March 1, 1946.

77. Roman Catholic Church Welfare Institution in Germany 7-percent 20-year secured sinking fund gold bonds, due June 1, 1946.

78. Ruhr Chemical Corp. 6-percent sinking fund mortgage bonds, series A, due April 1, 1948.

79. Ruhr Gas Corp. 6½-percent secured sinking fund bonds, series A, due October 1, 1953.

80. Ruhr Housing Corp. 6½-percent first mortgage sinking fund bonds, due November 1, 1958.

81. Siemens & Halske Stock Corp.; Siemens-Schuckertwerke Co., Ltd., 6½-percent 25-year sinking fund gold debentures, due September 1, 1951.

82. Siemens & Halske Stock Corp. 6-percent participating debentures, series A, due January 15, 1930.

83. Tietz, Leonhard, Inc., 7½-percent 20-year mortgage gold bonds, due January 1, 1946.

84. United Industrial Corp. (Viag) 6-percent hydroelectric first (closed) mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, due December 1, 1945.

85. United Industrial Corp. (Viag) 6½-percent sinking fund gold debentures, due November 1, 1941.

86. United Steel Works Corp. 6½-percent 25-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, series A, due June 1, 1951.

87. United Steel Works Corp. 6½-percent 25-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, series C, due June 1, 1951.

88. United Steel Works Corp. 6½-percent 20-year sinking fund debentures, series A, due July 1, 1947.

89. Unterelbe Power & Light Co. 6-percent 25-year sinking fund mortgage gold bonds, series A, due April 1, 1953.

90. Vesten Electric Railways Corp. 7-percent first mortgage 20-year sinking fund gold bonds, due December 1, 1947.

91. Westphalia United Electric Power Corp. 6-percent first mortgage sinking fund gold bonds, series A, due January 1, 1953.

92. Wurttemberg, state of, consolidated municipal external loan of 1925, 7-percent serial gold bonds.

Other dollar bonds of West German issuers are considered as valid and do not need to be registered for validation. Bonds of East German issuers are not eligible for validation at this time.

German bonds denominated in a non-German currency other than dollars must be validated in the country of offering.

For detailed instructions see the explanatory pamphlet, also obtainable from the Validation Board or your bank, broker, or dealer in securities.

WHY VALIDATION IS NECESSARY

Validation is necessary to prevent the sale or payment of German dollar bonds which had been purchased for retirement, and disappeared after the Soviet armed forces occupied Berlin in 1945. The procedure for validating dollar bonds in the United States has been established by agreements between the United States and German Governments.

SCOPE OF VALIDATION

The Board will validate only dollar bonds which are shown to have been held outside of Germany and certain neighboring territories on January 1, 1945. Application for validation of dollar bonds which cannot be shown to have been held outside of Germany on that date may be made through the board to an agency in Germany. For informtion on this procedure consult the explanatory pamphlet.

MARK OR REICHSMARK SECURITIES

German bonds issued prior to 1925 and denominated in old marks are generally without any tangible value; they are not included in any validation or debt settlement program. For securities issued after 1924 and denominated in reichsmarks, a special validation procedure is still applicable. If you have not already had such reichsmark securities validated, please communicate with the Securities Settlement Advisory Agency of the German Federal Republic, 30 Broad Street, Suite 3601, New York 4, N. Y.

VALIDATION BOARD FOR GERMAN DOLLAR BONDS,
30 Broad Street, New York 4, N. Y.
DOUGLAS W. HARTMAN,
United States Member.
Dr. WALTHER SKAUPY,
German Member.
FEBRUARY 1958.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a good many people in the United States have these bonds. Perhaps all of them did not buy them; perhaps some have inherited them. At any event, it is obvious that a number of them are put away in one place or another—perhaps in boxes or in bank or in socks. My purpose at this time is to call attention to the fact that at present approximately $20 million or more can be recovered by those who own the bonds, even though heretofore the owners had thought the bonds had become worthless.

The Validation Board is doing all it can, with very limited sums, to bring this situation to the attention of bondholders and banks who have failed to learn that these bonds now have value when validated. A very substantial amount of paid advertising has been done all over the country. I am told that during the past 4 years the best part of $100,000 has been spent on newspaper advertising to bring this matter to the public's attention. However, it appears that most of the publicity concerning this activity enters the financial pages of newspapers, and little or none of it gets into the general news columns. The Validation Board's experience indicates that most of the late filers are those who rarely read the financial pages of newspapers.

A further comment which I should like to make is that all the bonds involved are printed in the English language, and appear in denominations of $1000, $500, or, in a few instances, $100.

The Board's annual report for the year ended August 31, 1956, and its current reports, include a section on challenged registrations. The material interestingly describes quite a number of efforts which have been made to slip through the validation procedure bonds allegedly looted during the Russian occupation.

The German records, which in large part were also looted or destroyed during and after the last World War, have been reconstructed by the issuers of the securities to such an extent that most of the serial numbers of the missing bonds are known. The Board informs me that it has not had from any German issuer a single complaint that it has thus far validated a looted bond.

Mr. Douglas W. Hartman, the American member of the Validation Board, told me quite confidently that the Board anticipated little difficulty in detecting any effort which might be made before the end of validation to have looted bonds validated.

At this time I should also like to call attention to the fine job being done by this Board for validation of German dollar bonds. The United States member, Mr. Hartman, and the German member, Dr. Walther Skaupy, have given a wonderful demonstration of what dedicated representatives of two nations can do in endeavoring to achieve a common goal.

I also take this opportunity to commend the German issuers of these bonds and the Federal Republic of Germany for the highly commendable way in which they are trying to honor these securities.

In conclusion, I call attention to the specimens of German dollar bonds which I hold in my hand. I ask that the Members of the Senate study them, in order that they may recognize them should any of their constituents have questions regarding this matter.

Mr. President, I trust that the press will see to it that sufficient notice is given of this situation, so that those who own bonds can locate them. It is most desirable that the remainder of the bonds be located.

SPEED NEEDED ON DAIRY-PRICE-SUPPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Congress has less than 60 days in which to act upon an approaching deadline in dairy-price-support legislation.

If appropriate action is not taken, there will be a disastrous drop in the level of price supports on dairy products. According to an announcement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, the drop is scheduled, as we are aware, for April 1—the beginning of the new marketing year.

To avoid slashing an already-too-low farm income, the Congress, therefore, must act with all possible speed on proposed legislation to maintain at least the present level of price supports for dairy products.

I am pleased that the House Agriculture Committee has been taking action on proposed legislation to cancel the attempt to slash support prices. Also, it is greatly encouraging that the Senate Agriculture Committee reports that it will soon be getting its hearings under way. Again, I respectfully stress the need for immediate action, since the deadline is only a few weeks away.

As we know, I have cosponsored proposed legislation—S. 2924 and S. 2912—which would cancel the attempt to slash price supports to 75 percent of parity. I am happy to reemphasize that these bills have broad bipartisan support. Since the introduction of these measures, I have received a great many communications in support of them.

Naturally, all of us can appreciate the farmers' interest in seeking to maintain the very modest minimum income which they now receive. This is, of course, a basic consideration.

Besides hearing from a great many individual farmers, I have also heard from a number of farm organizations. Among these are the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, the Milwaukee Cooperative Milk Producers, and the Consolidated Badger Cooperative.

But I should like to stress the additional fact that this proposed legislation has gained support from many other segments of the general economy. These include implement dealers, private and cooperative creameries, electrical associations, and others.

I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a few of these messages from a cross-section of our Wisconsin economy.

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

FOND DU LAC, WIS., *January 16, 1958.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.,

Our State board of directors, in session today, January 16, 1958, were stunned by President Eisenhower's message on agriculture wherein he recommends that dairy support minimums be lowered to 60 percent of parity and wherein he considers dairying along with peanuts, tobacco, and the other basic commodities. At present parity figures, the President's proposal would permit the lowering of 3.95 percent milk to about $2.40 per hundredweight. This could cost Wisconsin dairy farmers another $95 million per year in dairy income in addition to the $45 million cut Benson has announced for the next production year.

We urge that you use every possible means to institute a $3.50 per hundredweight mandatory minimum dairy support price.

WILLIAM C. ECKLES,
General Manager, Pure Milk Products Cooperative.

MILWAUKEE COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 3, 1958.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Milwaukee Cooperative Milk Producers believes that Secretary of Agriculture Benson's plan to cut price supports to 75 percent of parity is wrong and should not be put into effect.

We believe that farmers are in no condition to accept a cut of from 22 to 25 cents per hundredweight for milk, because their costs are going up instead of becoming lower.

Particularly dairy farmers are the hardest working people in the Nation and receive the lowest return for their effort and investment.

We trust that you will do what is necessary to keep price supports on dairy products where they are now, at least for all of the year 1958.

Thanking you, we are,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES DINEEN, *Secretary.*

[From a Merrill, Wis., implement dealer]

JANUARY 29, 1958.

Hon. Senator WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has been called to my attention numerous times of late by farmers in our locality about the Benson proposed cut in dairy-support program. I know that there is a surplus production of dairy supplies and that something different from what has been done will have to be planned out and put into practice to get us out of a mess.

After considerable discussion with farmers in the community, small-business men that are directly affected by farmers' change in income, and also in talking with some manufacturers, I believe that for the present at least we should not let the supports be cut and something should be done about the surplus that is coming on the market from the Eastern States fluid-milk producers.

I know that if our farmers here will have to take a cut in their dairy income that I and many other small businesses will also feel the hurt of the small incomes.

May I ask that you as our representative give this serious consideration and work toward a goal of helping our Wisconsin farmer.

Yours very truly,

SHAWANO, WIS.,
January 23, 1958.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe every effort should be put forth immediately on your bill S. 2924 and then self-help bill H. R. 10043 or Laird's bill will be the best for permanent legislation for the Wisconsin dairy farmer.

GEO. W. RUPPLE,
Consolidated Badger Co-Op.

RICHLAND COOPERATIVE
ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Richland Center, Wis., January 16, 1958.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Richland Cooperative Electric board, at its last meeting, directed me as secretary to write to you and ask for your assistance in reversing the order of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, under which dairy price supports will be cut to the minimum level under present law. Wisconsin farmers are already eating into their depreciation and other reserves to keep going, and the action of the Secretary in pulling the rug out from under them will result in complete bankruptcy for many of the hard pressed farmers.

National Milk Producers Federation has estimated that dairymen will lose about $250 million in income next year as a result of the Benson cut. Experience has plainly demonstrated that previous cuts by Secretary Benson have not resulted in any decrease in surpluses, and have not improved the prices of milk and dairy products in the market place. At a time when reliable reports indicate that Wisconsin dairy farmers are earning an average of only 43 cents an hour, for working time last year, we cannot find language strong enough to condemn this unfortunate action in further depressing farm income.

We call upon you to give us every assistance possible in securing a reversal of this unfair order.

Very truly yours,
THERON M. JANNEY,
Secretary.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 31, 1958.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am a large dairy farmer in Wisconsin, also president of Falls Dairy Co., Jim Falls, Wis., where we receive milk direct from approximately 1,500 farmers as well as purchasing milk from small cooperative and private creameries. I am also executive vice president of Western Dairy Cooperative at Clarkfield, Minn., where we receive milk from 16 cooperative creameries and 1 private creamery representing approximately 3,000 farmer producers. The drop in the support price will not hurt the creameries as the reduction in price will be passed on to the farmer. This drop in price, however, will be a very serious blow to the dairy farmer. It is beyond us to comprehend the justification for continually reducing the prices paid to farmers while nearly all other segments of our economy continue to raise prices. The labor costs are being increased yearly. In many cases these increases are automatic, having been negotiated from 1 to 3 years ahead with the result that everything the farmer purchases is costing him more money. This price squeeze on one of the most important segments of our economy is not, in our opinion, justified. The lowering of price supports will not reduce the production but will increase it as these farmers must have a minimum cash income to pay their obligations. We request that you use every effort and means possible to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from reducing the support price April 1. In our opinion the least that can be done is to maintain the present support level.

PIRA FARM, WIS., *January 31, 1958.*

Senator WILEY: A word to let you know I am with you to stop any further cut in price supports.

From a dairy farmer.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As a farmer in Barron County I hope you are doing everything you can to stop Benson from lowering the rate of parity.

If not I'll just have to milk more cows to make ends meet and that won't help the so-called overproduction.

Sincerely,

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a very fine letter from Mr. Charles Cummer asking support for the King-Jenkins bill, H. R. 4662. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and I have introduced an identical measure in the Senate because of our interest in the educational system and the need to correct an unjust situation. Our bill would permit teachers to deduct amounts up to $600 a year from gross income for their expenses for tuition, books, and other equipment, travel and living expenses while away from home, to the extent that they exceed their normal living expenses, in connection with their enrollment in a course or courses of education at an institution of higher education accredited by the accrediting agency of a State or Territory or by a regional accrediting agency. Most schools and States now require that teachers return to college for further training during the summer months or at night school during the school year so as to maintain professional status. This should be considered a business expense, and in other businesses can be deducted from gross income.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Cummer's letter printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Hon. ED THYE:

I am a schoolteacher at the junior high school here in Moorhead, Minn. I have been teaching for 8 years.

I spent the summer of 1954, 1955, and 1956 doing graduate work at St. Cloud State College. Ordinarily I would have done carpentry work to supplement my income. I have never figured the exact dollar cost of attaining my master's degree. I spent money for tuition, and so forth, and lost out on additional income because I felt I could become a better teacher by taking further training.

If the King-Jenkins bill, H. R. 4662, is passed to enable teachers to deduct from taxable income the cost of further education it will be too late for me to benefit financially. However, I urge you to vote favorably on this issue.

It is inexcusable and a rank injustice that a businessman can deduct such things as entertaining customers and a teacher cannot deduct educational expenses.

I know men teachers who put in a full day of teaching and then attend a 3-hour evening class once or twice a week. Maybe their basic reason is to get a better salary but he probably needs that extra dollar more than the businessman.

I respectfully urge you to vote favorably toward the King-Jenkins bill and to urge others to do likewise.

Sincerely,

CHARLES CUMMER.

A CHEMICAL ENGINEER VISITS THE U. S. S. R.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the fall of 1957, a group of Russian engineers were permitted to visit Minnesota and see our mining industry. At the same time, a five-man technical mission studied the peat industry of Russia for 3 weeks. Included in this group was Dr. Edward L. Piret, of the department of chamical engineering at the University of Minnesota. His trip was sponsored by the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission, State of Minnesota. Dr. Piret wrote of his experience in the December issue of Chemical Engineering Progress. Because of its inter-

esting content, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that every Member of the Senate will have an opportunity to benefit from his findings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHEMICAL ENGINEER VISITS THE U. S. S. R.

(By Edgar L. Piret, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Recently, as a member of a 5-man technical mission [1] arranged by the United States State Department, I had an opportunity to visit and study for a 3-week period the large peat industry of the U. S. S. R. It was also possible to visit Soviet institutions of education and research, including several devoted specifically to chemical engineering. This paper will serve as background for a later report on chemical engineering in the U. S. S. R.

Soviet engineers and professors were always cordial, open, and informative in their discussions. The officials place no restrictions on the taking of pictures and several requests to see laboratories and special items of interest were granted. As a consequence, the trip proved most interesting and informative. The fact that we were official guests of the Ministry of Fuel and Power undoubtedly eased these visits greatly.

A visitor to Russia will frequently and most forcefully be struck by the seemingly sudden Soviet scientific development, and by the sharp contrasts in advancement which he sees. He will find it difficult to draw conclusions, because at one moment he may see a modern laboratory or apparatus of advanced design, yet in the next moment he will see equipment, a design, or working methods of several decades ago.

Perhaps a more startling experience is to discuss a right up-to-the-minute engineering subject with a Soviet engineer thoroughly familiar and up to date in his field, and then a few minutes later suddenly discover that despite his obvious good will, intelligence and high education, this same engineer's knowledge of the true economic, social, and political conditions in the United States is highly inaccurate and out of date by 25 or more years.

In several laboratories, I noticed very recent issues of American chemical engineering and chemical journals and it was easy to talk with Soviet chemical engineers and other technical men about modern engineering problems—for example, a theoretical or experimental aspect of the unit operations. They were well informed, talkative, and described their interests and problems in education and research in an open, stimulating manner.

In almost terrifying contrast because of its significance, I saw not a single American or, for that matter, English or other West European newspaper or popular magazine on sale in any hotel lobby, railroad station, department store, bookstore, or bookstand.

One sees many such American items even in the lesser cities of France, Finland, Germany, Italy, Sweden, etc. Lack of interest in the United States or inability to read English [2] most certainly is not the cause of this conspicuous absence of information. Time and again in the U. S. S. R. I (and others of our group) was asked by people in the streets, by students, and others, for any American book, magazine, or even scrap of newspaper that might have wrapped a package in our luggage.

When I speak of English language and Western European publications, I am of course excluding such newspapers as the French Communist Humanité, Moscow News (published in Moscow), copies in libraries, books by James Fenimore Cooper and other classics of years ago, and especially what to me were obviously carefully selected volumes of highly unrepresentative Western writers. These publications unfortunately leave the Soviet man with the erroneous impression that he is well informed about the outside world. He does not even know that he doesn't know.

Thus, on one hand we see that the Soviet engineer has ready access to, and uses, the latest technical literature of the West. On the other hand, the same man has no effective access to our newspapers, or even to our most popular magazines or representative contemporary literature. Most tragically, what I did hear on every hand about our country and its people was highly inaccurate and warped. It recalled to me the parallel situation I met in Germany in 1936.

The need for a broad and early flow of information and understanding is all too clear.

Certainly, the people I came in contact with professionally in the Soviet Union are intellectually capable of better understanding us and our way of life, given more information. So there is a chance that efforts in that direction would result in substantial gains.

It is generally known that the U. S. S. R. is now, in a highly planned and vigorous manner, concentrating much effort on the technology and mechanization of its basic industries. Also, it appeared to me that Soviet Government policy is to give the highest priorities—and to support on a scale unprecedented in world history—to its scientific, engineering, and industrial research and development personnel and laboratories. Still more significant, because of the certainty of the effects within 10 to 15 years, is that this expansion of industry and of basic and of applied research is now being supported with a vigorous modernization and expansion of the educational centers for the training of engineers and scientists. Automatic control and the use of recording instruments seems to be particularly emphasized in the chemical engineering educational program.

The present status of Soviet science and engineering, as related to that of the Western World, is of course difficult to assess accurately in a short visit to the country. But it was evident to me after having seen several laboratories—and particularly after observing in detail the methods and the scope with which they are carrying on the peat industrial research program—that the Soviets have, in that field at least, advanced to where they are using modern engineering techniques, modern methods of industrial product and process development, and modern managerial techniques.

For example, we were shown an extensive laboratory program in which comprehensive and accurately taken data were being used to calculate economic optimum for projected processes. For other similar projects several pilot units were testing the laboratory results. Surprisingly, several large-scale semiworks operations were also being run in parallel to decide, under essentially full-scale conditions, the costs of competing processes. Within a single ministry and program the Soviet system allows for the evolution of more than one process all the way up to and including full-scale production. Each stage is evaluated in terms of rubles/ton, including such items as raw materials, labor, transportation, amortization of plant, amortization of equipment, safety clothing, etc. The only items I have found missing were interest on capital and social security.

The concentration of effort and of funds on technical education, research, and development for heavy industry and for the military is inevitably taking place at the expense of the living standards of the people.

Certainly the people of Moscow, Leningrad, and of the smaller towns and villages I saw have a Spartan or less existence. They see few, if any, luxuries. The living standards of the Russians are far below our own, but as far as I could tell, these standards were not so low as to provoke violent discontent. Most Russian people simply have no knowledge of the conditions in the outside world. Their basis of comparison is their past. After all, the history of Russia has always been an unhappy one, with oppression and grinding poverty the lot for nearly everyone.

The Russian people I saw in the cities were adequately, if only roughly clothed and seemed adequately nourished. It was stated that a great improvement in clothing had occurred in the past 3 years.

The accompanying table shows that the lot of the young Russian engineer is today poor when compared with his American counterpart. For example, about 10 percent of a young Soviet engineer's monthly salary is gone when he buys a single pair of very ordinary quality shoes. A similar pair of shoes would cost a young American less than 2 percent of his monthly salary of $475. A good pair of shoes is practically unobtainable for the young Russian since he would have to pay nearly 2 weeks salary for them. A small Volga car, whose equivalent here would cost the young American about 4 months' salary, represents so many months of work (15) for the Russian that it is clearly out of reach.

The table appears to show that as far as his monthly earnings are concerned, the starting salary of the young Russian engineer is only a little above that of other workers in the country. However, special privileges of many kinds typically reserved for select groups in the Soviet system, status, and earnings potential as indicated in the table make the young engineer's situation an enviable one when compared to others in Russia. He is also at a decided advantage relative to highly trained professionals in nontechnical fields.

Then, too, if he, for example, manages to become a staff member and ultimately a professor at an institute of engineering education, he achieves not only one of the most remunerative positions, but one held in highest honor in the community.

The Russian of the cities must be particularly conscious of the educational and technical advancements of his country which are displayed before him in the form of elaborate, permanent educational exhibitions intended to excite him with their implied promises for the future. High buildings, ornate subways, and immense stadiums also feed emotional hungers. Amusement parks are lined with posters showing industrial production curves, with increasing slopes for the future, and slogans inciting the Russian to greater efforts (much like our own wartime posters). There are no advertisements increasing his appetites and urging him to buy. Nor is knowledge of the outside world, or of what he does not have, available to disturb him from his tasks. The Russian citizen is apparently expected to feel that he has considerable economic freedom since he can within his organization criticize work methods, foremen, etc. Political freedom he has never had and probably does not miss. Morality is identified with the good of the party, and religion is mere superstition.

The decision to concentrate much effort on education for science and engineering, on research and development, etc., at the expense of other facets of national life, is, of course, a result of policy decisions which can

[1] Sponsored by the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission, State of Minnesota.

[2] Sixty-five percent of the students in the Soviet institutions of higher learning study English, according to the recently released report on Soviet education by the United States Office of Education.

most easily be imposed on a nation by decisive authority from above.

The new buildings of the University of Moscow represent one recent peak result of such a policy. This large group of structures located on the Lenin Hills overlooking Moscow cost $300 million to build. This is a recent project, built in 1949–53, and consists of a main 32-story building and 36 other buildings situated in a parklike area of some 800 acres. With its 43 elevators, marble halls, and corridors, it is impressive. Its design, however, leaves much to be desired from the viewpoint of efficiency. The main point to be noted is that this new University of Moscow, with its 23,000 students, trains scientists exclusively—chemists, physicists, mathematicians, geographers, geologists, etc. The literary and other less favored faculties are still located in the antiquated, crowded buildings of the old university in downtown Moscow. This new palace of education-for-science on Lenin Hills, the many well-supported institutes for engineering, education, and research, and the incentive of the high rewards are clear indexes of the great value which the Soviet Government attaches to the advancement of science and engineering and to education for these fields.

All this concentration on technology of course fits in with the materialistic philosophy of the Communists. However, it should not be inferred that there is no cultural activity. A visit to the ballet at the Bolshoi Theater or to an outdoor performance at the Kyrov Stadium, or a recalling of modern Soviet composers will quickly show that this is not so. I was told that there has been a most extensive development over the whole country of many schools of music and that there is a strong interest in poetry. The paintings that I did see, however, appeared completely unimaginative and stagnant. The multitude of crowded bookstores and bookstalls lining the main streets of Moscow, of Leningrad, and other towns we saw is indicative of a wide interest in reading.

One sees in city parks, along highways, in the subway stations, and also in small towns, statues and posters showing a young man or girl studying a book. These apparently are ideals to which the Soviet youth is exposed. The presence and significance of such statues is less surprising when one is informed that in the last 40 years the Soviets have raised themselves by their own bootstraps to increase the number of students in their schools from less than 10 million to more than 34 million today and that universal secondary education is planned by 1960. Illiteracy has been essentially eradicated. A new nation has taught itself within two generations—young and old alike—to read and to write and has produced in 1955 young scientists and engineers at double the rate of our United States of America—the most advanced and powerful industrial nation of the world. Today Russia is reported to have 70,000 or so Ph. D.'s in science and engineering.

There are now 33 Soviet universities and a multiplicity of technical institutes and research organizations which inevitably have affected and will continue to raise the scientific and technical skills of the Russian.

A visitor naturally searches to find the incentives used to promote so much advanced study and research in the U. S. S. R. The answer came quickly. Money and prestige, as might be expected, are the incentives used even in Russia today. They are a measure of the value of the individual's contribution to the state.

A Soviet student enters a higher technical school through severe competitive examinations and is considered to be working for the state as he would in an industrial plant. There are no tuition fees since last year, and all successful students have substantial scholarships. Retention of these scholarships (as well as their amounts and privileges) is related to scholastic performance, as is the job to which the graduating student has access. As has been pointed out, the rewards available to the engineering graduate—and particularly to the engineering educator—are considerable.

The directions in which the best talent tends to flow under such circumstances are obvious, and the effect upon the quality and number of high-grade engineers and scientists available to the nation follows.

Our own industrial experience has demonstrated, in no uncertain terms, that it is essential for a corporation to have a strong research and development program if it is to maintain its position relative to competition. Our earnest competition for the future is no longer largely between corporations: it is between our Nation and the U. S. S. R. It is a challenge to each one of us.

The effects of the Russian policy for education and research on the development of the Soviet state are already clear. If the United States invests heavily in better education and basic research it can be certain of a high return in a few years in the welfare and material wealth of the American people. It is a good investment even without considerations of national security. Its achievement, however, will take more than investment.

IMPRESSIONS THAT REMAIN

The high personal qualities and drive of the men who received us in their laboratories and plants.

The burdens evident in the faces of the people we saw in the villages—a reminder of our common humanity, problems, and hopes, and the need for justice and for peace in the world.

SALARIES IN THE U. S. S. R., AS TOLD BY SEVERAL DIFFERENT PERSONS TO E. L. PIRET IN RUSSIA IN JULY 1957

Nonqualified labor, 500 rubles per month.

Women sod pickers, 700 to 800 rubles per month.

Taxi drivers, 800 to 900 rubles per month.

Women on construction jobs, 600 to 1,000 rubles per month.

Women guides, university graduates, 800 rubles per month.

Tractor drivers in peat fields, 900 rubles per month.

Peat field supervisors, 2,700 rubles per month.

Engineers just out of school, 1,000 rubles per month.

Engineers with 15 years experience, 3,000 to 4,000 rubles per month.

Coal miners, 3,000 to 4,000 rubles per month. (Recognizing essential and dangerous work.)

Machinists (48 hours per week), 1,000 to 2,000 rubles per month.

High-school teachers, 1,200 to 1,500 rubles per month.

Medical doctor or lawyer, 1,500 to 1,800 rubles per month.

Chemists (with 4 years training): After 10 to 15 years' experience, 1,500 rubles per month; with a kandidat, 2,800 rubles per month; with a doktor, 4,500 rubles per month.

Engineering assistant to a deputy minister of the government, 2,500 rubles per month.

Manager of a 500-man plant, 3,500 rubles per month plus additional facilities (car, apartment, etc.).

Professors at a university, 6,000 to 11,000 rubles per month plus additional facilities (car, etc.).

President of the Academy of Science is the highest salaried individual in the U. S. S. R.

Artists' salaries are very, very high; e. g., a top dramatist, 20,000 rubles per month.

A party member receives no pay for his political work (I was told).

PRICES

Moscovite sedan, 15,000 rubles.

Volga sedan (comparable to a very small European Ford), 30,000 rubles.

Ordinary quality dress shoes, 100 rubles.

Good quality shoes, 300 to 400 rubles.

One kilogram butter, 28 rubles.

One kilogram white bread, 1 ruble.

One kilogram good meat, 10 rubles.

EXCHANGE RATES

Commercial, 1 ruble equals 25 cents United States.

Tourist, 1 ruble equals 10 cents United States.

INCREASED EQUIPMENT ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, every one of us knows from personal experience that operating our automobiles becomes more expensive with each succeeding year. Whenever individuals are reimbursed for the use of their cars in business, the rate per mile has steadily increased.

Among those who must operate their automobiles in the line of duty are the rural letter carriers of the country. It has been their experience that the expense has outrun the size of the reimbursement. In response to this situation, S. 3050 was introduced January 16, 1958, by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. This measure proposes to increase the equipment-maintenance allowance for rural carriers in the postal service to 11 cents for each mile or fraction thereof or $4.50 per day, whichever is greater. The rate is now 9 cents. There is a provision, too, for an additional allowance of $2.50 per day for carriers serving heavily patronized routes.

Hearings on this bill were recently conducted by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Included in the record of the hearing, Mr. President, is my statement in support of S. 3050. Because my statement contained some significant figures provided by rural carriers from my own State, I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER BEFORE SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 7, 1958, HEARING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON S. 3050, EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of meeting in Portland with a delegation of rural carriers from my home State of Oregon on October 28, 1957. We met in my Portland office and we discussed the situation that confronts every rural carrier in the country. That situation may be stated simply as one in which expenses are consistently outrunning income. Just as the farmer has to buy his equipment at inflated prices out of income that has not risen proportionately, so the rural mail carrier finds himself paying higher prices for his cars each time he replaces his old one. He also finds that the price of gasoline and oil have climbed to new highs. His equipment allowance has

not kept pace. The result is that the rural carrier is digging deeper every year to cover his expense deficit from his salary. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in effect the rural carriers, to the extent of that deficit, are endowing rural delivery service.

I am sure it wasn't conceived that such should be the case when the Grange battled successfully in behalf of the inauguration of rural free delivery in the last century.

I told the rural carriers who placed before me the imperative need of adjustment of the mileage equipment allowance that I wanted them to provide me with copies of their worksheets so that I could present the undisputable facts to my colleagues on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This they have done and the figures fully support their claims. I have gone over a score of these expense sheets which I will leave with the professional staff members of this committee for further analysis. Let me point out a few figures gleaned from these reports which emphasize the extreme need for enacting S. 3050. The deficit reported in these 20 reports ran as high as $781.97. There were 3 of the 20 rural carriers reporting whose deficits were under $100. There were three who had deficits of more than $500. The average deficit of the 20 who reported was $256 annually. This is a substantial contribution, I am sure you will agree, that each of these rural carriers is making to the postal service. True, it is deductible expense which is subtracted from their salary on line 5, page 1, of form 1040. But it is unjust and inequitable, and as far as the families of the individual carriers are concerned, it is in effect a cut in salary.

This year these rural carriers in Oregon are faced with the prospect of an even greater deficit if measures to increase the mileage equipment allowance fail of enactment. Their liability and collision insurance, for one thing, has jumped 30 percent. Those who will replace their automobiles will do so at a far higher figure than the old car cost when it was new. Mr. Chairman, these figures lead me to concur with Mr. Kenneth D. Fendall, president of our Oregon Rural Letter Carriers' Association when he says "We carriers feel it is unfair to ask us to dip into our salary to pay costs of equipment that we have to have to properly serve our routes." There would seem to be only one reply that could properly or fairly be given Mr. Fendall. That would be enactment of S. 3050.

I have assured the president of the Oregon rural carriers that I will vigorously support and work for such a measure.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a brief statement relating to the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which occurs Sunday, February 16, should be honored by every American who holds sacred the ideals upon which our liberty and independence were established.

This anniversary commemorates a historic event in the world struggle for freedom and justice. It brings to our attention once more the heroism of the Lithuanian people and their courageous determination to keep uppermost in their hearts and minds their goal of national independence.

Held captive by a foreign invader and robbed of their sovereignty by the armed might of Soviet aggression, these valiant people have never surrendered to despair. Subjected to savage persecution under the iron heel of Communist tyranny and terrorism, they have never lost hope of ultimate victory. Their spirit of independence has not been crushed but lives on to inspire new hope that the day of liberation is close at hand.

It is important, therefore, on this memorable anniversary, to make known to the people of Lithuania that we are dedicated to the noble cause of Lithuanian independence and join them in prayer that their land may soon again be restored to her rightful and honored place among the free nations of the world.

ALASKAN AND HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate know, S. 49, the bill to enable the strategic and richly endowed American Territory of Alaska to become a State, was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the first session of this 85th Congress, and is now pending on the Senate Calendar. It is Calendar No. 1197.

In connection with this pending legislation, the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald both have published recently highly pertinent editorials—the New York Times this morning and the Post on last Friday, February 7. I ask unanimous consent that these most timely and carefully considered editorials appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1958]

STATEHOOD SHENANIGANS

We don't believe President Eisenhower was being disingenuous when he came out at his press conference last week for bringing the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills up simultaneously. But the overwhelming probability is that if the attempt to tie the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills together succeeds neither one will get through.

Such a failure would be a new breach of the promises made by both major parties in 1952 and again in 1956. The Republican platform of 1952 pledged "immediate statehood" for Hawaii and "statehood under an equitable enabling act" for Alaska. In 1956 the platform called for "immediate statehood" for both Territories. The Democratic platforms in 1952 and again in 1956 likewise pledged "immediate statehood" for the two. If platform promises were like other kinds of promises Alaska and Hawaii would now be States.

But the promises have been evaded: first, in 1953, when Hawaii was killed off by tagging Alaska to the same bill; now, in 1958, when Alaska's cause is likely to be ruined by linking it, in the same bill or an immediately following bill, with the now more difficult cause of Hawaii. Senate Minority Leader KNOWLAND has given warning to this effect, and since he could rally some race-conscious Democrats the effect may be fatal to both Territories. There has been a shift in the statehood situation since 1953 as Alaska's political strength has grown and as Hawaii's leftwing elements have frightened off some former friends of Hawaiian statehood.

There is no quarrel between the Hawaiian statehood advocates and the Alaskans. If Alaska gets through at this session Hawaii's chances at the next session will be improved. But the parliamentary attempt to tie the two together comes—let there be no mistake about that—from those who don't want either Territory to enjoy self-government that prevails in other parts of the Union.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 7, 1958]

TAKE ALASKA FIRST

Senator KNOWLAND has muddied the water over consideration of statehood for Alaska by insisting that Hawaiian statehood also be considered immediately. We hope that this is an inadvertence, and not a deliberate maneuver to thwart statehood for either Territory. Republicans would take upon themselves an ugly responsibility if they were to resurrect the cynical device that was used to kill statehood several years ago when the two bills were tied together.

Until Mr. KNOWLAND's statement, or at least until President Eisenhower's news conference on Wednesday, the chances for Alaskan statehood seemed brighter than in a long time. Speaker RAYBURN had given the bill his personal endorsement and promised to bring it to a vote in the House. There were similar grounds for optimism in the Senate, with tacit agreement that the Alaska bill would pave the way for later consideration of Hawaii. Both Republicans and Democrats seemed to have concluded not only that Alaska's cause is just, but also that both parties would benefit from early passage of enabling legislation. Interior Secretary Seaton has been a consistent supporter of statehood and last year suggested a sensible plan for protection of the Federal interest in Alaska that has become the basis of the present bill.

On Wednesday, however, Mr. Eisenhower advocated the simultaneous admission of both Alaska and Hawaii; and now comes Mr. KNOWLAND'S statement. This has an ominous ring, for it is not the way to help Hawaii. Champions of statehood for both Territories know that there is more controversy over Hawaii. Therefore the most promising course is to concentrate on passing the Alaska bill now, in full confidence that when Alaska finally assumes her privileges and responsibilities as a regular member of the Union, Hawaii will not be far behind.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, my own record in the Senate as a supporter of statehood for Hawaii speaks for itself. I took an active part in the hearings held by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 81st Congress which led to our favorable report on H. R. 49, the Hawaii Statehood Enabling Act of that Congress. This was the first Hawaii statehood bill ever to be reported out of committee in the Senate.

In the 82d Congress I was a sponsor of the Hawaii bill; and again in the 83d Congress, I not only was a sponsor, but also took an active part here on the floor of the Senate for passage of the statehood bill. In the 84th Congress, as Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I introduced the Hawaii statehood bill and helped hold the hearings on the measure. So, too, in this Congress, I introduced S. 50, statehood for Hawaii, and helped with our committee's favorable action on the measure.

Today, Mr. President, I am as firm a supporter of statehood for Hawaii as I have been all through the years. But I am also a realist. In the other body,

the Alaska bill, H. R. 7999, has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Hawaii bill has not even been acted on by the Territories Subcommittee.

It is obvious that the Alaska bill has an excellent chance of enactment this session; the Hawaii bill has relatively little. Together, neither of them would have much chance, in my considered opinion.

Therefore, all friends of statehood should unite in permitting Alaska to go forward alone this year.

Incidentally, with respect to Alaska, I might mention that our measure, S. 49, does not provide that the two so-called Tennessee plan Senators should be recognized and seated forthwith in this body. On the contrary, specific provision is made for primary and general elections to be held in the Territory next year for the purpose of nominating and electing representatives to Congress after the State has been admitted. Thus, each political party again would have equal opportunity of electing Senators and a Member of the House for the 86th Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I want to say as one who has also supported statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska, ever since I came to the Senate, and as one who has been vitally interested in the subject, believing both of these great Territories will gain statehood, that I hope very much the leadership in the Senate and the majority policy committee will not only schedule for consideration by the Senate the bill to grant statehood to Alaska, but, when the Senate has acted upon that bill, I hope they will immediately thereafter schedule for consideration the bill to grant statehood to Hawaii, for action by the Senate, to at least give the Senate of the United States an opportunity to again pass upon these great public policy questions relating to statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate the Senator's statement and pay tribute to him for his genuine statesmanship in behalf of both Alaska and Hawaii. I am in thorough agreement with the Senator that both Territories should become States. As stated, I have sponsored and supported bills for that purpose throughout the years.

I intend to go forward with support of statehood for Hawaii after we succeed in securing passage of the Alaska bill. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the likelihood of getting a bill through for Hawaiian statehood immediately is not very favorable. As soon as the circumstances are propitious, I am willing to support it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to compliment the distinguished Senator for getting both bills on the calendar, where they follow in sequence, one behind the other. I notice Calendar No. 1197 is Senate bill 49, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and immediately following that is Calendar No. 1198, Senate bill 50, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

I know that the committee would not have reported the bills to the Senate unless the committee members felt both Territories were qualified for statehood. All I am suggesting to the distinguished Senator is that once the bill to provide statehood for Alaska has been taken up and has been acted upon, immediately following that, as appears on the Senate Calendar, the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii should be taken up, so that at least the Senate of the United States will have an opportunity to vote on the question immediately following consideration of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate that statement by the distinguished and able Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the distinguished Senator will be able to join with us on both sides of the aisle in getting a vote on both of these measures at this session.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator may be sure I will. I have always supported statehood for both Territories, and I shall continue to work for statehood for Hawaii.

FIGHT FOR WORLD HEALTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the eminent medical authority, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, M. D., who specializes in that subject for the New York Times, has written a persuasive column entitled "Fight for World Health." Dr. Rusk seeks further support of the various branches of the National Institutes of Health and he pays deserved tribute to our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as the "dean of American health legislation." Dr. Rusk emphasizes the fight against cancer and heart disease.

I ask unanimous consent that this salient article by Dr. Howard Rusk, from the New York Times of February 2, 1958, appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT FOR WORLD HEALTH—AN ANALYSIS OF MONEY NEEDED TO MOUNT OFFENSIVE ON CANCER AND HEART DISEASE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In his state of the Union message earlier this month, President Eisenhower invited the Soviet Union to join in the current global plan for the eradication of malaria from the world in the next 5 years.

He then suggested that as a first step toward his "Science for Peace" plan that the Soviet Union and the United States pool their efforts in research against the two great killers and cripplers, cancer and heart disease.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, long the "dean" of American health legislation, has now proposed immediate implementation of the President's suggestion by a dynamic program of "health for peace."

Speaking on the Senate floor, Mr. HILL deplored what he termed "the unfortunate contrast between word and deed."

He cited the President's proposal in his state of the Union message, but then added, "yet in his budget message he proposed that we cut back our own domestic fight against these dread killers of mankind."

In his budget message, the President recommended that the overall appropriation for the National Institutes of Health remain in the next fiscal year at the current $211,183,000.

Reallocation of funds within the National Institutes of Health would reduce funds from the National Cancer Institute from $56,402,000 to $55,923,000 and the National Heart Institute from $35,936,000 to $34,712,000.

Once again the President also plans to ask Congress to increase the overhead or indirect cost allocation to medical schools and other research institutions from the present 15 percent to 25 percent. Congress refused to do this last year.

OTHER BUDGET REQUESTS

The President's other budget proposals relating to the health activities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would:

Reduce the $121 million available for Federal grants for hospital construction to $75 million.

Increase funds available to the Food and Drug Administration by 1 percent.

Decrease tuberculosis control funds by 50 percent.

Increase funds for radiological health activities by 50 percent.

Appropriate another $30 million for Federal grants for construction of medical research facilities.

Reduce funds for venereal disease and communicable disease control.

As the first step toward health for peace, Senator HILL urged that the President submit to Congress a substantial supplemental budget increase for research against cancer and heart disease and a long range research program against these diseases.

The remainder of his program would:

Expand United States participation in existing international programs against cancer and heart disease.

Have the United States take the initiative in planning international research attacks on cancer and heart disease.

Provide for an official exchange between Russian and American scientists engaged in research on cancer and heart disease.

Provide that the United States initiate plans for an international clearinghouse on medical research information not only on cancer and heart disease but on all the major illnesses which plague humanity.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT NOTED

The question of increased funds for medical research has long had bipartisan support. Two years ago, for example, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine, introduced a bill calling for a $1 billion expenditure by the Federal Government over a 5-year period for medical research, Federal grants for medical research facilities, and Federal aid to medical education.

Congress has regularly appropriated more funds for the research programs of the National Institutes of Health than recommended in the President's budget. Congress recognizes that the people of the United States firmly believe in tax-supported medical research.

Nor can the contribution which Senator HILL's proposals to international understanding be questioned. Most people agree that while we and the rest of the world are spending billions of dollars for research for instruments of death and destruction in our struggle for survival, we should spend a few million on promoting health, happiness, human understanding, and dignity in our struggle for peace.

But if we are to take advantage of the opportunity within our reach of uniting the people of the world in the common cause against diseases which know no geographical or ideological boundaries, we must follow Senator HILL's advice that we must act and act boldly, now.

PAY TELEVISION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter I wrote to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission regarding the alleged propaganda campaign by the television networks to prevent the public from viewing pay television.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1958.
The Honorable JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I read a statement by E. F. McDonald, Jr., president of Zenith Radio Corp., in the city edition of the Washington Daily News dated Wednesday, February 5, 1958, at pages 20–21, a copy of which is enclosed.

The allegation is made by Mr. McDonald that certain television stations in the country, pursuant to urging by their network, are employing their facilities to make false charges against subscription television, all of which, it is alleged, is a part of a propaganda campaign to induce members of the public to write letters in opposition to subscription television to Members of Congress.

It was my understanding that the law imposes upon television station licensees the duty of fair and objective presentation of all controversial issues to the public. It is my further understanding that they cannot use their facilities for one-sided and unfair propaganda campaigns in which they or anyone with whom they associate have an interest.

If my understanding of the law is correct and if the charges are factual, then it would be true that certain television licensees have improperly used their facilities and have violated their duties as licensees.

I have taken no position on subscription television, although I cannot understand why the American people are not capable of deciding for themselves whether they like pay television after they have seen it.

I take no position with respect to the allegations made by Mr. McDonald. I am concerned with determining the truth or falsity of the allegations. If Zenith's charges are not true, then this fact should be exposed to the public. If they are true, then it is highly important that we determine whether such licensees have violated the law or whether the law should be strengthened to avoid such tremendous unrestrained concentrations of propaganda power.

I would appreciate your determining the treatment that television stations have given to subscription television since October of 1957, particularly with regard to the fairness of their presentation of the subject. I would appreciate a report from you at your earliest convenience.

I am aware that your Commission is presently under fire in connection with other matters. However, inferences that you have been unduly influenced by the networks are inconsistent with the fact that you did not yield to the pressures which are presently being brought to bear on the Congress in connection with this matter. It may well be that the fundamental soundness of our democratic form of government may be in for a serious testing. It is in that light that I believe everyone having any connection with this problem should carefully examine his conscience at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL B. LONG.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the advertisement by the Zenith Corp., to which my letter makes reference.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE ALL SCARED TO DEATH OF YOU, THE PUBLIC

Yes; they are running scared as cats. They are afraid to give you the freedom to choose on your own behalf the television programs you might want to see. They say that you must be compelled to watch the programs they select for you or nothing at all.

Who is so afraid? The president of CBS and the president of NBC and the president of ABC and the president of the National Association of Broadcasters, and a number of other very powerful people who run television networks and are so afraid to trust you that they are operating a nationwide propaganda and lobbying campaign, hoping to high pressure you and Congress.

What are they so afraid of? These men know better than anyone else that your TV set is technically capable of receiving the finest new motion pictures, hit Broadway plays, and other attractions which you can now see only by leaving your home and going out to the theater or stadium.

They know you would like to be able to see these programs in your own living room at a cost to the whole family of less than one ticket to the movies. No babysitters—no traffic, no parking fees—and no commercials in the program.

They are afraid that even the limited trial run of subscription TV, recently authorized by the FCC, would prove a public demand for really great programs and be a huge success.

This is what wakes them up shaking in the middle of the night. They are afraid you will find out how good TV can really be. This is why they are flooding the public and Congress with the phony charges that subscription TV will make every set owner pay for the programs he now sees free. They know this is not true and that it cannot ever be true.

At Zenith, we have time and time again pointed out that it would be plain business stupidity to ask you to pay to see a program you are now receiving free. The FCC has stated that it does not intend to permit, during the tests or after them, any practices that will impair the availability of advertising supported or so-called free programs. But despite all this—the phony charge continues being dinned into the ears of millions of Americans, accompanied with the request that people object to subscription television in letters to Congressmen.

The campaign is paying off handsomely. Thousands of letters from people rebelling against the idea of having to pay for present television programs are pouring into Congressmen's offices.

Actually, these thousands of letters prove what we have always known; namely, that the public would be outraged if asked to pay for television programs now received through advertising sponsorship. It has always been our position that subscription television can only succeed if it offers vastly superior programing for which people are willing to pay.

This all-out network campaign raises a frightening specter of network power over the public mind. If it is successful, it will confirm the three networks as the most powerful and dangerous lobby the country has ever known. Between them, they will have an ironclad grip over what shall be seen and what shall not be seen on the Nation's 40 million television sets. This power is now being used to prevent you from even sampling the wares of a new competitor, subscription television. It can also be used for many purposes, political as well as economic. Where will it stop?

If anyone has any doubt about the matter in which this power is being used today, here are a few of the facts:

Last January 13, on the eve of Congressional hearings regarding subscription television and proposed action to loosen the stranglehold networks now have on their dependents, the affiliated stations, the Columbia Broadcasting System threw an enormous banquet in Washington. There was provided a lavish star-studded program of entertainment which CBS would have charged an advertiser a quarter of a million dollars to televise. It was specifically designed to attract Members of Congress. What these guests had not anticipated was the presence of scores of executives of affiliated stations, well briefed beforehand, and strategically seated in the hope that the captive audience of Senators and Congressmen could be indoctrinated against subscription television.

Stations were urged to go on the air at home to repeat the charge that subscription TV would take over all TV, and to urge their listeners to write opposing letters to their Congressmen.

One station, a CBS affiliate, went so far as to tell the kids listening to a children's program that it would be killed off by pay-TV and to be sure to get mother and dad to write their Congressman and Senator.

Others bought space in local newspapers to publish the same phony charges.

Still others scurried through the Halls of Congress, urging their representatives to vote for legislation that would ban even the FCC-authorized trial of subscription TV.

NBC, another network, asked its affiliated stations to contribute money to an organization formed solely for the purpose of fighting subscription TV.

Washington has rarely, if ever, seen such a display of high-pressure lobbying from entrenched and vested interests.

All this has just one purpose—they want to pressure Congress into thinking that the people are against subscription television. The networks and the movie theaters don't really believe you are against it—on the contrary, they are so afraid you will support it during the course of the trial run proposed by the FCC that they are frantic in their efforts to prevent you from having that chance. If they really believed you were against paying a small fee for better, commercial-free programs, or that we won't be able to bring such programs to you, then they should welcome a public test. They know as well as anyone that we must have your support, earned by giving you the top-notch programs you really want, because without your support, even a limited test would be a crashing flop.

It is astounding enough that the networks dare undertake such an unprecedented thing as the outlawing of a new competitor at birth. It is shocking enough that their cynicism toward governmental processes has reached the point where they insult Congress by seeking to use lavish entertainment, pressure from special interests, and letters obviously induced by unfair propaganda to obtain legislation to protect their own pocketbooks. It is amazing enough that they can take in hundreds of millions of dollars each year out of the public's airwaves, for which they pay nothing, and then use those public airwaves to conduct unfair propaganda campaigns. But the most astounding, shocking, and amazing thing of all is that three organizations in New York City could have amassed such terrible power. The

question is no longer whether subscription television will benefit the public. The question is whether our democratic institutions and processes can coexist with such tremendous concentrations of unbridled and irresponsible power.

E. F. McDONALD, Jr.,
President, Zenith Radio Corp.

[From the Tulsa Tribune of January 23, 1958]

WHAT ABOUT PAY TV?

Presidents of America's three major radio-TV networks have been busy this week warning a Congressional committee that pay TV would ruin free TV.

The argument is intriguing. Here, say the gentlemen, are magnificent television programs free to the American people at a mere twist of the fingers. Yet if the Federal Communications Commission approves a 3-year test of pay TV, say these network presidents in unison, practically all the good shows and talent would gravitate to the pay circuits, leaving free TV nothing.

Let's examine this:

Why should a man pay for product A when a similar product B is offered free? There is only one answer. He must prefer product D enough to make up for the price.

How could pay TV survive in the face of competition from free TV? Only if pay TV offered programs that appealed to X number of people so much more than the free TV fare that these people would be willing to fork over enough to make pay TV a paying proposition.

Is there any reason why Americans should not have a choice between free entertainment and paid entertainment? They always have. You can go to the symphony, or you can play a record on your phonograph. You can take a bus ride, or you can walk your girl through the park. You can go to a movie, or you can flip on the TV.

Ah, as Hamlet said, there's the rub.

What the TV tycoons are really saying is that if you want to see good shows without commercials you cannot see them in your home—no, not even if you are willing to pay for the privilege. You must load the kids in the car and drive to the nearest theater. Your home entertainment is to be reserved exclusively for what the presidents of NBC, CBS, and ABC choose to give you.

If these gentlemen choose to give you grade B movies, interrupted every few minutes with lengthy sales talks, you must take it. You cannot subscribe to something else for your living room. In short unless you are willing to go to the inconvenience of leaving your house you must leave your entertainment in the hands of the commercial networks.

So much for these crocodile tears about pay TV "depriving the American people of free entertainment." If the American people choose not to pay the commercial circuits will lose no viewers. And unless the pay circuits offer better fare than TV does at present they will have no business.

We have here a very fundamental issue. Do the electronic screens in America's living rooms belong to NBC, CBS, and ABC or do they belong to the people who have bought them? Is it in the interests of free enterprise to give the three networks dictatorial power over what one shall see in his home, or shall the homeowner be allowed to buy a program if he thinks it's worth the price?

We hope Congress isn't fooled by these anguished gentlemen.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR MILK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from 800 members of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association of Madison and Onondaga Counties of New York with reference to the determinations of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the support price for milk.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC., DISTRICT 11

We, the delegates of district No. 11, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, representing 800 members in Madison and Onondaga Counties, in regular session on December 27, 1957, after discussion, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson in reducing dairy support prices to 75 percent of parity will cost the dairy farmers of the Nation $300 million in the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958; and

"Whereas this will be reflected by a drop of 12 to 25 cents per hundredweight in the blend price paid to farmers under Federal Order No. 27; and

"Whereas farmers under Federal Order No. 27 have won substantially improved prices under the new order which became effective August 1, 1957; and

"Whereas the move of the Secretary offsets much of the advantage that producers will continue to receive under the new order; and

"Whereas the Secretary took ill-advised action in announcing his decision by promising reduction in the retail price of fluid milk which promise has no basis in economic fact due to the increasingly high cost of labor in handling and processing milk: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we support the action of President Benham and our board of directors in calling upon the Congress of the United States to take direct legislative action to protect the income of dairy farmers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors urge Congress to pass enabling legislation for a producer-financed self-help program; and we further

"*Resolve*, That the Dairymen's League board of directors call upon all other farm organizations to join in bringing this matter to the attention of their members and urge them to support Congressional action to protect the income of dairy farmers."

R. M. AUSTIN.
LAURENCE DAMON.
MARSHALL H. HIGLEY.

THE CORDINER COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from the Board of Supervisors of Essex County, endorsing the recommendations of the so-called Cordiner Committee for compensation of members of the armed services.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 25, Cordiner Committee report

Whereas the United States Air Force has stated that its No. 1 problem is retention of skilled personnel and this same problem exists in the other services; and

Whereas a committee headed by Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, has proposed a modernized military-pay system based upon accepted methods of American industry and designed to aid the military services to reward and retain skilled individuals in critical jobs; and

Whereas it has been estimated that if adopted the Cordiner Committee's recommendations would eventually save $5 billion annually in training costs and at the same time substantially increase the striking power of our military forces: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Essex County Board of Supervisors does unanimously urge the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation containing the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable IRVING S. IVES, United States Senator; to the Honorable JACOB JAVITS, United States Senator; and to the Honorable DEAN TAYLOR, Member of the House of Representatives; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to all county boards of supervisors of New York State and that the Essex County Board of Supervisors does urge all organizations and individuals to contact their Representatives in Congress and ask them to support the Cordiner Committee report.

ZELMA A. COOK,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Essex County.

PETITIONS RELATING TO PRACTICES OF ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER INDUSTRY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two petitions; one from Delaware County, N. Y., and one from Clinton County, signed by various citizens interested in electric power furnished to consumers by electric cooperatives, who protest against what they call an advertising campaign by the electric light and power industry.

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

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, people who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems—are privileged people. They pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most other people pay because, the ad concludes, a strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is

the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas has made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric-power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly.

Now, therefore, we, the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, IRVING IVES and JACOB K. JAVITS and our Congressman, WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, and our State senators, Wheeler Milmoe and Fred Rath, and our assemblymen, Paul Talbot and William S. Calli, to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

Anna Maxwell, director, Joseph Marshal, Richard Ford, Emma A. Sanders, Clinton, N. Y.; Fred Moreley, Charles Record, Cazenovia, N. Y.; Lawrence R. Cary, Canastota, N. Y.; Payne J. Hart, Eaton, N. Y.; Gordon H. Roberts, Madison, N. Y.; Stewart Schindler, Oriskany Falls, N. Y.; David J. Jones, W. C. Brown, Erieville, N. Y.; M. D. Lyon, Jr., Eugene Lyon, William H. Lucas, Cazenovia, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems * * * "are privileged people." They "pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay," because, the ad concludes, "A strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems"; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars: First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly;

Now, therefore, we the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

S. V. Campbell, Everett Brown, Joseph Whittaker, Jr., George Jaquish, Theodore M. Soderblom, Israel Shediowit, Robert Finkle, Delhi, N. Y.; Raymond Stewart, Burton Henderson, Herbert I. Huggins, Bovina Center, N. Y.; Andrew Jamieson, Fraser, N. Y.; Edna M. Northrop, Alton Francisca, Delhi, N. Y.; Franklin Davis, Delancey, N. Y.; Paul Moody, W. W. Moody, M. C. Russell, Hamden, N. Y.; R. W. Baller, Fraser, N. Y.; Dominick E. Peccio, Arthur Gerkin, William N. Board, Mrs. Stanley V. Campbell, Delhi, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems * * * are privileged people." They "pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay" because, the ad concludes, "A strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems"; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric-power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly;

Now, therefore, we the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer:

J. William Bouw, Helen Bouw, Alonzo Van Bromer, Lucy Van Bromer, Isaac Jacobson, Dorothy Jacobson, Arthur Harens, Grayce Harens, David Jacobson, Margaret Jacobson, Albert Bouw, Joyce Bouw, John Shaver, Margaret Shaver, Carlton ————, Georgiana ————, Zorys Pocepma, Helen Pocepma, Roscoe, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government-controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems * * * are privileged people." They "pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay" because, the ad concludes, "A strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems"; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly;

Now therefore, we the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

Walter G. Hoyt, Norman F. Hoyt, Joseph L. Hoyt, Walton, N. Y.; Harold Moody, Delhi, N. Y.; Walter Tweedi, Walton, N. Y.; Charles A. Davidson, Eston Davidson, Charles R. Davidson, Delhi, N. Y.; Carroll A. Tweedie, Mrs. Walter G. Hoyt, Mrs. J. L. Hoyt, Walton, N. Y.; Mrs. Charles Davidson, Delhi, N. Y.; Clifton Hunt, Elizabeth Anderson, Lloyd Hunt, Lyle Hunt, Florence Tweedie, Elma Barnes, Bruce D. Hoyt, Horton Tweedie, Millard Kilpatrick, Jr., William A. Tweedie, Van Blackman, Letha Blackman, Pearl Tweedie, Elma Barnes, Prince D. Hoyt, Walton, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "people who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems" * * * "are privileged people." They "pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay" because, the ad concludes "a strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems"; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privileges by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly.

Now therefore, we the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

Peter Svegel, John S. Hinkley, Sr., Ray Olsen, Valentine Oblinski; Bloomville, N. Y.; John Dovman, East Meredith; W. B. Fuller, Leonard Scofield, Clarence M. Buel, Bloomville, N. Y.; George Skog, East Meredith, N. Y.; Sydney G. Oxberry, Bloomville, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems" * * * "are privileged people." They "pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay" because, the ad concludes "A strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills * * * because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems"; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis. And any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build goodwill, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric-power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly.

Now, therefore, we the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

Warren Weaver, Roderick Butler, Anger Norris, George F. Hoag, Willie Yurnpu, Alfred Harmisch, Edna Gustafson, Altley Gustafson, Andes, N. Y.; Gregg Little, De Lancey, N. Y.; Christine Ruchar, Fred Ruchar, Stanley Reed, Howard Rose, George Larr, Virginia Reed, Andes, N. Y.

Whereas many of the Government controlled and regulated electric light and power companies are expending vast sums of money in false and misleading advertising campaigns in national magazines; and

Whereas the ads complain that whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, people who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems—are privileged people. They pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the tax you and most people pay because, the ad concludes, a strange twist in Federal law exempts them from paying most of the taxes in electric bills because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems; and

Whereas these statements are false and misleading in two particulars:

First, the Federal wholesale power agencies are not electric systems in the usual sense. They do not anywhere sell power at retail. Some Federal power is purchased and resold at retail by nonprofit cooperative electric systems, which, in general, pay all taxes except the Federal income tax. This they do not pay because they operate on a nonprofit basis; and any other business organization is afforded the same privilege by law.

Second, despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power; and

Whereas these advertisements are designed, not to build goodwill, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas had made possible rural electrification; and

Whereas we believe advertising of this sort is an unfair and deceptive practice; contrary to the public interest because it is designed to eliminate even a modicum of competition from the electric power industry. It is doubly reprehensible coming from a group of companies, each of which enjoys an absolute monopoly.

Now, therefore, we, the undersigned, petition our United States Senators, our Congressmen, our State senators, and our assemblymen to (1) sponsor and promote legislation to prohibit this reprehensible practice of false propaganda at the expense of the electric consumer.

Harry Hedman, Rorig Avedela, Frank Winston, J. Johnsen, W. B. Mason, Clarence Palmer, Mary J. Palmer, H. F. Sleyler, Walter A. Clayton, Jefferson, N. Y.; Henry McCulley, Davenport, N. Y.; Marjorie Hedman, Jefferson, N. Y.; Don McCulley, Grace McCulley, Davenport, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADDITIONAL STAFF MEMBERS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 253) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 2, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "March 1" and insert "February 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "amended", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer has been agreed upon by the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Further it has the unanimous consent of all the minority members of the committee.

This amendment provides for a minority staff member to be included among the four additional staff members provided for by Senate Resolution 253. This amendment—sometimes referred to as the "Curtiss amendment"—has come to be a standard proviso in all resolutions dealing with committee appropriations and I offer this amendment to bring it in line with the other requests for committee appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ four additional professional staff members and two additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appoint-

ment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

CONSTRUCTION OF U. S. S. "ARIZONA" MEMORIAL AT PEARL HARBOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1253, House bill 5809.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5809) to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that there is no intention on the part of the leadership to take action this week upon the unfinished business.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent from the Senate today. Previously he had prepared some comments on the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

They detail some of the history of this beloved Member of the United States Senate.

They indicate that CARL HAYDEN will surpass the record set by Representative Joe Cannon for the number of consecutive years spent in the Congress.

I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in wishing Godspeed for many happy years ahead for the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, dean of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments which the junior Senator from Arizona had previously prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

On the 19th of February, my senior colleague, the distinguished Senator CARL HAYDEN, will surpass the record set by Representative JOE CANNON for the number of consecutive years spent in the Congress. Because it now appears highly probable that I will be called to active duty with the Air Force during the week on which that day falls, I want to speak briefly this morning on the occasion of this approaching record and about the remarkable man who is establishing it.

The name of HAYDEN in the State of Arizona is synonymous with the history of white men in that area. His family is one of the oldest families to live in the State and as an indication of the impact the family name has had on our history, there is a Hayden Mountain, in the Grand Canyon, Hayden Peak, Hayden's Butte and Hayden's Ferry, which later became the town of Tempe, where Senator HAYDEN was born. I might add that there is also a high school in Phoenix named the Carl Hayden High School. It has been my rare privilege to have known him and his charming wife all of my life, and I have enjoyed also a close friendship with his sisters.

As he has been to so many new Senators, he has been of extreme help to me as I have progressed through my 5 years in this body. His advice is always freely given, and to work with him on legislation is truly an educational experience.

In politics in Arizona, CARL HAYDEN's popularity oversteps party lines and there can be found for him universal support among members of both parties. He is not looked upon as a Democrat Senator, but as a Senator of whom all Arizona is justly proud.

In order that my colleagues might have a better insight into the devoted history of this man, I ask unanimous consent that a very short biography and history of his record be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Since its admission to the Union in 1912, Arizona has repeatedly elected to the House of Representatives, and later to the Senate, CARL HAYDEN, who is now serving his sixth term as a Senator.

The town of Tempe, Ariz., in which CARL HAYDEN was born October 2, 1877, was originally called Hayden's Ferry, in honor of his father, a descendent of settlers who had come to Connecticut from England in 1630. His parents were Charles Trumbull and Sallie Calver (Davis) Hayden. Graduated from the Normal School of Arizona at Tempe in 1896, CARL HAYDEN next attended Stanford University for 4 years. There, by a narrow margin, he lost an election to the presidency of the student body which he had considered certain. The Arizona statesman's practice has since been to seem anxious of an election outcome so as to stir his supporters to greater campaign activity. Relating the early incident to a reporter in 1950, he observed, "It taught me a lesson. I've been running scared ever since."

From 1902 to 1904 HAYDEN was a member of the Tempe Town Council, at the same time engaging in the flour-milling business; and for the succeding 2 years, was treasurer of Maricopa County. In 1904 he was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at St. Louis. Maricopa County elected him its sheriff in 1907, retaining him in that post until 1912 when he entered Congress. During World War I, HAYDEN, who had been a member of the 1st Arizona National Guard from 1903 to 1913, served in the United States National Army. He was detailed to duty at Camp Lewis (Wash.), and was made a major of infantry in 1918.

When Arizona was admitted to the Union in 1912, CARL HAYDEN was elected to the United States House of Representatives as the Congressman at Large; he held that office from the 62d to the 69th Congress. As a Representative from an arid State, he demonstrated repeatedly his interest in irrigation and water rights, becoming known as one of the foremost proponents of such legislation. The committees on which he served in the House were Indian Affairs, Irrigation of Arid Lands, Public Lands, Mines and Mining, and World War Veterans Legislation.

In the course of 15 years in the House, HAYDEN voted in favor of the establishment of the United States Children's Bureau and for the revision and codification of laws concerning Federal courts; for the passage of a bill limiting immigration, over the Presidential veto; and for one to provide a more autonomous government for the Philippines. He also approved of the publication of information about contributions and expenditures in election campaigns. During World War I he favored the furnishing of defensive arms to merchant vessels; the naval and fortifications appropriations; the declaration of war against Germany and Austria-Hungary, and the Victory loan bill. His approval was given as well to the passage of the bill for Near Eastern relief; the passage of the woman suffrage amendment; the Federal farm loan; the relief of the starving in Germany; the prohibition of child labor; and the authorization of the construction of aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps.

HAYDEN was elected in 1926 to the United States Senate, to which he was to obtain reelection in 1932, 1938, 1944, 1950, and 1956, with the last-named term to end in 1963. His initial year in the Senate was notable for the 6-weeks-long filibuster he and Senator Ashurst maintained against certain aspects of the Boulder Dam proposal.

As a Senator he continued his fight for irrigation and good roads. Prior to World War II HAYDEN voted for Federal aid for rural post road construction; for the establishment of the Federal Farm Board; for the establishment of a National Employment Service; for the passage over the President's veto of the Muscle Shoals project; for the passage of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill; for the repeal of the 18th amendment; for the establishment of a 5-day workweek; for the passage of the Social Security Act; for the stabilization of the bituminous coal industry; for appropriation for the proposed Passamaquoddy project; and for the appointment of additional judges to the Federal judiciary. He was against the immediate payment of the veterans' bonus; the return of relief fund administration to the States; the amendment of the cash and carry provisions of the Embargo Act and the amendment to the Neutrality Act.

With the defeat for renomination of Senator Henry F. Ashurst by Ernest W. McFarland in 1940, HAYDEN became senior Senator from Arizona. Immediately preceding and at the beginning of World War II, HAYDEN approved the loan to Finland; the establishment of the Women's Army Corps; the amended bill providing for the end of discrimination against Negroes in the Army; for deferment of men in certain draft categories, particularly of agricultural workers. Toward the end of the war, he advocated the restoration of funds previously withdrawn from the Office of War Information, as a necessary part of occupation policy.

In 1947 HAYDEN was 1 of the 4 Democratic Senators who joined 2 Republicans on the Senate Rules Committee to seek amendment of the rule pertaining to filibusters. The year preceding, when HAYDEN voted against elimination of the poll tax, he explained that he considered a constitutional amendment the proper method of eliminating such voting disabilities. With other western Senators, concerned for the shutdown of mines in that area because foreign imports of metal were underselling the domestic, Senator HAYDEN joined the 1949 effort to reimpose a tariff on imported copper.

Early in 1950 HAYDEN was responsible for a rider to the successfully passed equal rights amendment, which provided for the retention of existing legislation assuring rights, benefits, and privileges to women. That April he also expressed his opposition to blanket appropriation measures, such as the Wherry resolution for an overall budget estimate, "until Congress has had experience with a one-package appropriation bill," said the New York Herald Tribune. As chairman of the Rules Committee, HAYDEN in 1951 appointed a subcommittee to consider rules relating to telegrams sent by Senators at Government expense, an investigation which led to the establishment of a maximum amount available for such a purpose.

From the 80th Congress on, the Arizona Democrat supported the Marshall plan, Federal aid to education, the Military Assistance Act, the amendments to the Southwestern Power Administration appropriations, and the confirmation of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. He was not in favor of the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill, the Reed-Bulwinkle amendment to the Interstate Commerce Commission Act, or the ratification of certain amendments to the North Atlantic Security Pact. One of the major issues with which he has been concerned in recent years is the Central Arizona project, providing water from the Colorado River, a measure which achieved passage in the Senate in 1950 and 1951.

Besides the Appropriations Committee, of which he is chairman, HAYDEN serves on the Rules and Administration Committee and on the Joint Committee on Printing. He has also been a member of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, the Interoceanic Canals Committee, the Mines and Mining Committee, the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, and the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee. In 1949 he was chairman of the Joint Committee to Arrange for the Inauguration of the President-elect.

The Arizona Senator is a Mason. He was awarded an honorary LL. D. by the University of Arizona in 1948. On February 14, 1908, he married Nan Downing of Los Angeles. "The highly respected HAYDEN," the Washington Post once said, "works hard, speaks little, generally votes for the little fellow." Once, when asked by President Roosevelt why he insisted upon talking about roads each time he visited the White House, recounted Pathfinder, HAYDEN replied: "Because Arizona has two things people will drive thousands of miles to see—the Grand Canyon and the Petrified Forest. They can't get there without roads."

On October 21, 1957, Senator HAYDEN set a record for continuous service in Congress when he surpassed the 45-year, 8-month service record held by Adolph J. Sabath, a Representative from Illinois.

He was chosen President pro tempore in 1957. Senator HAYDEN has served longer in the Senate than any other sitting Member. The honorary post of President pro tempore makes the Senator third in line of Presidential succession.

On February 19, 1958, when he begins his 47th year in Congress, the Senator will establish a new record for longest service in Congress. This record was previously held by Joseph G. (Uncle Joe) Cannon, a Representative from Illinois.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Civil Rights Act of 1958," and I ask that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

The bill (S. 3257) to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the conclusion of the printing of the bill an article from the Christian Century for February 5, 1958, entitled "Protestantism Speaks on Justice and Integration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the measure which a group of my colleagues and I have just introduced is a bill to give effect to the constitutional guaranties, under the 14th amendment, of equal protection of the laws.

We should never forget that the 14th amendment provided that all persons who were either born or naturalized in the United States were citizens both of the United States and of the State in which they live. No differentiation was provided between these citizens—all were presumed to be of equal value and to possess equal rights. No categories of first- and second-class citizenship were set up.

This amendment also went on to declare that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. These provisions are an organic part of the fundamental law of the land.

The Supreme Court is the body which under the Constitution is charged with the interpretation of that document. It has done so in the case of the 14th amendment.

While I shall not question the good faith of anyone, I had always thought that citizens should seek to obey the Constitution and laws as thus interpreted, even as they might seek to change them. If individuals can assume the right to decide for themselves which laws they will obey and which they will disobey, utter chaos is introduced into our lives. Sections and groups will feel justified in disregarding laws which clash with their interests, and the Union as we know it will break up.

Most of us do not want to see this happen. With charity toward all and malice toward none, should we not push on to put substance behind this amendment and not permit it to be nullified or violated?

That is the purpose of this proposed legislation, to extend full first-class citizenship and equality of opportunity to all of our Negro and Spanish-speaking citizens.

Twice in the past 2 years the House of Representatives by large majorities has adopted provisions to protect these basic rights under the 14th amendment. Forty-one Members of the Senate in 1957 voted or announced their position against stripping that section from the civil rights bill. Other Senators expressed their deep interest in the rights involved, though opposing the specific provisions to protect them in part III of that bill. Clearly this is a major item in the unfinished business of the country and the Congress.

The sponsors of this legislation believe they have greatly improved and clarified the proposed methods for giving effect to these rights. We offer the bill now in order that Congress and the executive branch may take their rightful places alongside the Supreme Court to help end the denials of equal justice on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

A CONSTRUCTIVE NEW APPROACH TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

In the area of public education, where the rights of Negro citizens, and in the Southwest of Spanish-speaking citizens, are being most stoutly contested today, this measure embodies a new approach to the safeguarding of their constitutional rights.

It provides for technical assistance—at a cost of $2.5 million a year for 5 years—financial grants—in the amount of $40 million a year for 5 years—and administrative procedures to help local governments to put into successful operation plans for desegregation.

Thus, it would foster compliance with the Constitution and the historic decisions of the Supreme Court by offering the best available technical information, conciliation, encouragement, financial aid, and desegregation planning, with due regard for the court's orders concerning deliberate speed.

It recognizes the responsibility of the Federal Government for the impact which the Court's decisions have on local educational policies which were based on a different concept of the law. It would hold out the helping hand of the National Government, therefore, to those communities in all sections of the country which are trying or will try to end racial segregation in their public school systems.

We believe this is a constructive approach to one of our most basic and complex national issues. By enacting it, we believe the Congress can help to broaden the emphasis from a succession of hotly contested legal battles—essential as they are—to a new succession of cooperative and effective community efforts to remove the barriers to equal treatment in our public schools.

It is there in the communities in the last analysis that these problems must be worked out. If we can thus help to bring the finest educational, social and moral—as well as legal—insights to bear upon the issue in one locality after another, it should immeasurably strengthen the Nation's foundation of law and order, respect for human dignity, and active good will.

ENLARGED PREVENTIVE REMEDIES

At the same time this bill provides authority for the Attorney General to bring preventive actions in equal protection

cases generally, as well as in public-school cases. The legal remedies against violations of important constitutional rights would thus be enlarged, as was attempted in part III which was stricken from last year's civil rights bill, only by provisions this time which are much clearer.

The mounting difficulties under some State laws for private individuals to receive the required help as they seek legal protection for their rights, we believe, make this Government assistance essential. Our system of law and justice requires that the door to the courts shall not be barred against the redress of unlawful grievances and the settlement of controversies over constitutional rights.

If anyone be in doubt as to the laws I am referring to, these remarks are pointed at the so-called antibarratry laws of a growing group of States in the South, which tend to make it a penal offense for anyone to offer money or legal assistance for court actions to the interested parties, such as the parent of a child whose constitutional rights, in the opinion of the parent, are being violated.

Here again it should be emphasized that the primary aim of these provisions in the proposed legislation is preventive, not punitive.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND THE DESEGREGATION DECISIONS

The preambles to the bill include, among their important findings, that the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court express the moral ideals of the Nation and point the way to a Nation enhanced in strength and dignity at home and enhanced in honor and prestige throughout the world.

We stand firmly behind the Supreme Court, and we believe that the attempts to disparage the Court because of its decisions in this and certain other matters are not founded upon a full understanding of American principles. We believe it is proper for Congress and for the public opinion of the Nation to stand behind the Supreme Court in these matters.

The findings likewise point out the importance of our recognizing more generally that "the Constitution, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, is the supreme law of the land."

Upon these clear principles and the express power given to Congress in the 5th section of the 14th amendment, the positive provisions of the bill to foster compliance with the Constitution and the Court's desegregation decisions are based.

In a notable speech to the patent bar in New York last year, Chief Judge John J. Parker of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, a native of North Carolina and a distinguished southerner, expressed something of the spirit in which we hope this measure may be considered and approved. He said, in part:

> What is it that really makes America great—greater than any other nation that has ever existed? It is not the strength of the Army or Navy or Air Force. It is not the wealth of field or forest or mine or factory. It is not the splendor of her cities or the culture of her colleges and universities. It is that in her heart of hearts she believes in the sovereignty of the individual soul and the open door of opportunity for every man without regard to race or creed or color or any other circumstance. * * *
>
> At the head of the judicial system stands the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decisions of that Court must be accepted as to the meaning of the Constitution. You can't have even a baseball game without an umpire to interpret and apply the rules, and you can't have constitutional government without the authority somewhere to interpret and apply the Constitution. Final authority to do this is vested in the Supreme Court, whose duty it is to apply the great general principles of government which the Constitution embodies to the changing conditions of the times, with power on its part to overrule even its own prior decisions, when in the light of better understanding or changed conditions they are deemed by it to be erroneous.
>
> If liberty is to continue to live in America, these constitutional principles must be preserved. * * *
>
> And no man must be prejudiced by reason of race or color or creed in his standing before the law or in his enjoyment of benefits conferred by the State.

I think it was 28 years ago that Judge Parker was nominated for membership on the Supreme Court of the United States. The confirmation of his appointment was defeated by the so-called liberal bloc in the Senate. Had I been a member of that liberal bloc then, I probably would have voted as they did. But with the passage of time, I think it has now become apparent that the defeat of Judge Parker was a great mistake, and that Judge Parker has gone on to a distinguished career in the 4th Circuit, which entitles him to the respect and admiration of the people everywhere.

I think that is a caution, probably, to those of us who may be tempted upon occasion to reject nominations, to reflect that the passage of time reveals qualities of which we may not be fully aware at the moment.

THE URGENT NEED FOR POSITIVE ACTION

Both national and international developments give a new urgency to the need for this legislation.

It is over 3½ years since the Supreme Court decided that segregation in public schools is a denial of equal opportunity and violates the 14th amendment. It is over 2½ years since the final order of the Court was entered in those cases, providing that the principles be applied with practical flexibility, but with all deliberate speed. And earlier decisions ordering the admission of Negroes to State universities had foreshadowed these decisions of 1954 and 1955 for a number of years.

Substantial progress toward compliance has been made since then in a number of border States. Token progress has been made in the elementary and high schools of some other States and in universities and colleges of most States.

But strong resistance is still effective in a group of at least seven so-called hard-core Southern States.

The Southern School News estimated in January that there is desegregation in only 762 out of 3,008 biracial districts in the 17 Southern and border States.

That publication also noted that more than 140 State legislative measures have been enacted since 1954 in an effort to preserve segregation. Outright nullification statutes, pupil placement schemes, provisions to close or withdraw all State funds from any school which is desegregated, support for a "private school" system if necessary, criminal penalties for spending tax moneys on desegregated schools, loss of retirement benefits for failure by State officials to enforce State laws requiring segregation, power to suspend compulsory attendance laws, and interposition statutes are some of the devices adopted.

Such restrictive statutes have not been confined to the field of education. They have also been passed to preserve racial segregation in transportation and recreational facilities, to restrict Negro registration and voting, to harass the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other organizations active in this field. And new proposals are reported frequently in the daily press.

Mr. J. Francis Polhaus, formerly on the staff of the Department of Justice, and now counsel for the Washington bureau of the NAACP, has compiled from responsible southern sources a brief summary and comment on more than 100 of the laws, resolutions, ordinances, and State administrative policies being used to thwart the Court's decisions. To demonstrate the nature and seriousness of this problem, I ask unanimous consent that the compilation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. These State actions should be carefully studied, for I believe they indicate the necessity for affirmative action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 3.)

PROBLEM IS NATIONAL, NOT SECTIONAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is not the Southern and border States alone that have desegregation problems. We in the North must frankly concede, as I have previously in the Senate, that while our education laws are rather uniformly in accord with the Constitution, some communities in our States also err. De facto segregation based on school districting and discrimination against Negro teachers are reported in many northern areas; and the transition to desegregation is not always orderly or peaceful there, either.

The problem is truly national in scope, although it is most severe in the South, where the Negro population is a greater proportion of the total and where old educational patterns are more deeply set. The Court has spoken to all sections of our Nation, including the States we represent.

REASONED, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WILL FOSTER COMPLIANCE AND LAW AND ORDER

The rate of the extension of desegregation has now perceptibly slowed. Although this is understandable as the areas of easier adjustment to the law complete their action, an embittered resistance can lead—and, indeed, already has led—to tragic outbreaks and lawlessness, unless wise, reasonable, and affirmative leadership is offered.

With the filing of new school suits to end racial segregation in Georgia, the

New York Times southern correspondent, John N. Popham, reported 3 weeks ago:

The immediate short-run impact is certain to be one of turbulence, new tensions, oratory, and proposals for new and more stringent resistance legislation.

The United States District Court which recently knocked out three laws aimed at the NAACP, referred to "the situation in Virginia, where the attitude of the public authorities openly encourages opposition to the law of the land, which may easily find expression in disturbances of public peace."

Those who have a deep regard for human justice, for law and order, and for our national strength therefore cannot remain passive in the face of these active threats to orderly government and to America's prestige abroad. While the forces of resistance are heating up, and also are seeking to stifle all opposition, it is no time for those who would maintain law and order to lapse into the inertia of a cooling off period.

There is surely a better way to approach the problems of desegregation than the way used last fall in Arkansas. A sensitive report of that situation, made by a Little Rock pastor, Rev. Robert S. Cartwright, as published in the Christian Century of October 9, 1957, points to some of the helpful lessons to be learned from their regrettable experience, as contrasted with the orderly transition in Louisville, where the community marshaled its resources with great care and foresight. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Century for October 9, 1957]

LESSON FROM LITTLE ROCK

(By Colbert S. Cartwright)

(NOTE CONCERNING AUTHOR.—Colbert S. Cartwright has been pastor of the Pulaski Heights Christian Church in Little Rock, Ark., since 1954. Before that he served a 4-year pastorate in Lynchburg, Va. A son of Editor Lin D. Cartwright of the Christian Evangelist, he grew up in the South, graduated from Washington University and Yale University divinity school. Mr. Cartwright is president of the Arkansas council on human relations, a member of the board of the Southern Regional Council, and chairman of the social education and action committee of the Arkansas Christian Missionary Society.)

On the day that Arkansas National Guardsmen first formed a cordon around Little Rock's Central High School to block the entry of nine Negro students, a Lutheran pastor had occasion to make a sick call at a house across from the school. As he walked past a rocket launcher partially blocking the street, he asked one of the guardsmen if he thought such heavy weapons were necessary.

"If you'll pardon the expression, sir," was the reply, "I feel like a damned fool—protecting 2,000 white high-school students from 9 colored students."

There are many aspects of the Little Rock school crisis which can only be termed foolish—regardless of one's choice of theological modifiers. However, behind Gov. Orval E. Faubus' action lie facets of the Little Rock school problem which are in danger of being overlooked. It will be tragic if the Nation sees nothing more at Little Rock than a picture of Faubus' folly.

OTHERS SHARE RESPONSIBILITY

The Little Rock school board and Superintendent Virgil Blossom must share responsibility for the Little Rock debacle. Their whole approach to the task of making a transition from a dual to an integrated school system unwittingly invited the drastic action which Governor Faubus took on September 2 when he called out the National Guard.

It has been Faubus' contention that the Little Rock community "is not in the condition to have integration at the moment." This is a judgment impossible to prove or disprove. Many observers are convinced that the transition would have been made with a minimum of trouble if the Governor had not interfered. There are other persons of both races who have watched with growing alarm the school board's development of an approach to the problem which disregarded everything experience has taught about human nature.

The Arkansas Gazette summarized that approach accurately: "(1) The Little Rock plan of integration was voluntarily evolved by the Little Rock School Board over a period of 3 years. It was a legal design intended to accomplish the minimum integration over the longest period of time permissible under the Supreme Court ruling. (2) The plan was presented to the people of Little Rock in these terms and fully explained. School Superintendent Virgil Blossom himself made an estimated 200 speeches in this 3-year period setting forth the plan in detail to interested white and colored parent groups."

The general attitude of Dr. Blossom in explaining the plans for integration to white groups was that the prospect was as distasteful to him and the school board as to anyone else. His argument rested solely on the fact that the school board knew no way to get around the Supreme Court decision. He emphasized the wisdom of the school board's designing its own deliberate program to avoid having to take a faster route if a Federal district court should delineate a plan. The superintendent explained the plan to anyone who would listen. He asked help from no one.

This approach to preparing the community for the mingling of the races in public schools revealed no awareness of the lessons taught by troublesome Clinton, Tenn., or peaceful Louisville, Ky. Superintendent Omer Carmichael, of Louisville, has said that one thing was plain to him from the beginning: Preparation for so radical a change has little hope of success unless it is a communitywide program. In the Louisville story he explains the manner in which he sought to involve the whole community in a discussion of desegregation. He solicited help from parent-teacher associations, the Kentucky Council on Human Relations, churches and church-related groups, women's clubs, civic groups, and other organizations. He secured the cooperation of radio stations and disseminated literature on race relations. As the whole Louisville community became involved in thinking about race relations, the problem was seen not only from the legal but from the moral, social, and psychological points of view.

It is significant that the hindsight of the people of Clinton points to the wisdom of the Louisville approach. Looking backward, Mayor W. E. Lewallen said: "We thought we had done enough when we set up a sort of committee and talked the situation over with some of the civic clubs and leaders. We were wrong." He observed that events have scuttled the old southern maxim that the less said about race relations the better.

NO CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSAL

In relationship to the community, the Little Rock School Board has consistently taken an autocratic approach. Carefully avoiding consultation with either Negro or white patrons, the board on May 24, 1955, announced to the public a plan of gradual integration under which high-school-level grades would be desegregated probably in September 1957. If all went well, integration would follow in the other grades over a period of approximately 6 years. Since no one had been consulted, many persons questioned the plan. Many Negroes wanted a faster plan; many white persons wanted no plan at all. Interested citizens, both Negro and white, went to Dr. Blossom with questions. When any point of the plan was questioned there was only one reaction—a defensive bristling.

Five months after the plan was announced the Arkansas Council on Human Relations convened a meeting at Little Rock at which Dr. Blossom explained his plan. Irene Osborne, who had been working in Washington, D. C., to marshal community support for the school desegregation program there, spoke on the importance of community relations in making the transition. Dr. Blossom exhibited open hostility toward the approach she suggested.

In December 1955, the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of Greater Little Rock, composed of Negro ministers, asked the school board to appoint an advisory committee, which would include Negroes, to work in the direction of racial integration in the schools. The board not only declined, but refused to suggest any alternate way in which the Little Rock community might help in paving the way to a smoother transition. At about the same time, Dr. Blossom presented the plan of gradual integration to the Greater Little Rock Ministerial Alliance, composed of white ministers. The plan was received with general enthusiasm. But when the alliance suggested that it endorse the plan officially and publicly, Dr. Blossom urged it not to do so. To the present time he has not sought the help of ministers of either race in preparing the community for the board's plan of integration.

During the 1955–56 school year professional educators in Little Rock became concerned because no preparation was being given high-school teachers for the new problems they would face when integration came. They suggested to Dr. Blossom that informal meetings of teachers be arranged to discuss such problems. He did not think well of the suggestion, and at no time has he sought to help teachers face their own prejudices or to provide them with guidance in dealing with problems of group dynamics.

At a luncheon meeting on October 12, 1956, Robert Snyder, for 3 years chairman of the St. Louis Council on Human Relations, explained to a number of Little Rock civic leaders the way in which 85 organizations in his city worked to help the schools meet the problem of school desegregation. Dr. Blossom was present, but indicated no interest in gaining such support from Little Rock agencies. On March 11, 1957, he explained the school board's plan to the community council, a group made up of representatives from all metropolitan area organizations and agencies concerned for civil betterment. Although he did not emphasize the need for preparing the community for school integration, he did state for the first time publicly that he would call on the various groups to help prepare the community. He did not say when. To date their help has not been requested.

INCREASING UNEASINESS

During the past summer the Negro community grew uneasy as it saw the Little Rock School Board doing all within its power to discourage Negro pupils from entering the previously all-white high school. A group of concerned Negroes went to Dr. Blossom with a complaint. He admitted that screening had been taking place, but defended it as being in the best interests of all. The Negroes suggested that it might be well if some channel of communication could be established between him and the Negro community. He readily agreed that it would be a

good idea to have a committee which could help interpret to the Negro community what the school board was trying to do, and said he would call on the group the next week to work out details. But he never called. Throughout the summer months persons of both races, deeply concerned for the problems of human relations, became increasingly disturbed as they realized that the social forces of Little Rock were not being marshaled to aid in a smooth transition to integration. No one knew what might happen. There might be trouble, for which no one was ready.

Had the school board developed adequate plans with law enforcement officials for every eventuality? Several prominent Little Rock citizens investigated the possibility of bringing to the city a law-enforcement official nationally known as an expert in the field of police-community relations to counsel quietly with local officials. When Dr. Blossom was approached on the possibility, he replied that he had adequately studied the problem and needed no outside help.

THE GOVERNOR TO THE RESCUE

Governor Faubus' decision on September 2 to call out the troops and to block integration was the natural outcome of every step the Little Rock School Board had taken. It had insisted all along that the only reason the schools were being integrated was that the Federal Government was forcing it to do so. It had consistently refused to seek the help of the community in gaining moral support for its reluctant step. Then the Governor in shining armor came to the rescue. He said the school board did not need to integrate, that since the community was not prepared for integration there would be violence. He would call out the militia as the "preservator of the peace."

Dr. Blossom, the school board and Little Rock's leading citizens were stunned by Faubus' unprecedented actions. They did not want the Governor to interfere. Knowing that some racial mixing in the public schools is inevitable, they would prefer to have it come about peacefully and on their own terms. What they failed to consider was that their whole approach had played directly into the hands of the members of white citizens councils. Having sought to prepare the community solely upon a legalistic basis, they had no defense when the Governor, prompted by rabid segregationists in Little Rock, insisted he had found the needed loophole.

Three days after the Governor ordered his troops to prevent integration in the name of States rights, the school board found itself in the position of being on the Governor's side. It went to Federal court and petitioned the judge to suspend temporarily the plan of integration. This was exactly what the Governor and his white citizens council cohorts were pleading for. The school board's house of cards had fully collapsed. Citizens who had agreed to compliance if there was no other way out now took fresh hope in the Governor's action and the school board's acquiescence. Little Rock became sharply divided.

Arguments among Little Rock citizens will continue for years as to whether Governor Faubus got a square deal in Federal court. Few will question why the problem arose in the first place. Fewer still will be aware of the responsibility the school board must share for the ridiculous situation which arose.

The experiences of Washington, Louisville, and Clinton all point to the fact that transition, difficult at best, can come about only if all the resources of the community are marshaled to help. They have taught that the moral and social psychological aspects of the problem must be adequately considered. Little Rock tried a different path. On September 2 it was confronted with a "dead end" sign. It is still a question whether the school board can read the sign.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we know that these outbreaks, whether in Illinois or Arkansas, in Pennsylvania or Alabama, are blazoned around the globe.

We can, perhaps, repair some of the damage done by them to our standing in the free world—and especially in the eyes of the uncommitted colored peoples of other continents—if we now move with wisdom, understanding, and assurance to foster equality of opportunity. That is the aim of this bill, and will be its effect, I believe, if and when it is enacted.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF BILL'S PROVISIONS

A. CONSTRUCTIVE STEPS FOR EQUAL TREATMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Through authority conferred upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill will furnish to the officials and private citizens of good will in all parts of the country the tools with which to accelerate in our public schools the growth of equal treatment for all of our citizens, without regard to race.

TITLE II

This title authorizes the Secretary to assist, through the compilation and distribution of data, the making of surveys, the arrangement of conferences, the appointment of advisory councils, the provision of specialists' services, and the development of community understanding for desegregation programs that are in harmony with the Constitution. Appropriations up to $2.5 million a year for 5 years are authorized for these purposes.

TITLE III

This title authorizes the Secretary to make grants for school facilities in areas where the chief problem preventing or hindering effective compliance is the lack of adequate buildings or other physical equipment.

It also authorizes grants for employing additional teachers, in-service teacher training, employment of specialists, short-term training courses, and other additional educational measures undertaken to eliminate segregation, while at the same time assuring that existing educational standards will not be lowered.

Funds would also be available to local communities that wish to comply with the Court's decisions, but where, as in Georgia and Virginia, the State threatens to cut off funds or close the schools.

Appropriations of not more than $40 million a year for 5 years are authorized to cover the costs of the grant programs.

TITLE IV

The bill further provides in title IV that when other methods fail, the executive branch of Government, acting through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans to accomplish the objectives of the Court's decisions. In the development of both the tentative and approved plans, however, there are express provisions for the fullest possible local consultation and participation.

The responsibility to go forward in a situation in which officials are hostile is now almost entirely in the hands of private individuals and organizations. Experience has shown that this problem will not become any less troublesome if we countenance the resulting delay.

B. FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN LEGAL REMEDIES, TITLES V AND VI

The bill also provides for Federal assistance in legal remedies under titles V and VI.

In the history of America's advance toward equal justice, court proceedings have been the means of making many of our greatest forward steps. They are still an indispensable part of our protections against racial discriminations.

A growing group of States, however, have passed so-called antibarratry laws which make it much more difficult for civil-rights groups or others to assist persons in bringing or maintaining lawsuits for the vindication of their civil rights. Other forms of pressure—such as organized boycotts, threats, and intimidation—have also been used to deter such legal actions.

Since the persons who are denied their rights to equal protection are more often than not poor persons, unable alone to sustain the heavy costs of litigation, and more subject than others to hostile pressures, these laws and pressures will increasingly padlock out of court the Negroes and also the Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest in their efforts to maintain suits to carry out the law of the land.

To meet this situation, the proposed legislation would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to start civil actions for preventive relief against those who deprive persons of their rights to equal protection of the laws, on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This authority is much like that provided in part III of last year's bill H. R. 6127, and in the 1956 measure, H. R. 627. As I have said, on two occasions it was overwhelmingly approved by the House. The authority is more explicitly and clearly set forth here, however, in titles V and VI.

Title V confers the power to file compliance actions in school cases in connection with approved desegregation plans, when the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by conciliation, assistance, and otherwise have failed.

Title VI first authorizes preventive action against those State and local officials and others acting under color of State law in cases involving denial of equal protection generally, including school cases, by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; but it provides that the Attorney General may sue only upon a signed complaint, and when, in his judgment, the person aggrieved is unable to seek effective legal protection for himself—section 601.

Suits are also authorized by the Attorney General against those who attempt to prevent local officials from according persons equal protection of the laws, or who act to hinder the execution of court orders for equal protection—section 602. Action to deprive persons of their rights under the 14th amendment because such persons are opposing

denial of the rights of others, is also made a basis for legal action by the Attorney General—section 603. In addition, the Attorney General is explicitly authorized to intervene in cases brought by others for relief against the denial of equal protection of the laws, because of race, color, religion, or national origin—section 604.

Thus, in the field of legal remedies, also, this measure would extend a significant helping hand of the National Government to the safeguarding of constitutional rights.

FURTHER LEGISLATION IS ESSENTIAL

Mr. President, in 1957, Congress ended a stalemate of over 80 years, and passed a civil-rights bill primarily designed to protect the right to vote. This is a substantial advance, and can lead to others, as citizens previously barred exercise this basic right to choose their representatives and officials in Government.

Some urge this as a reason for delaying the proposal or consideration of additional legislation now.

But the indignities of racial segregation and discrimination still continue and cannot be ignored. We know that in schools, on buses, in public recreation areas, and in many other places, our Negro and Spanish-speaking citizens find themselves barred from equal opportunity.

We know that these incidents in our schools are not only personal affronts and tragedies for those excluded, checking their full individual development and handicapping them in the race of life. We know that the exclusions also deprive the Nation of their full contribution to society, at a time when we are belatedly discovering that maximum educational effort is essential to national security.

We know too that these failures gravely damage our moral position before the world.

In a situation where such basic human rights are involved and in a world contest in which freedom itself is at stake, we cannot afford the luxury of indifference or inaction. To drift in the uncertain currents of skillfully promoted resistance to the lawful decisions of the highest court in the land, is to run the risk of defeat of all we hold dear.

Without self-righteousness, men of good will in communities across the country and in Congress are called to resume the forward march begun last year. By doing so, we shall add moral authority to material strength. We shall better pass the inspection of our own consciences and of the watching eyes of a world of men determined to have and to enjoy freedom and equality of opportunity. We are mindful of the problems which we face, and no one should underestimate them, but they are less than those created by our failure to act.

These are some of the reasons why the sponsors of this legislation urge that it be given careful study, prompt hearings and early approval by Congress.

The period of time for which appropriations are authorized for the new powers given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in this bill is 5 years. Within that time will occur the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. If we can set in motion now the procedures that will take this country far along the road to equal justice for all its citizens, that centennial can mark another historic milestone in the progress of freedom.

The bill (S. 3257) to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators) is as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I. SHORT TITLE AND FINDINGS

SECTION 101. This act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Act of 1958".

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby finds that:

(1) recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States holding racial segregation unlawful in public education, public transportation, and public recreational facilities (hereinafter referred to as the antisegregation decisions) as a denial of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws express the moral ideals of the Nation and the world and point the way to a Nation enhanced in strength and dignity at home and enhanced in honor and prestige throughout the world,

(2) these antisegregation decisions are being resisted in many areas of the Nation most directly affected by them and indirectly evaded in other areas, thereby denying to millions of Americans within our borders the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws,

(3) many States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units have failed to make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance with the Supreme Court's decisions in the field of public education despite the substantial time which has already elapsed since the promulgation of those decisions in 1954 and 1955,

(4) the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws is being denied to many persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin in fields other than education, transportation, and recreation,

(5) these denials of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws restrict millions of Americans to second-class citizenship and deprive the Nation of the maximum development and maximum benefits that can be contributed by such persons, and

(6) legislative and executive action (A) is necessary to safeguard and guarantee to all Americans the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws and (B) will aid in expediting universal compliance with the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court.

(b) The Congress further finds that the rights protected by the Constitution, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, will be more widely accepted and more fully enjoyed in all areas of the Nation, and particularly in those areas of the Nation most directly affected by the decisions, when it is generally recognized and understood that—

(1) the Constitution, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, is the supreme law of the land,

(2) all Federal and State officials are bound by their oaths or affirmations to support the Constitution, and

(3) the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government are acting and will continue to act, with such Federal authority as is found necessary, to protect the constitutional rights upheld by those decisions of the judicial branch of the Government.

(c) The Congress further finds that:

(1) The present system whereby individual plaintiffs in the Federal courts bear the burden of protecting constitutional rights, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, is neither the exclusive nor the most effective means of protecting those constitutional rights and the public interest in safeguarding those constitutional rights, and has resulted in local restrictive and punitive measures against the individuals and organizations engaging in, and supporting, efforts in the courts to assert those contitutional rights; and

(2) Specific authorization to the executive branch of the Federal Government to act in support of the constitutional rights upheld by the antisegregation decisions (A) will provide a more rational, uniform, just, and effective system of protecting constitutional rights than the present procedure under which the safeguarding of constitutional rights is determined by the varying resources and courage of individuals and organizations and by the varying State statutory restrictions placed upon them, and (B) will render less effective, and hence tend to reduce, hostile community pressures upon individuals and organizations seeking to safeguard constitutional rights.

(d) The Congress hereby recognizes it to be the initial responsibility of all States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to safeguard the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws as declared by the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court and to administer their systems of public education, public transportation, and public recreational facilities in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, but the Federal Government, to maintain a more perfect union, to extend justice, to promote the common defense, and to secure the blessings of liberty to all persons, has a coordinate responsibility to guarantee the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, to prevent denials of the right when State or local authorities cannot or will not do so, and thus to enhance the Nation's internal strength and its position throughout the world.

(e) Recognizing its authority and responsibility under the 5th section of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and its obligation to uphold the coordinate authority and responsibility of the judicial branch of the Government, the Congress hereby declares its intention that the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution against deprivation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and affirmed by the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court, shall be protected by all due and reasonable means, and to that end enacts the following provisions of this act.

TITLE II. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized to render technical assistance to States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to eliminate denials of constitutional rights in the field of public education by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and to come into compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of public education by—

(a) assembling, publishing, and distributing information which, in his judgment, will prove helpful in obtaining public understanding of, and compliance with, the Constitution and decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of public education;

(b) surveying the progress made in eliminating segregation in public education in various parts of the country and making available to public agencies, private organi-

zations, private individuals, and the general public the results of such surveys, including wherever possible successful case histories of desegregation and the ways and means utilized to bring about desegregation in such instances;

(c) planning, calling, and holding local, State, regional, and national conferences attended by State and local officials, representatives of private organizations, and private citizens, to discuss ways and means of eliminating segregation in public education generally or in any particular State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit;

(d) appointing local, State, regional and national advisory councils to assist the Secretary in carrying out his duties under this act and to offer their assistance to any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit to come into compliance with the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of public education;

(e) reporting to the Congress, at least semiannually, concerning the progress being made in eliminating segregation in public education in various parts of the country; and

(f) assisting, by such other related means as he deems appropriate, States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to eliminate segregation in public education.

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall recruit, employ, and train specialists in preparing, putting into effect, and carrying out plans for eliminating segregation in public education and shall offer the services of the specialists to States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units. Upon request of any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit, the Secretary shall make available to the requesting governmental unit the services of one or more specialists for such periods of time and in such numbers as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate in the light of the particular needs of the requesting governmental unit.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary is authorized to reimburse any State or local official, representative of a private organization, or private citizen who is invited by him to attend any local, State, regional, or national conference held under the authority of section 201 (c), and any member of an advisory council appointed under the authority of section 201 (d) who is carrying out authorized functions, for travel expenses incurred, and to pay to any such person per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same amounts as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service serving without compensation.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to reimburse any State or local official who, with the approval of the Secretary, is invited to confer with one or more specialists employed by the Secretary under section 202 for travel expenses incurred in attending such conference, and to pay to any such official per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same amounts as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service serving without compensation.

SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, such amounts not to exceed $2,500 000 in any fiscal year as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title.

TITLE III. GRANTS TO AREAS WHERE DESEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION IS BEING CARRIED OUT

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units which maintained racial segregation in their public schools on May 17, 1954, and which make application for such grants, to assist in meeting the costs of additional educational measures undertaken or to be undertaken to further the process of eliminating segregation in the public schools of the applicant State, municipality, school district, or local governmental unit, while at the same time assuring that existing educational standards will not be lowered.

(b) Grants may be made under this section for—

(1) the cost of employing additional schoolteacher;

(2) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation;

(3) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation and of providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of plans and efforts for eliminating segregation in the schools in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or unlawful resistance to such plans and efforts; and

(4) other costs directly related to the process of eliminating segregation in public schools, including the replacement of State payments to a school district or other political subdivision withdrawn because the applicant district or subdivision is eliminating, or is starting to eliminate, segregation.

(c) Grants may also be made under this section for the construction, enlargement, or alteration of school facilities when the Secretary finds that lack or inadequacy of existing facilities makes the carrying out of any reasonable plan for desegregation without lowering existing educational standards impracticable or materially more difficult.

(d) Each application made for a grant under this section shall provide such detailed breakdown of the additional educational measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

(e) Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(1) the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him;

(2) the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it;

(3) the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation;

(4) whether the additional educational measures undertaken or to be undertaken are reasonably and effectively designed to further the process of eliminating racial segregation, while at the same time assuring that existing educational standards will not be lowered; and

(5) such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 302. The Secretary is further authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning to meet or assist in meeting the cost of short-term training courses or institutes, not to exceed 4 weeks in duration, for personnel of public schools or of educational agencies engaged in or about to undertake desegregation, designed to enable such personnel to deal more effectively with problems incident to desegregation. Such grants may also be used by such institutions to establish and maintain fellowships for such training courses or institutes, covering tuition, fees, and such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as may be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 303. Payments of grants under sections 301 and 302 may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 304. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and for each of the 4 suceeding fiscal years, such sums, not exceeding $40 million for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) In making grants from funds appropriated for any fiscal year for the purposes specified in section 301 (b), the Secretary may disregard applications received after August 31 in that fiscal year, or may subordinate such applications to applications recei ed before that date. In the event that he receives, either before or after that date, applications which he considers would materially contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title, but which he cannot grant because of lack or inadequacy of available funds, he shall forthwith report this fact to the Congress and to the President, together with his recommendation with respect to the appropriation of additional funds.

(c) In the event that the Secretary receives applications for grants for the purpose specified in section 301 (c) which he considers would materially contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title, but which he cannot grant because of lack or inadequacy of available funds, he shall forthwith report this fact to the Congress and to the President, together with his recommendation with respect to the appropriation of additional funds.

TITLE IV. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION DIRECTED TOWARD ELIMINATING SEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

SEC. 401. The Secretary shall make every effort to persuade States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education and to carry out in full such programs as they may start, and to this end he shall utilize the authority provided in titles II and III.

SEC. 402. Whenever the Secretary shall find that all efforts under titles II and III and under section 401 of this title have failed, and continue to fail, in bringing about a start toward the elimination of segregation in public education in any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit, the Secretary is authorized to prepare a tentative plan for the elimination of segregation in public education in such State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit. In preparing such a tentative plan, the Secretary shall seek the advice and assistance of public officials, private organizations, and private citizens in the area and of any local, State, regional, or national advisory council appointed pursuant to section 201 (d) and he shall carefully consider such advice and assistance wherever available. Tentative plans prepared by the Secretary under the authority of this section shall take into account the need of the particular area for time to make an orderly adjustment and transition from segregated to desegregated schools.

SEC. 403. (a) Whenever the Secretary has prepared a tentative plan for the elimination of segregation in public education in any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit, he shall forward the plan to the governor, mayor, or other appropriate official, as the case may be. If the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit agrees to put into effect the tentative plan as proposed by the Secretary or as modified by the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit with the consent of the Secretary, the Secretary shall utilize the authority granted in titles II and III to assist

the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit in putting into effect the tentative plan.

(b) If the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit (1) does not agree to put into effect the tentative plan as proposed by the Secretary or as modified with his consent, or (2) after agreeing to the tentative plan as so proposed or modified, does not, in the judgment of the Secretary, carry out such tentative plan, the Secretary shall hold a public hearing upon the tentative plan. Notice of such hearing shall be given to the local authorities concerned by registered mail and notice shall be given to private organizations and private citizens within the area by publication in one or more newspapers. Local authorities, private organizations, and private citizens shall be permitted to participate in the hearing and present evidence and argument in favor of the tentative plan, in favor of amendments to the tentative plan, or in opposition to the plan or to any plan, but cumulative evidence may be excluded in the discretion of the Secretary. Anyone shall be permitted to file a written statement with the Secretary in addition to, or in lieu of, personal appearance at the public hearing.

(c) After the hearing provided in subsection (b) has been concluded, the Secretary shall prepare and issue an approved plan for eliminating segregation in public education in the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit. He shall publish the approved plan in the Federal Register and in one or more newspapers in the area affected thereby and shall transmit a certified copy thereof to the appropriate official of the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit involved.

(d) In order that the proceedings under this title shall expedite the elimination of segregation in any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit, the Secretary shall handle all proceedings under this title as expeditiously as possible. The Secretary shall complete any proceedings hereunder within 1 year from the time that a tentative plan is forwarded to the governor, mayor, or other appropriate official under section 403 (a), or, in case a State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit agrees to a tentative plan but does not carry it out, within 6 months from the time that the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit is not carrying out such tentative plan.

SEC. 404. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 405. The Secretary is authorized to carry out his responsibilities and exercise his authority under this title and under titles II and III through designated personnel in his own office or through any existing bureau, division, or agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or through a new office created by him for the special purpose of exercising the Secretary's responsibilities hereunder, except that the Secretary shall personally review and sign any approved plan issued under section 403 (c).

TITLE V. AUTHORIZATION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

SEC. 501. (a) Whenever (1) the Secretary has published in the Federal Register an approved plan for the elimination of segregation in public education in any State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit pursuant to section 403 (c), (2) the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit has rejected the plan or has refused or failed to act in accordance therewith, and (3) the Secretary has certified to the Attorney General that all efforts to secure compliance with the Constitution and the Supreme Court's decisions by conciliation, persuasion, education, and assistance under titles II, III, and IV have failed, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction or other order, against the appropriate officials of the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit and any individual or individuals acting in concert with such officials to enforce compliance with the approved plan.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized to move to dismiss or discontinue any action brought under subsection (a), or to propose or to agree to a decree adopting a plan for elimination of segregation in public education which is different from the approved plan, whenever he determines that the State, municipality, school district, or other local governmental unit is making, or is prepared to make, a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance with the Constitution and the Supreme Court's decisions in the field of education and to work toward full compliance with all deliberate speed.

(c) Any interested party may, with the leave of the court, intervene in any action brought under subsection (a), and the court shall consider any proposals by the intervenors, as well as by the defendant or defendants, in determining its final decree.

TITLE VI. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

SEC. 601. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed compiaint that any person or group of persons is being deprived of, or is being threatened with the loss of, the right to the equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, such person or group of persons is unable for any reason to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive such person or group of persons of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and against any individual or individuals acting in concert with them.

(b) A person or group of persons shall be deemed unable to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of subsection (a) not only when such person or group of persons is financially unable to bear the expenses of the litigation, but also when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or other economic activity of, or might result in physical harm or economic damage to, such person or group of persons or their families.

(c) Nothing contained in titles IV and V shall limit the authority of the Attorney General to institute and maintain an action under subsection (a).

SEC. 602. The Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding, for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, (1) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder, any Federal, State, or local official from according any person or group of persons the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, or (2) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder the execution of any court order protecting the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

SEC. 603. The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute for or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive any person or group of persons or associations of persons of any right guaranteed by the 14th amendment of the Constitution, because such person or group of persons or association of persons has opposed or opposes the denial of the equal protection of the laws to others because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

SEC. 604. Whenever a suit is brought in any district court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the right of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Attorney General is authorized to intervene in such action with all the rights of a party thereto and to seek compliance with any lawful order issued by such district court.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted under sections 501, 601, 602, and 603 of this act and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted and, in the case of proceedings instituted under sections 601 and 602, without regard to whether any administrative proceeding is pending or contemplated under tilte IV, it being the purpose of title IV to expedite not delay the elimination of segregation in public education throughout the Nation. In any proceeding hereunder, the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

SEC. 702. Nothing in this act or in any administrative proceeding hereunder shall be construed to impair any right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States or any remedies already existing for their protection or enforcement, nor to prevent any private individual or organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now permitted by law.

SEC. 703. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Christian Century of February 5, 1958]

PROTESTANTISM SPEAKS ON JUSTICE AND INTEGRATION

(In anticipation of the churches' observance on February 9 of Race Relations Sunday, we present a compilation made by the National Council of Churches at our request of the latest official statements on racial justice and good will issued by Protestant denominations and responsible organizations. These statements prove that evangelical Christianity in America is deeply cognizant of its obligation to offer to the Nation Christian answers to its major problem in human relations. They show that the churches,

working independently, have been led to achieve a remarkable unanimity since the Supreme Court, on May 17, 1954, handed down its historic decision calling for an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools.—The Editors.)

[We] commend the Supreme Court for this far-reaching decision, and urge the support and cooperation of our entire constituency in its implementation. (African Methodist Episcopal Connectional Council, June 1954.)

Thanking God for the Supreme Court decision and reaffirming our confidence in the inevitable fulfillment of American democracy under the Constitution; recommending to our farflung constituency * * * active cooperation with local school boards in implementing the program of immediate desegregation and urging our pastors, presiding elders, and people to contribute to the morale-building principles employed to create the climate of public opinion favorable to desegregation in every form of American life * * * we authorize, empower, and urge our secondary schools and junior colleges to amend their charters and/or their rules and regulations, if necessary, so as to provide for integrated faculties and student bodies. (African Methodist Episcopal Zion Board of Christian Education—School and College, August 1954.)

We recognize that during the past 10 years great strides have been made in race relations in America and that it was a logical next step for the Supreme Court to declare * * * that our public schools must be integrated to assure equality of educational opportunity. We fully support the Supreme Court decision and deplore the resistance to this decision in certain States where integration of public education has met organized opposition (American Baptist Convention, 1956).

Wherever and whenever the churches help to foster race or class distinctions between people, and wherever and whenever they support attitudes of superiority or inferiority between persons, groups or classes, they violate God's pattern. * * * Christian churches unfailingly, therefore, must condemn segregation and stratification as the evil fruit of natural man's pride and his arrogant assumption of superiority over those who appear to be different from him (American Lutheran Church, 1954).

We urge our members to use their influence in the securing of full rights of citizenship for all, and in discouraging any activity in their communities which would seek to circumvent orderly judicial procedure in the implementation of the Supreme Court decision on segregation (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, June 1956).

The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court * * * that racial segregation in public education in our country violates the 14th amendment to the Constitution marks a new historic milestone in the progress of our Nation toward the goal of full and true democracy (Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, 1955).

We note with appreciation all recent steps made in the direction of elimination of segregation, including the decision of the Supreme Court interpreting the Constitution as opposing segregation in the public schools. We appeal to our brethren to lead out in effecting these social changes in every area of life * * * [and] to consider appearing at local and State hearings on the issue of integrating the public schools and to give testimony in support of the Supreme Court decision (Church of the Brethren, 1954).

We call upon all Americans to undertake timely and tolerant implementation of the Supreme Court decision, and [ask] that our department of race relations and the Council for Social Action carry forward such activities as will develop public support for the Supreme Court decision (Congregational Christian General Council, June 1954).

We urge Christians to practice and seek to spread equality of opportunity for all people; equal pay for equal work; equal protection by law; equality of suffrage; equal recognition of persons as persons without respect to religion, class or race. (Cumberland Presbyterian Church, June 1955).

We approve and commend the decision of the Supreme Court concerning segregation in the public schools, and * * * call upon our churches, our agencies and our institutions to reexamine themselves in light of the implications of Christ's gospel, and to initiate and encourage voluntary, racially inclusive community groups to plan for full compliance with the gospel of Christ, as well as definite techniques for implementation within their own bodies (International Convention of Disciples of Christ, 1954).

We must say plainly that to attempt to evade integration in the public schools by actions which would weaken or undermine the public schools is wrong. No doubt, integration in public schools will proceed at different rates. There are situations in which wisdom and discretion are needed as well as situations in which the complacent need to be stirred to effective and constructive action. The decision of the Supreme Court outlawing racial segregation in the schools provides the occasion for the members of Christian congregations to bear witness to the truth in love and to the love of truth; to support with their sympathy and prayers those who are devoted to constructive efforts toward a greater degree of justice; and to encourage consultation between white and colored persons in the local community in the interest of common understanding and planning (Evangelical and Reformed General Synod, 1956).

We express our gratitude for the unanimous decision of the U. S. Supreme Court that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional. We urge our church members to assist in preparing their communities psychologically and spiritually for implementing the Supreme Court's decision. * * * We call upon our local churches, annual conferences, colleges and theological seminaries, boards and institutions to implement this decision so that men everywhere may be lifted to new levels of social responsibility and new dimensions of human brotherhood (Evangelical United Brethren Church, November 1954).

The decisions of the Supreme Court * * * relative to segregation make necessary far-reaching and often difficult readjustments throughout the Nation. We call upon our people to effect these adjustments in all good faith, with brotherliness and patience. In doing this all racial groups must be willing to admit their imperfections and seek to correct them. Let these things, however, be done in love lest the cause of Christ suffer at our hands (Methodist General Conference, 1956).

According to Christ and Paul there can be no question of race relations, because there is only one race, the human race. Man himself has divided the race on the basis of color. If man would only stop worrying about petty differences and concentrate on likenesses, there would be no race problem. The problem is not really race relations, but human relations. Segregation in the Church of God is the ugliest thing in the religious world, and a disgrace to a Christian nation (National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc., 1954).

The assembly commends the principle of the decision and urges all members of our churches to consider thoughtfully and prayerfully the complete solution of the problem involved. It also urges all our people to lend their assistance to those charged with the duty of implementing the decision, and to remember that appeals to racial prejudice will not help but hinder the accomplishment of this aim (Presbyterian, United States, General Assembly, 1954).

We receive with humility and thanksgiving the recent decision of our Supreme Court * * * with humility because action by our highest Court was necessary to make effective that for which our church has stood in principle; with thanksgiving because the decision has been rendered with wisdom and unanimity. We urge all Christians to assist in preparing their communities psychologically and spiritually for carrying out the full implications of the Supreme Court decision. We call upon the members of our churches to cooperate with civic organizations, neighborhood clubs, and community councils as effective means for the accomplishment of racial integration in the public school system (Presbyterian, United States of America, General Assembly, 1954).

The 58th General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America now commends to all the clergy and people of this church that they accept and support this ruling of the Supreme Court, and that by opening channels of Christian conference and communication between the races concerned in each diocese and community, they anticipate constructively the local implementation of this ruling as the law of the land (Protestant Episcopal General Convention, 1955).

We recognize the fact that this Supreme Court decision is in harmony with the constitutional guaranty of equal freedom to all citizens, and with the Christian principles of equal justice and love for all men. We urge our people and all Christians to conduct themselves in this period of adjustment in the spirit of Christ; we pray that God may guide us in our thinking and our attitudes to the end that we may help and not hinder the progress of justice and brotherly love; [let us] exercise patience and good will in the discussions that must take place, and give a good testimony to the meaning of Christian faith and discipleship. We express our belief in the public school system of our Nation as one of the greatest factors in American history for the maintenance of democracy and our common culture, and we express the hope that in the working out of necessary adjustments, its place in our educational program shall not be impaired (Southern Baptist Convention, June 1954).

We believe that Christians have special responsibilities to keep open the channels of communication and understanding among the different groups in this controversy. Our congregations are encouraged to contribute to the solution of the problem by demonstrating in their own corporate lives the possibility of integration (United Lutheran Church in America, 1956).

We believe the United Presbyterian Church has always believed in the integration of the races. Therefore, in these days when this issue is astride the conscience of the nation we love, we reaffirm our first principles: That God hath made of one blood all nations for to dwell upon the face of the earth; that He is no respecter of persons; that men are created equal and meant to live together in a love that means equality of opportunity and privilege. In the light of these principles we thank God that the laws of the land have made segregation illegal in education (United Presbyterian Church of North America, June 1956).

Be it resolved, That * * * the Florida Council of Churches go on record as favoring this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which provides equity and justice to all the citizens of this great Nation regardless of color. Urging the people of this State of Florida to remember their obligations as a people under God and to act in charity, tolerance, and wisdom in bringing this State into conformity with the

will of the conscience of the Nation as expressed through the supreme judicial body of the United States. Calling all the people represented by the member bodies of this council of churches to prayer and prayerful study of the problem that Christian principles and not worldly prejudices may prevail in the solution of this difficult social problem now confronting the people of the State of Florida (Florida Council of Churches, October 1954).

We approve and commend the decision of the Supreme Court concerning segregation in the public schools, and * * * we call upon our churches, our agencies, and our institutions to reexamine themselves in light of the implications of Christ's gospel and to initiate and encourage voluntary, racially inclusive community groups to plan for full compliance with the gospel of Christ, as well as definite techniques for implementation within their own bodies (Kentucky Council of Churches, April 1955).

We believe that this decision is consistent with the spirit and teachings of Jesus Christ, and we further affirm that this decision is in keeping with what has been through many years the official position of the Christian church, as it has understood the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ. * * * We call upon the members of our State legislature to find just ways of implementing in our State the decision of the United States Supreme Court. We ask that in every circumstance they exercise clear and calm judgment and Christian good will in all their attitudes and actions concerning this vital matter in accordance with the ideals of our Christian faith (New Orleans Council of Churches, July 1954).

Now that the Supreme Court has spoken * * * we urge that the churches as represented in the council accept the decision of the Court as the law of the land and endeavor as fully as possible, in the spirit of Christ, to realize an integrated public school system (North Carolina Council of Churches, January 1956).

We call upon the churches of Virginia and their people to face with resolution the enormous task of helping the citizens of this Commonwealth to make the necessary adjustments to the Supreme Court's decision which is in accord with Christian principles. We urge all Christians to move with Christian patience and hope upon a course of good faith and wisdom in order that they may not become the victims of despair (Virginia Council of Churches, January 1956).

We firmly believe that the Supreme Court of the United States has acted in keeping with the basic principles of our American democracy and in keeping with the teachings of the Christian church when it declared segregation in the schools unconstitutional (Washington, D. C., Federation of Churches, October 1954).

The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional gives a clear status in law to a fundamental Christian and American principle. The decision will have far-reaching effects in the whole Nation and the world. * * * In the period of transition from one pattern to another (whatever the length of the period to be prescribed by the Court), we know that the churches and individual Christians will continue to exert their influence and leadership to help the authorized agencies in the several communities to bring about a complete compliance with the decision of the Supreme Court. The law of neighborliness is the great guide available to Christians as they deal with this situation in their local communities. "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself." The second part of the great commandment contains the potential for lifting men to a new level of social responsibility and for creating new dimensions of human brotherhood (National Council of Churches General Board, May 1954).

EXHIBIT 3

COMPILATION OF RECENT STATE AND LOCAL LAWS, RESOLUTIONS, ORDINANCES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES, WITH COMMENTS BY MR. J. FRANCIS POLHAUS, COUNSEL, WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

ALABAMA

Alabama, in an attempt to evade the Supreme Court's school decisions, has adopted a pupil placement law.

This plan gives local boards of education "full and final authority and responsibility for the assignment, transfer, and continuance of all pupils." It provides that there shall be no reallocation of pupils "according to any rigid rule of proximity of residence." The board of education shall consider, among other factors, "the psychological qualification of the pupil"; "the psychological effect upon the pupil of attendance at a particular school"; "the possibility or threat of friction, or disorder among pupils or others"; the possibility of breaches of the peace or ill will or economic retaliation within the community" (Act No. 201, regular session, Alabama, 1955: I Race Relations Law Reporter [1] 235).

In this act the legislature is authorizing the local boards to, in effect, surrender their authority to those persons in the community who will promote mob action.

In an attempt to make school officials immune from legal action to enforce constitutional rights, Alabama has amended its constitution to allow the legislature to designate as judicial officers members of State school boards, State boards of education, county school boards, city school boards or commissions, and all superintendents of schools, school officials and employees (Act No. 82, Alabama, first special session, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 417).

In defiance of the Supreme Court, the legislature adopted an interposition resolution declaring the Court's segregation decision "null, void, and of no effect" (Southern School News,[2] vol. II, No. 8, p. 6, Act No. 42, Alabama, first special session, 1956).

Alabama reaffirmed its unconstitutional school policy of segregation by adopting an amendment to its school laws providing for school boards to conduct "separate schools for white and colored children whose parents * * * voluntarily elect that such children attend schools with members of their own race" (Act No. 117, Alabama, second special session, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 717).

In a series of amendments to its constitution, Alabama granted to the legislature authority to close, withdraw State aid from, or even dispose of, public schools threatened with integration, and to donate funds and property to private schools (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 3, page 3; Act No. 82, Alabama, first special session, 1956).

Also authorized is a so-called private school plan whereby a local school board, on petition of a majority of school patrons, may close a school and lease the property for "private, nonprofit, educational purposes" and use public funds to pay pupils' tuition in private schools. Teachers transferred to these private schools would continue to be eligible for State benefits (S. S. N., vol. IV, No. 3, p. 5).

In addition to the above noted legislation of a statewide effect, both the State legislature and local governing bodies have passed legislation to thwart the enjoyment of civil rights.

The legislature passed two bills, applying to Macon and Marengo Counties, which would allow the county school boards to discharge any teacher "at any time such action is deemed necessary to promote the best interest of the schools" (Acts No. 40 and 41, first special session, Alabama, 1956).

A local act applicable to Wilcox County requires any organization soliciting membership or funds in the county to pay a $200 license fee, a $50 fee for each solicitor and $5 for each member signed up (Act No. 238, regular session, Alabama, 1955).

This act would, of course, apply to organizations other than those advocating integration. Labor unions would, for instance, be similarly affected. It is doubtful, however, that it will be invoked against segregation organizations or other groups seeking to stifle civil rights and civil liberties.

The city of Huntsville, Ala., in an attempt to perpetuate the separate but equal doctrine, has adopted a resolution making the local golf courses available 1 day a week to Negro patrons (I R. R. L. R. 589).

The city of Montgomery has made it a misdemeanor for white and colored to engage in athletic contests together, or for any owner or operator of a public establishment to allow interracial athletic contests (Montgomery Ordinance No. 15–57, March 19, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 714).

On November 13, 1956, the Supreme Court in the case of *Gayle* v. *Browder* (77 Sup. Ct. 165), affirmed a district court decision that enforcement of State and city laws requiring segregation on public carriers was unconstitutional. Nevertheless, on March 12, 1957, the Birmingham City Commission reaffirmed its policy of segregation on public buses, adopting an ordinance which reaffirmed, reenacted, and continued in full force and effect its existing law requiring segregation in the transit system (Ordinance No. 1342–F, II R. R. L. R. 457).

Because of the growing importance of the vote of colored citizens in the town of Tuskegee, the State legislature enacted a statute redefining the city limits of the town, removing from the municipality almost all colored voters (Act No. 140, Alabama, 1957 sess.; II R. R. L. R. 856).

Not content with this attempt to deny Negro citizens a voice in their government, the legislature went a step beyond and passed an amendment to the State constitution authorizing the legislature to abolish Macon County, the county in which Tuskegee is located. The purpose of this is to dilute the potential high percentage of colored voters (Macon County's colored population is 85 percent) by dividing these voters among neighboring counties. This amendment was approved on December 17, 1957 (Washington Post, December 18, 1957, p. 1).

The background of this amazing perversion of the democratic process is set out in a press conference of officers of the Tuskegee Civic Association, participated in by Senator DOUGLAS and other Senators, on July 30, 1957. A transcript of the testimony of this conference appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, 1957.

ARKANSAS

On November 6, 1956, the voters of Arkansas voted on and approved three measures designed to maintain segregation in the public-school system. All three measures were to become effective on December 6, 1957.

The first of these measures was an amendment to the constitution of Arkansas designed to nullify the United States Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases. This amendment directed the general assembly to "take appropriate action and pass laws opposing in every constitutional manner the unconstitutional desegregation decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, of the United States Supreme Court, including interposing the sovereignty of the State

[1] Hereinafter referred to as R. R. L. R.
[2] Hereinafter referred to as S. S. N.

of Arkansas to the end of nullification of these" (amendment No. 47, Arkansas constitution; I R. R. L. R., 1117).

An initiated petition of interposition was also approved which reads, in part:

"The people of Arkansas assert that the power to operate public schools in the State on a racially separate but substantially equal basis was granted by the people of Arkansas; any and all decisions of the Federal courts or any other department of the Federal Government to the contrary notwithstanding" (I R. R. L. R. 591).

The third of the measures adopted at this time was a school assignment plan, intended to evade the Supreme Court's decisions on school segregation. The chief means to be used in this evasion is apparently a provision that one of the factors to be considered is the "possibility or threat of friction or disorder among pupils or others" (I R. R. L. R. 579); Arkansas Stat., 80–1519 et seq.).

This provision is obviously an invitation to mob action of the Little Rock type.

State Commissioner of Education Ford said the law would help districts which want to keep their segregated schools (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 6, p. 8).

Arkansas' compulsory school attendance law has been amended so that students are relieved of the necessity of attending school if classes are racially mixed (Act No. 84, Arkansas Legislature, 1957 session, II R. R. L. R. 453).

The legislature has created a State agency to assist in preserving segregation. This State sovereignty commission has been granted the right to examine "all records, books, documents, and other papers touching upon or concerning the matters and things about which the commission is authorized to conduct an investigation." Subpena power is granted to the commission with punishment for refusal to obey or a fine up to $1,000 and 6 months' imprisonment (Act No. 83, Arkansas Legislature, 1957 session, II R. R. L. R. 491).

In an attempt to intimidate those seeking to promote desegregation, Arkansas has enacted legislation requiring "persons and organizations promoting school desegregation by legislation or litigation" to register and submit reports to the State sovereignty commission (Act No. 85, Arkansas Legislature, 1957 session, II R. R. L. R. 495).

Upon the recommendation of State Attorney General Bruce Bennett, Little Rock and 11 other communities in the State have adopted local ordinances requiring any organization, upon request of local authorities, to file specified information about finances, officers, and members within a city. These ordinances are under legal attack by the NAACP (S. S. N., vol. IV, No. 6, p. 3).

In the meantime, these statutes are being used to harass the NAACP. Mrs. Daisy Bates, State president of the NAACP, and Rev. J. B. Crenshaw, president of the Little Rock branch, have been arrested and fined for failing to reveal the membership list of the Little Rock branch.

FLORIDA

Florida has also enacted a pupil placement bill. Its author, Senator Johne, says of it: "Counties that want to keep segregated schools can do so under this bill" (S. S. N., vol. II, No. 1, p. 5).

This act sets up the county board of education as the authority to assign children to the school "as shall be determined by the board to be best adapted or qualified to serve the best interests of the child and of the public school system." The authority of the board is "full and complete and its decision as to the enrollment of any pupil in any such school shall be final" (ch. 29746, Laws, Florida, 1955; I R. R. L. R. 237).

Further legislation on the assignment of pupils established vague criteria for assignment, such as the "psychological, moral, ethical, and cultural backgrounds of the pupil." The board is directed to take into account "sociological, psychological, and like intangible social scientific factors as will prevent, as nearly as practicable, any condition of socioeconomic class consciousness among pupils attending any given school." There is no provision requiring members of the boards to have any specific training in any of the social sciences (ch. 31380, Laws, Florida, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 924).

At the same time, school authorities were authorized to ignore continuing contracts and tenure in assigning teachers. Chapter 31391, Laws, Florida, 1956. "This is designed to permit the dropping of Negro teachers regardless of their qualifications" (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 2, p. 10). It would, of course, also subject white teachers to lack of job security and make them subject to pressures from local boards.

Florida, as other States refusing to comply with the Supreme Court's decision, has passed a resolution of nullification and interposition denouncing "the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States" (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17–XX, 1956 special session; I R. R. L. R. 948).

The Governor of the State has been granted what amounts to dictatorial powers under the guise of emergency authority to quell violence. The statute granting such authority reads in part:

"In all such cases when the Governor of the State of Florida shall issue his proclamation (of emergency) as herein provided he shall be and is hereby further authorized and empowered, to cope with said threats and danger, to order and direct any individual person, corporation, association or group of persons to do any act which would in his opinion prevent danger to life, limb or property, prevent a breach of peace or * * * to refrain from doing any act or thing * * * and shall have full power by appropriate means to enforce such order or proclamation" (ch. 31390, Laws, Florida, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 955).

The only limitation on the Governor's use of this grant of power is that it shall be used "when, in his opinion, the facts warrant."

In an effort to harass those supporting the Federal Constitution, the legislature set up a committee to investigate the NAACP. The committee was granted a $50,000 appropriation and given broad subpena powers (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 3, p. 13).

In addition to State action, the battle against integration has been carried on on a local level.

The legislature passed a bill for Jefferson County, forbidding teachers of one race to instruct pupils of another, and forbidding pupils to engage in or attend athletic contests or use school cafeterias with children of another race (S. S. N., vol. IV, No. 3, p. 2).

Not only the school-segregation cases, but decisions of the Federal court relating to public beaches have been the objects of defiance by local authorities.

The city of Delray Beach has passed an ordinance providing: "No member of the Negro race shall go upon the Delray Beach municipal beach or the Delray Beach municipal pool" (Emergency Ordinance No. 236, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 733).

The city of Sarasota has likewise attempted by statute to deny colored citizens the right to use the public beaches. It adopted an ordinance requiring the clearing of public beaches whenever persons of different races shall enter on the beach at the same time (Ordinance No. 913, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 945).

Of recent enactment by the State legislature is a bill (H. B. 794, 1957) calling for "automatic closing and suspension of operation of any public school in this State upon the employ of Federal troops in the vicinity of said school for certain purposes." The Governor signed this into law in October 1957.

GEORGIA

Georgia has reacted strongly to the Supreme Court's decisions protecting the rights of minority citizens. The legislative reaction has taken various forms, among them a resolution of interposition and nullification, a call for impeachment of Supreme Court Justices, a memorial to declare the 14th and 15th amendments invalid, and a statute requiring State officers, under penalty of loss of pension rights, to continue enforcing unconstitutional State laws.

The nullification resolution declares:

"That said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of the races in the public institutions of a State as announced and promulgated by said Court on May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, are null, void, and of no force or effect" (H. Res. 185, 1956 sess.; I R. R. L. R. 438).

The legislature adopted a resolution on February 27, 1957, calling on the United States Representatives from Georgia to introduce a resolution of impeachment against Chief Justice Warren and Justices Black, Douglas, Reed, Frankfurter, and Clark because of certain decisions in which they participated (H. Res. 174, 1957 sess.; II R. R. L. R. 485).

As yet, no Georgia Congressman has introduced such a resolution.

On March 8, 1957, the legislature passed a resolution memorializing the United States Congress to declare the 14th and 15th amendments "null and void and of no effect" (S. Res. 39, 1957 sess.; II R. R. L. R. 483).

The statute relating to enforcement of segregation laws provides:

"Any peace officer * * * who knowingly refuses or fails to attempt to enforce any law of this State requiring segregation or separation of the white and colored races in any manner or activity * * * shall forfeit all retirement benefits, all disability benefits, and all death benefits" (Act No. 197, Georgia Laws, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 450).

Even before the Supreme Court's decision in the school cases, Georgia had begun its plan to avoid the possible consequences of such a decision.

In 1954, a constitutional amendment was ratified to allow the legislature to provide for grants of public funds to citizens for educational purposes (art. VIII, sec. XIII, Georgia Constitution).

Following the Court's ruling in the segregation cases, the State adopted a battery of laws intended to evade compliance with the Constitution as applied by the Court.

A group of laws approved February 6, 1956, laid the groundwork for the closing of public schools and the operation of a State-sponsored private school system.

The first of these provides for the closing of public schools by the Governor whenever a school becomes ineligible for State funds (i. e., when integrated). The students of such a closed school become eligible for an "education grant" from public funds (Act No. 11, Georgia Laws, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 418).

Acts No. 13 and 14 of the 1956 session of the legislature authorize the State and local boards of education to lease and sublease public school property for "private school purposes" (I R. R. L. R. 420).

Supplementing the above acts is a law to bring within the State teachers' retirement system teachers who would teach in these "private" schools (Act No. 15, Georgia Laws, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 424).

The Governor has been granted authority to suspend the compulsory school laws throughout the State or in any part of the State (Act No. 139, Georgia Laws, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 453).

In order to insure conformity by the teachers of the State, the State Board of Education has adopted a resolution to revoke "forever" the license of any teacher who "supports, encourages, condones, or agrees to teach mixed classes" (S. S. N., vol. II, No. 2, p. 4).[3]

In a further effort to block any possible integration, the legislature has dried up any funds to support a possibly integrated school.

It has been made a felony, punishable by 2 years' imprisonment, for any school official of the State or municipal or county system to spend tax money for public schools in which the races are mixed (Act No. 82, Georgia Laws, 1955).

The appropriations act of 1957 contains a provision that prohibits funds to be used for any public educational facility in which white and Negro races are not separated (House Resolution 243, Georgia, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 421).

Following an attack on the segregated system of the University of Georgia, School of Law (*Ward* v. *Regents* (II R. R. L. R. 369, 599)) the State board of regents announced it would enforce admission requirements that would make it a practical impossibility for a colored person to apply, because of the social and political pressures on those sponsoring him.

These requirements would be: (1) Signature of two alumni that the applicant is of good character, (2) a testimonial from the ordinary or clerk of superior court of the applicant's county that he "bears a good reputation in the community," (3) a recommendation that he is a "fit and suitable person" for admission from the judge of the superior court in his county of residence (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 11, p. 6).

In areas other than public-school segregation, Georgia has also acted to render ineffective decisions of the Federal courts.

In the field of public transportation, the State has adopted a law requiring segregation of intrastate passengers in waiting rooms of public carriers. Any carrier failing to comply is subject to penalty for a misdemeanor for each day it so fails (Act No. 413, Georgia Laws, 1956; I. R. R. L. R. 428).

Also passengers who fail to use the waiting rooms designated for their race under the above noted statute are subject to criminal prosecution; officers who enforce this law are exempted from suit for false arrest, false imprisonment or other legal action (Act No. 405, Georgia Laws, 1956).

To avoid allowing colored citizens to exercise their constitutional right to use public parks and other places of public recreation, Georgia has authorized the State or its political subdivisions to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such property (Act No. 20, Georgia Laws, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 427).

Pursuant to this authority nine State parks were leased to private operators. Average rental of these leases was $2,000 for 12 months. Most of the parks were leased to former park superintendents (S. S. N., vol. II, No. 11, p. 9).

Under the guise of emergency powers, and in a bill practically identical with Florida's on the same subject, the Governor is granted the same absolute power referred to in the above discussion of Florida's emergency statute. This includes the authority to order anyone "to do any act" or "refrain from doing any act" (Act No. 60, Georgia Laws, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 505).

Also, the State Patrol and Bureau of Investigation has been charged with the duty of entering any county or municipality "for the purpose of making arrests and otherwise enforcing any law of this State requiring segregation or separation of the white and colored races in any manner or activity" (Act No. 384, Georgia Laws, 1956).

LOUISIANA

Shortly after the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases, Louisiana amended its constitution to continue segregation under its police power. The amendment provided:

"All public elementary and secondary schools in the State of Louisiana shall be operated separately for white and colored children. This provision is made in the exercise of the State police power" (Act No. 752, Louisiana, 1954, I R. R. L. R. 239).

Supplementing this amendment, the legislature passed a law providing: (1) segregation in all elementary and secondary public schools; (2) withdrawal of State certification for any noncomplying school; (3) withdrawal of State support, including funds for free books and school lunch program from any noncomplying school; (4) criminal penalties ($500 to $1,000 fine or 90 days to 6 months imprisonment) for any violating the provisions of the law (Act No. 555, Louisiana, 1954, I R. R. L. R. 239).

It also enacted a pupil placement plan which gave each parish superintendent of schools authority to assign students. No criteria were provided for making such assignments (Act No. 556, Louisiana, 1954).

As soon as these legislative provisions were legally attacked, they were declared unconstitutional. *Bush* v. *Orleans Parish School Board* (138 F. Supp. 336 (1956)).

In the field of higher education, Louisiana had for several years admitted colored students to its State supported colleges. This was done pursuant to court cases predating the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954.

Following the decision of May 17, the State not only attempted to thwart that decision, but to reverse its policy with respect to higher education as well.

It did this by adopting a law requiring all students and applicants at tax supported colleges to have a certificate of good character signed by their high school principals and district superintendents (Act No. 15, Louisiana, 1956).

At the same time it passed an act making it a grounds for dismissal from employment for any teacher to perform "any act toward bringing about the integration of the races within the public school system or any public institution of higher learning" (Act No. 249, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 941).

Taken together, these laws made it impossible for colored students to obtain the required certification. It was so recognized by the Federal Court and the scheme was declared unconstitutional. *Ludley* v. *Board of Supervisors of L. S. U.* (150 F. Supp 900).

Act 249, referred to above, also provided for dismissal of teachers for advocating racial integration or for belonging to or contributing to an organization enjoined from operating in Louisiana. At the time, the NAACP was under injunction prohibiting it from doing business in that State.

Similar restrictive legislation was applied to public school bus operators, teachers and employees of the Orleans parish public school system (Acts 248, 250 and 252, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 943, et seq.).

An act affecting the city of New Orleans provides "Those public schools being utilized in the education of children of the Negro race through the twelfth grade of school shall * * * be utilized solely and exclusively in the education of children of the Negro race unless otherwise classified by the legislature."

A similar provision was made with respect to "white" schools and a provision was likewise made that all new schools would be designated "white" or "Negro."

The law also requires that white and colored students will be taught only by teachers of their own race.

It further attempts to deny legal attack on the law by providing that the act may be contested only with the consent of the legislature (Act No. 319, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 927).

The State has suspended its compulsory school attendance laws in any school system which is ordered integrated (Act No. 28, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 728. This has been interpreted as applying to the parochial school system (S. S. N., vol. II, No. 12, p. 3).

In attempting to prevent lawsuits from being brought against segregation in the school and park systems, Louisiana has amended its constitution and designated the governing boards of these institutions special agencies of the State. It has withdrawn permission for suits to be brought against special agencies except with the consent of the legislature (Act No. 613, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 776).

Louisiana has, of course, adopted a resolution of interposition. Therein it declares the May 17, 1954, decision of the Supreme Court and any similar decision to be in violation of the United States Constitution "insofar as such decisions may affect or apply to the sovereign State of Louisiana" (House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 753).

The attack on desegregation has not been confined to the public-school system.

A particular retreat into reaction was taken when the State outlawed interracial athletic events and established forced segregated seating at all athletic events (Act No. 579, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 953).

Prior to the enactment of this legislation, colored athletes had been participating before unsegregated audiences for several years. Shreveport was represented in baseball in the Texas League, where colored players were active. The United States Naval Academy and the University of Pittsburgh had participated in the Sugar Bowl football game on an unsegregated basis. Because of this reversal of State policy, the United States Military Academy was forced to transfer its 1957 football game with Tulane, scheduled for New Orleans, to West Point, in order to comply with the policy of the National Government. Again in defiance of a Supreme Court ruling, Louisiana has enacted a law requiring racially segregated waiting rooms for intrastate passengers of public carriers, with criminal penalties of $100 to $300 fine and 30 days to 6 months imprisonment for any violation (Act No. 27, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 741).

Employers are required, under criminal penalty, to provide separate sanitary facilities, eating places and drinking facilities (Act 395, Louisiana, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 947).

This last requirement appears to contravene Executive Order No. 10479 which prohibits discrimination by employers holding Government contracts. Logically, it would bar the issuance of Government contracts to any Louisiana industry.

MISSISSIPPI

In Mississippi, the State has thrown its full power into the effort to render null and void the school segregation decisions of the Supreme Court.

In a resolution of interposition and nullification, Mississippi's legislature has declared:

"the decisions and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mis-

[3] Later rescinded on the advice of the State attorney general as unnecessary. The teachers' oath to uphold the laws of the State was sufficient to prevent membership in the NAACP, he added.

sissippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid and of no effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi." (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125, Mississippi, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 442).

Implementing this resolution is an act which directs all officers of the executive branch of the State government to prohibit "the implementation of or the compliance with, the Integration Decisions of the United States Supreme Court," and to prohibit the "mixing or integration of the white and Negro races in public schools, public parks, public waiting rooms, public places of amusement, recreation or assembly."

Any law officers acting in compliance with this act is granted "a full and complete defense to any suit" brought against him by "any person * * * or by the Federal Government of the United States" (ch. 254, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956; II R. R. L. R. 480).

As a further means of resisting the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the State set up a "legal educational advisory committee." This committee was granted authority to command the appearance of witnesses. The testimony of such witness "would be used in support of the State using its police power to maintain segregation for 'peace and order'" (S. S. N., vol. I, No. 6, p. 9).

At about the same time the Governor appointed 1,100 lawyers as special assistant attorneys general to act in defense of school officials against whom suits might be brought (S. S. N., vol. I, No. 6, p. 9).

Later the State created a "State sovereignty commission" with the duty "to do and perform any and all acts necessary and proper to protect the sovereignty of the State of Mississippi, and her sister States, from encroachment thereon by the Federal Government."

The commission was granted subpena power to require examination of witnesses and production of books, records, etc. Failure to respond to the subpena of the commission was made punishable by "fine or imprisonment in the discretion of the commission" (ch. 365, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 592).

The legislature appropriated $250,000 to finance the activities of the Sovereignty Commission. Out of these funds, the commission decided to employ secret investigators and informants (S. S. N., vol. II, No. 12, p. 5).

In the field of public school education, Mississippi acted early to attempt to frustrate the Supreme Court's decisions

In December 1954, it adopted an amendment to its constitution which would authorize the legislature to abolish public schools through the State and allow the legislature to authorize counties or separate school districts to abolish their schools (ch. 132, General Laws of Mississippi, 1955).

Also there was enacted a statute prohibiting "persons of the white or Caucasian race from attending schools of high school level and lower, wholly or partially supported with State funds, which are also attended by a member or members of the colored or Negro race." Violations of this law are made punishable by a fine up to $25 or 6 months imprisonment (ch. 43, General Laws of Mississippi, 1955).

The State has also abolished its compulsory school attendance law in order to avoid possible integration (ch. 288, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 422).

In a series of bills to preserve segregated travel, Mississippi requires public carriers to provide and designate racially separate waiting rooms and toilet facilities for intrastate travelers. Failure to use such facilities as designated is made punishable by penalties up to $1,000 in fine and 1 year imprisonment (chs. 258, 259, and 260, General Laws of Mississippi, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 430 et seq.).

As a means of insuring these and all other of its illegal and unconstitutional laws are obeyed, Mississippi has made it a criminal offense to conspire to violate the State's segregation laws by force, violence, threats, intimidation or "otherwise" (ch. 20, General Laws of Mississippi, 1954).

Realizing that the structure of enforced segregation is built on the denial of the franchise, Mississippi amended its constitution in order to further restrict the voting rights of its colored citizens. By this means, colored voters were reduced from 22,000 in 1954 to 7,000 in 1955, according to testimony given by Governor Coleman to the House Judiciary Committee. This 7,000 voters is out of a colored population in the State of 900,000 (House hearings, H. R. 140 et al., 85th Congress, 1st sess., p. 730).

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina is another State which has constructed an elaborate scheme to deny colored children their right to attend public schools without racial discrimination.

One measure in this scheme is the transfer of authority from enrollment and assignment of pupils from the State Board of Education to local city and county boards (ch. 1372, session Laws of North Carolina, 1955).

The purpose of this transfer, as explained by its segregationist proponents, was to require that each of the 172 school administrative units must be sued in any complete legal attack on segregation on a statewide basis (S. S. N., vol. I, No. 9, p. 10).

Another, and perhaps the principal, measure devised to block integration is a school-placement plan. This plan, as amended and in effect, grants to each local board of education "full and complete" authority to assign and reassign students to the public schools. In making assignments, the boards are "to provide for the orderly and efficient administration of the public schools, and provide for the effective instruction, health, safety, and general welfare of the pupils." Each board of education is authorized to adopt "reasonable rules and regulations as in the opinion of the board are necessary in the administration of this article" (ch. 7, extra session Laws, North Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 939).

Other parts of this scheme of evasion are:

An amendment to the State constitution to authorize expenditure of public funds for tuition grants "for the private education of any child for whom no public school is available or for the private education of a child who is assigned against the wishes of his parent * * * to a public school attended by a child of another race." This amendment also authorizes the legislature to provide "local option" whereby local educational units may be allowed to close their public schools (ch. 1, extra session Laws, North Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 928).

An act, adopted pursuant to the authority granted in the amendment noted above, which provides tuition grants as authorized in the amendment, for use for education in private, nonsectarian schools, (ch. 3, extra session Laws, North Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 930).

An act, adopted pursuant to the authority granted in the amendment note above, authorizing each local education unit "to suspend the operation of one or more or all of the public schools under its jurisdiction." It provides the machinery for such suspension and for the reopening of any closed school (ch. 4, extra session Laws, North Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 934).

An act providing for the suspension of the compulsory school attendance law where public schools are integrated and it is "not practicable for such child to attend a private nonsectarian school" (ch. 5, extra session Laws, North Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 938).

SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina began its drive to avoid the effects of the Supreme Court school decision before the decision was handed down by the Court.

It repealed that provision of its constitution requiring the State to provide a system of free public schools (Act (47) 2223, South Carolina, 1952, and Act (48) 1695, 1954). Later it provided that State funds shall cease "for any school from which, and for any school to which, any pupil may transfer pursuant to, or in consequence of, an order of any court" (Act (49) 329, South Carolina, 1955; I R. R. L. R. 241).

Another series of laws was enacted to avoid integration, if necessary by the elimination of the public school system. Among these were the repeal of the compulsory school attendance law (Act (49) 85, South Carolina, 1955); increased administrative grants of authority, including assignment of students, to local school authorities and the granting of authority to local school boards to operate or close public schools (Code, title 21, section 230); authorization for the sale or lease of public school property (Code, title 21, section 238).

School officials have been granted the authority to have children removed from a school and transferred to another by the sheriff or other law-enforcement officer where the enrollment of such children may threaten to result in riot, civil commotion or may in any way disturb the peace of the citizens of the community (Act No. 712, South Carolina, 1956).

Higher education has likewise come under attack in South Carolina. In its general appropriations act of 1956, the State provided that all appropriations for colleges and institutions of higher learning were made on the basis of racial segregation. The colleges given State aid are to be closed upon any pupil being ordered admitted immediately to it by the order of any court. In such an event, the South Carolina State College shall be closed also (Act No. 813, South Carolina, 1956). South Carolina State College is the institution serving colored college students in the State.

A similar appropriation bill provision granted funds for racially separate schools and parks and directed school authorities to close any institution to which a student is ordered admitted by court order (Act No. 49 (329) South Carolina, 1955).

South Carolina has joined those States voicing defiance of the Supreme Court by resolutions of nullification and interposition. Its resolution reads in part:

"The State of South Carolina * * * will exercise the powers reserved to it under the Constitution to judge for itself of the infractions and to take such other legal measures as it may deem appropriate to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people" (Act No. 914, South Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 443).

South Carolina, realizing the importance of the NAACP in the fight against its unlawful and unconstitutional legislation, has attempted to coerce the association by legislation aimed specifically at it.

It set up a special committee to investigate the activities of the NAACP at South Carolina State College to "determine what individuals at the college are members and sympathizers with" the association and to "further determine the extent of participation of the faculty and students in the activities of the association" (Act No. 920, South Carolina, 1956).

In order to further embarrass the NAACP, South Carolina enacted legislation prohibiting public employment of members of the association. It was made "unlawful for any member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to be employed by the State, school district, county, or any municipality thereof."

The authorities of any school were authorized to demand an oath of "any teacher or other employee * * * who is suspected of being a member" of the association. Any person who refused to submit to such interrogation would be "summarily dismissed" (Act No. 741, South Carolina, 1956).

This act was repealed when it was attacked in the courts (*Bryan* v. *Austin* (354 U. S. 933)), in order to avoid a ruling on its constitutionality. It was replaced by a law requiring all applicants for employment with State or local governmental bodies to give "information as to active or honorary membership in or application with all membership associations and organizations" (Act No. 223, South Carolina, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 852).

South Carolina also used the "avoidance" method of having its law declared unconstitutional in connection with the operation of State recreational facilities.

While a suit was pending in Federal court involving racial exclusion at Edisto Beach State Park, the State closed the park under a legislative mandate (Act No. 917, South Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 590).

In order to continue racial segregation in other State parks, the "State commission of forestry is vested with the authority to operate and supervise only racially separate parks and to admit to the facilities of the State parks only persons having the express permission of the State to use such facilities." Permission was granted in the law to "citizens of the State to use the facilities at the parks for their own race." Persons not complying could be found guilty of trespass and sentenced to $5,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment (Act No. 813, South Carolina, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 738).

South Carolina has enacted an "emergency" law, almost identical in language with those of Florida and Georgia. The language of these bills compels a conclusion that they had a common origin. The Governor, as he is in Florida and Georgia, is granted authority to "order and direct any person to do any act which would in his opinion prevent or minimize danger" or "to refrain from doing any act" (Act No. 349, South Carolina, 1957; I R. R. L. R. 855).

The laws noted above are those enacted since May 17, 1954. South Carolina, of course, continues to enforce its segregation laws enacted previous to that date. Among these is section 1272 of the labor laws of South Carolina, which prohibits laborers of different races from working together in the same room in any textile shop.

This State-imposed policy of discrimination, if complied with by textile manufacturers, violates Executive Order No. 10479. Accordingly, Government agencies, if they abide by the Executive order, would not contract for textiles manufactured in South Carolina.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee's house of representatives, not content with 1 resolution of defiance of the Supreme Court, has passed 2 such resolutions, denouncing the Court's "tyrannical usurpation of power" and "illegal encroachments upon the powers reserved to the State of Tennessee" (House Resolutions 1 and 9, Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 228 and 481).

In order to implement its defiance of the Court, Tennessee has enacted a series of laws relating to its public-school system.

It has authorized boards of education to provide separate schools for white and Negro children whose parents or guardians voluntarily elect that such children attend school with children of their own race (ch. 11, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 215).

It has given local boards of education authority to assign students on the basis of a long list of intangible and unascertainable factors. Some of these are: "the effect of the enrollment on the welfare and best interests of such pupil and all other pupils"; "the psychological effect upon the pupil attendance at a particular school"; "the sociological, psychological, and like intangible social scientific factors as will prevent, as nearly as possible, a condition of socio-economic class consciousness among the pupils"; "the possibility or threat of friction or disorder among pupils or others," etc. (ch. 13, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 215).

In order to avoid the possible effects of integration, transfer of students between school systems of different counties, cities, and school districts has been authorized (ch. 9, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 220).

Also authorized is the establishment and operation of joint schools by two or more boards of education (ch. 12, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 220). The law granting this authority is to permit "two counties, neither of which has a large enough Negro student population to make it economically feasible to maintain a separate Negro school, to operate a school or schools for students of both counties" (S. S. N., vol. III, No. 10, p. 12).

In order to impede the legal attack on segregation by the NAACP and other civil-rights organizations, Tennessee seeks to prohibit any person or organization from soliciting funds to "commence or prosecute further any litigation or other legal proceeding" unless the solicitor is a party or has a pecuniary right in the litigation. It also prohibits the expenditure of funds "from whatever source received" by one not a party until it (if a corporation) files a copy of its charter, bylaws, etc.; a list of members, directors, officers, etc.; a statement of its sources of membership fees, contributions, and other sources of revenue; a statement of all its financial transactions, etc. (ch. 152, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957).

The State seeks also to coerce organizations working in the field of interracial relations. In order "to promote interracial harmony and tranquility," it demands the registration of all persons and organizations "engaged in promoting or opposing legislation in behalf of or in opposition to a race or color" or those engaging "in raising or expending funds for the employment of counsel or payment of costs in connection with litigation in behalf of any race or color." It also requires the listing of membership, financial sources, etc., as does the previously mentioned statute on litigation (ch. No. 151, Public Acts of Tennessee, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 498).

TEXAS

Texas, in adopting a pupil placement law, has, as some other States seeking to avoid integration, encouraged coercion of local school boards by providing that among the criteria the boards shall use in assigning students shall be included "the possibility or threat of friction or disorder among pupils or others; the possibility of breaches of the peace or ill-will or economic retaliation within the community."

Its placement law allows parents to withdraw students from racially integrated schools (ch. 287, Texas Session Laws, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 693).

Texas seeks to prevent further integration by requiring that no school district shall abolish its dual (segregated) school system unless the voters of the school district have voted to do so. It seeks to abolish integrated systems now existing by allowing the voters of a school district to vote to return to a segregated system (ch. 283, Texas Session Laws, 1957; II R. R. L. R. 695).

The State has provided for the closing of schools where "violence or the danger thereof cannot be prevented except by resort to military force (Senate bill 1, Texas, special session, 1957; S. S. N., vol. IV, No. 6, p. 5).

Texas has joined those States adopting statutes labeled "anti-NAACP" laws. In an act allegedly aimed at the association, it requires "any organization that seeks to hinder or interfere with the operation of a public school to make public its roster of members on order of the county judge" (New York Times, December 8, 1957).

VIRGINIA

Virginia's program of massive resistance to the implementation of the 14th amendment began with the adoption of a resolution of interposition directed against the Supreme Court's decision in the school cases. It pledged the State "to resist this illegal encroachment on our sovereign powers" (Senate Joint Resolution 3, Virginia, 1956; I R. R. L. R. 445).

In special session the legislature in 1956 adopted a series of laws designed to alter the operation of Virginia public schools in such a way that the State could continue to operate under its unconstitutional segregation policy. These laws, approved on September 29, extend from chapter 56 through chapter 71 of the acts of the 1956 extra session of the General Assembly (I R. R. L. R. 1091 et seq.).

The first of these laws would make available State funds to governmental subdivisions of the State to replace the funds which will be withheld if schools are integrated. These funds will be available "for grants to pupils attending nonsectarian private schools" (ch. 56).

Another statute authorizes local governments to levy a property tax to raise money for such "private" school grants (ch. 57).

Other parts of this legislative plan authorize local school boards to make grants for "private" education out of school funds (ch. 62); provide administrative procedures for the expenditure of such funds (ch. 58); amend the budget laws to provide for such grants (ch. 67); and allow teachers in "private" schools to be included in the teacher retirement system (ch. 64).

The compulsory school attendance law was amended to provide that "no child shall be required to enroll in or attend any school wherein both white and colored children are enrolled" (ch. 59).

It is declared the public policy of the State that the efficient administration of the schools requires the segregation of white and colored students. Where such "efficient" school system cannot be maintained, local authorities are divested of control of the school and the school is closed. The Governor is given the authority and duty to take over the school and administer it in such a way as to prevent integration (ch. 68).

Where local authorities cannot operate an efficient public-school system, the State is authorized to take over and administer, through the governor, such efficient system. In such case the State shall operate its system in the unused school buildings and related facilities now or hereafter owned, constructed, and maintained by the school boards of the several counties, cities, and towns (ch. 69).

The keystone of the whole plan was the pupil placement plan which vested all power of enrollment or placement of pupils in a pupil-placement board. The board was to administer the law, taking into account in assigning students various factors, including the efficiency of the operation of the school. Inasmuch as an efficient school by definition is a segregated one, the board had no authority to place any student in an integrated situation (ch. 70).

The placement law has been declared unconstitutional on its face (*Adkins* v. *School Board of Newport News* (148 F. Supp. 430)).

On September 29, 1956, the legislature also passed a series of laws which have come to be known as the anti-NAACP laws. The purpose of this legislation is to close the courts to legal attacks on the constitutionality of Virginia's segregation policy. They attempt to impede the activities of the

NAACP and other civil-rights organizations in the following manner:

Prohibiting the solicitation of funds for legal proceedings except by a party to a suit and requiring the filing of membership lists, financial statements, sources of dues, and contributions, etc., by any organization contributing funds for legal proceedings (ch. 31, Virginia Extra Session, 1956).

Requiring the registration of any person or organization "who or which engages as one of its principal functions or activities in the promoting or opposing in any manner the passage of legislation by the general assembly in behalf of any race or color, or who or which has as one of its principal functions or activities the advocating of racial integration or segregation * * * or who or which * * * engages in raising or expanding funds for the employment of counsel * * * in behalf of any race or color." In addition to registering an organization is required to list its members, contributors, financial information, etc. Such information shall be public records (ch. 32, Virginia extra session, 1956).

By making criminal the giving, receiving, solicitation, etc., of funds for any legal action against the State, its political subdivisions, or officials thereof, except by a party to such suit or one having a direct interest therein. Also made illegal is the advising or instigating of such suit (ch. 36, extra session, Virginia, 1956).

At the same time that the above legislation was enacted, the legislature created two legislative investigating committees, the Committee on Offenses Against the Administration of Justice and a committee to investigate organizations promoting "litigation relating to racial activities" (chs. 34 and 37, extra session, Virginia, 1956).

These committees have spent most of their time in harassing litigants and attorneys in civil-rights suits and other proponents of constitutional rights.

They have, in secret sessions, inquired into the political and religious beliefs of witnesses and have conducted their investigations in the style of the secret police.

On the local level in Virginia, the county of Halifax has taken upon itself the regulation of solicitation of memberships by organizations, unions, or societies. No such solicitation shall be allowed without a permit. In passing on the permit, the board of supervisors shall consider "the character of the applicant, the nature of the business of the organization * * * and its effect upon the general welfare of citizens of said county" (I R. R. L. R. 958).

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor and that the observations of the Senator from New York may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. I have interrupted my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, only because I have a luncheon to attend at 1 o'clock, at which I am a co-host. I do wish to state, in deference to the monumental task which has been performed so magnificently by the Senator from Illinois in drafting the bill, my appreciation for being included as a cosponsor of the bill.

I believe that I bespeak the appreciation of my other colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle who have similarly been included.

It has been characteristic of the civil rights struggle that people in both great parties have realized that the way in which to get results is by working together. I believe we have given a rather model performance in terms of how a bipartisan group can work together effectively, keeping in closest touch, even though differing, without shattering the forces that have joined together.

I am very happy that we are continuing to work together. The Senator from Illinois has joined me on a bill of mine, and I am very glad to join him on his bill. I should like merely to make one observation, which to me is a very important one.

We are constantly being told that this kind of legislation should not be pressed; that we should not press legislation in the civil rights field. We are constantly being told that we will prosper best if the subject is let alone; that the natural forces of education will cause the moral position of the country under the Constitution with respect to equal opportunity to be asserted.

There are two answers to that assertion, Mr. President. First, we do not have that much time; secondly, history shows that it does not happen.

We do not have that much time, particularly at a time when our national morality is being tested as never before. We do not have that much time when a billion people, two-thirds of the free world, have us under the most concentrated attention as to whether we mean what we say in terms of world leadership, which will recognize them, although their skins may be yellow or black, as fully equal with us in every respect, including entitlement to their full development.

We have also found that it takes the sanction of law to make real progress.

I point out that the Senator from Illinois has very wisely drafted a bill, notwithstanding what may be said against it—and it will be said, and therefore I speak to it today—which in no way seeks to coerce anyone or drive anyone into a corner, or force anyone to do everything immediately. On the contrary, every help and technical assistance and money is being offered. Incidentally, that is the first time, as the Senator from Illinois has so properly said, that the financial grant factor has been introduced.

It also relies on the processes of the courts, which have shown every earnest desire to give time accommodation and terms to the proposal that the law requires conformance to the Constitution.

I say that because it is said of us on the civil-rights side that we are trying to force people to do something, to hit them over the head, and to coerce them. In the first place, Mr. President, what we propose ought to be done; in the second place, the most temperate and considerate course is contemplated, with the greatest amount of aid and the greatest amount of understanding by the American people of the social patterns in certain Southern States. I say that from the standpoint of those of us, including myself in New York, who seek to do something about these problems wherever they may be found.

Again, we are honorbound to proceed as diligently in self-criticism and self-evaluation as we proceed in respect to sections where this is not a popular idea.

I appreciate the opportunity to join with the Senator from Illinois, who is a real champion and a thoughtful champion in this field. I have uttered these words because we respect other people of good will, who we believe to be just as sincere as we are—as Americans who have very different points of view. However, by pressing forward in this field, as the Senator from Illinois proposes we do, we act not in derogation of that respect, but in a greater upbuilding of it.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York, not merely for the remarks which he has just made, but for his constant vigilance in this matter. No one understands the law of this subject better than does the Senator from New York. No one is more ardent in behalf of the cause. No one is more tactful in his methods of procedure. It is a great pleasure for us to be able to work with him and with the many other fine believers in this cause on the other side of the aisle.

I can promise the Senator from New York that we shall make every effort to have this a bipartisan venture. There will be no attempt to score any party advantage, and we will gladly move together for what we believe to be the best interests of the American people.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am pleased to be one of the cosponsors of the bill which the Senator from Illinois has introduced. I am glad he has introduced it. I happen to be one who thinks the civil-rights issue is one that has to be drawn in America. The sooner the better. The bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois should be effective in many respects in furthering civil rights.

I want the record to be perfectly clear that in sponsoring the bill I reserve the right either to offer amendments to the bill or introduce a supplementary bill which I think will provide for some other procedures that are needed in civil-rights legislation. However, the bill is a good bill, and in my opinion it represents a step we should take. I am very proud, therefore, to give my support to it. I think we need on the books legislation with teeth. When we get such legislation on the books, then, in my opinion, for the first time will we have effective civil-rights legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arizona with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred House Joint Resolution 533, making additional appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate without amendment and with the recommendation that the joint resolution be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that immediate consideration be given to House Joint Resolution 533.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The joint resolution was read the first time by title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

Unemployment Compensation for Veterans

For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for veterans, $25 million.

Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees

For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, $18,400,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the resolution provides $25 million additional for unemployment compensation for veterans and $18,400,000 additional for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. The committee was informed that funds are or will be in a few days completely exhausted and additional funds are required to pay these statutory obligations. As a matter of fact, the funds for unemployment compensation for Federal employees were exhausted on the 7th of this month. It is estimated that the funds for veterans will be exhausted in 5 more days. So passage of the joint resolution is urgently needed, and prompt action on it is requested.

The only thing I can add to what I have just stated is that in the regular appropriation bill of last year, the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for unemployment compensation for veterans was $42 million. Congress appropriated $36.8 million, which represented a cut of $5.2 million under the budget estimate, based on the best available data at the time. Now a request is being made for $25 million additional. Even though a cut in the request had not been made, a later estimate for an additional appropriation would have been made.

The same is true with respect to the other item. The budget estimate for the unemployment compensation funds for Federal employees was $32 million. The appropriation made was $25 million, which represented a decrease of $7 million. Now the Department has requested $18,400,000 in additional money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The joint resolution was reported from the Appropriations Committee unanimously. Both the Senator from Arizona and I sat in the committee during the hearings, and the joint resolution represents the unanimous recommendation of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. And as chairman of the committee, I was instructed to bring the joint resolution before the Senate at the earliest possible moment, which I am trying to do.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the urgency of the matter, I think the joint resolution should be promptly passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE NEEDS OF THE HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had prepared these remarks for delivery in the Senate prior to the launching of our earth satellite. In the light of that development, I went over the statement to see where the views which I intended to express should be revised.

In rereading the text, it occurred to me that too often, Mr. President, we tend to be carried away by the events of the moment. Too often, in the narrow perspective of this Capital City, we wax hot and cold on the basis of good news or bad. Too often we go from the extremes of excessive assurance to excessive despair.

At the time I prepared these remarks, Mr. President, I tried to view the international situation in broader perspective. Even as other Members of the Senate had been away from this city during the recess, so had I. Even as some had traveled through the country, to home States, to other States, so had I. Even as some had been abroad, in Europe, in Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere, I had gone to Europe and north Africa. Even as they did, I was happy to rediscover that the sun still rises and sets, not only in Washington but throughout the Nation and the world.

I found it useful to see what was going on elsewhere, and to explore the interests and sentiments of those who are not immersed in the day-to-day doings of government. I found it helpful to examine my own thoughts in the light of the hopes and the fears of others.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE DOMESTIC SITUATION

These remarks, then, were prepared in that context, in the context of the time for reflection which the recess permitted. For that reason, I do not feel that the launching of the satellite compels any significant revision in them. On the contrary, that event tends to make it more imperative than ever that we look at our situation not as it may be at the moment, but in a long perspective. That event happened to be, so to speak, one of our ups. There will be others, I am sure, just as I am sure that we shall have our downs.

If I dwell at length on foreign policy in these remarks, it is not because that is the only question confronting the Nation. I do so because as Senators realize, foreign policy is among the most compelling, difficult, and continuing questions with which we must deal. On the other hand, if I turn first in these remarks to matters other than foreign policy, it is because I do not assume that all of our troubles begin abroad and end at the water's edge or, perhaps I should say, at the stratosphere's limits. The eyes of Washington may be glued to the earth satellites and their hypnotic, symbolic, orbiting of the earth. That is not necessarily the case with citizens elsewhere in the Nation. There is an awareness, a growing awareness, that our national problems are larger than a mere matching of some particular Soviet achievement in the realm of science or military techniques. There is increasing concern not only with this one aspect of our affairs but with the total state of the Union.

I have spoken many times in the Senate in the past on foreign policy. In those discussions, however, I have often prefixed my remarks with this observation: We cannot, in an absorption with what goes on abroad, lose sight of what is going on at home.

The point bears repeating at this time. It bears repeating because there are domestic difficulties which adversely affect millions of citizens and they cannot be covered with a gloss of official optimism. It bears repeating because these difficulties, in turn, have a great influence on the position of the United States in the world. They affect our capacity to defend the Nation and they affect our capacity to bring about a durable peace.

These domestic difficulties have an international meaning because foreign policy is not unrelated to other aspects of our national life. It is not a thing apart. If we sink at home, sooner or later we shall sink abroad. If the Union is strong, cohesive and dynamic, there is at least a chance that foreign policy will be able to safeguard the Nation's security, to advance the welfare of our people and to further the hope of peace. If the Union is weak, divided and fearful, foreign policy can do little to uphold our position as a nation among many nations. In short, to the extent that we face the difficulties within our borders and deal with them, we shall be able to act on the much more complex difficulties that beset us abroad.

DOMESTIC ECONOMIC SITUATION

Let me turn first, then, in these remarks on foreign policy to the domestic situation. I suggest that we shift our eyes for a moment from the distant reaches of space and glance around us, first, at the economic situation. Look at the State of Michigan, at Pennsylvania, the State of Montana, at Maine or Alabama. Look at the mining industry, the steel industry, the aircraft, automobile and farm equipment industries, the textile industry. Look at the unemployment figures. Look at the condition of small enterprise, at the decline

of business profits and take-home pay, and look at the level of prices. It does not require a 100-inch telescope for this exploration. It does not require a high-speed electronic computer to discover that the economic map of the United States is pockmarked with craters of distress.

These are times, however, in which it is regarded as somewhat vulgar to see situations that have not first been tinted by the reassuring techniques of the administration's press agents. It is not pleasant political manners to mention unpleasant economic facts. It is much more acceptable to accent the positive and, after all, 1957 was the best year of our history. One can hear reputable economists assure us that 6 months hence all will be well, and the economy will once again be riding the beam or the boom. As for unemployment, moving now toward the 5 million mark, these same economists will tell you that that is an inevitable part of the rolling readjustment. Distress in particular areas and industries? These are merely temporary phenomena connected with the leveling off of the boom.

These terms have a kind of painless, inoffensive, almost pleasant, sound. But ask the miner of copper in Butte, unemployed for months, what they mean. Ask the men who manage these mines. Ask a steelworker in Pittsburgh, the timberjack in western Montana, or a weaver in New England. Ask the man who runs a small business, in these and other places. They may very well use that unmentionable word "depression" and speak of their fears of it.

The term may be too strong to describe the situation in which we now find ourselves. Nevertheless, we ought not to ignore the damage which this situation is already doing to millions of citizens. We ought not to underestimate the present and potential impact of this situation, whatever it is called, on our position in the world.

Here in Washington, it may seem logical to give a high priority to foreign-policy matters. These are indeed urgent matters. Is it unreasonable, however, for those who have been adversely affected by the economic decline at home to ask why foreign aid takes precedence over their own very real difficulties? Is it unreasonable for those who have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade program to raise questions as to the value of the program?

It is all very well to talk in abstract terms of long-range national benefits from these and other foreign policies. They can, indeed, provide such benefits. Individual citizens, however, do not live on abstractions. When their personal and immediate problems are overlooked by government, they are not likely to appreciate abstractions. Sooner or later, this lack of public appreciation will be reflected in legislative action and foreign policy may well suffer in consequence.

In a similar vein, the stability of many other free countries is tied closely to the economic stability of the United States. This nation is at the center of the international financial and trade complex of the non-Communist world. Nations heavily dependent on foreign commerce will prosper and falter as this Nation prospers or falters. A prolonged lull in economic activity in the United States can only have disastrous repercussions throughout the entire non-Communist world.

We may not now be in a period of general economic crisis. It is irresponsible, however, to dismiss the possibility that we might be headed in that direction. It is irresponsible to ignore the plight of those Americans who have already been rolled aside by the rolling readjustment. It is irresponsible to expect human beings to appreciate long-range national problems of government when their immediate and personal plight is overlooked by the Government.

We had better not wait too long and come forth with too little to reverse present economic trends. We had better make certain that the legal remedies for this type of situation, most of which were set up in the 1930's, are still adequate in this new era of automation.

Let us take the first step now by sweeping aside the cozy optimism that oozes about us and by recognizing honestly and openly that our economic house is not in order. The Russians did not make this situation. The satellites in the sky have nothing to do with it. We made this situation ourselves, and it is up to us to correct it.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

If there are economic difficulties which should concern us, there are also social problems which continue to confront the Nation. I remind the Senate that we still have a long way to go before the ideal of equal human opportunity is fully realized in this country.

I remind the Senate of the appalling crime rate, 315 major crimes per hour during 1957, the highest in the Nation's history.

I remind the Senate that millions of older people are still without adequate income to live out their years in decency, and without adequate opportunities to use their talents, skills, and willingness in a constructive fashion.

I remind the Senate that too many households in this country still live in legitimate fear of catastrophic illness with its ruinous medical and hospital costs.

I remind the Senate that the price of higher education is going beyond the reach of most families.

I remind the Senate of the disturbing situation in general health conditions, in physical and mental fitness. There are now some 16 million Americans—1 out of every 11—suffering from some form of mental illness; and few of these are receiving adequate care and treatment.

Mr. President, these are not new problems, nor are they problems peculiar to this country. In some cases, they may be more acute in other nations than they are here at home. In others, we have the dubious distinction of holding first place among the principal nations of the world.

There are any number of conscientious people, in private life and in Federal, State, and municipal governments, giving of themselves with great dedication in an effort to combat these and similar social ills. Nevertheless, the continued existence of these problems, in their present magnitude, approaches the dimensions of a national disgrace that cries out for corrective action. It is an indictment, not against free institutions, but against their neglect and misuse by those who profess to support them. It is a reflection of a social irresponsibility which freedom never licensed.

The Russians did not make these problems. The satellites in the sky have nothing to do with them. We made these problems ourselves or, at any rate, we have permitted them to accumulate through neglect. Their continued existence saps the strength of the Nation. It weakens us at home, and hence undercuts our position in the world. Let us take the first step now, not by boasting of our achievements in this area, even though they may be many, but by recognizing that our social house is still a long way from being in order, and that it is up to us to put it in order.

THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATION

Turning specifically to education as one of these social problems, here, too, the difficulties lie not with the Russians or the earth satellites, but with ourselves. The Russians do not operate our schools. We operate them. Those who are dedicated to education in this country, on the whole, do an admirable and, in a financial sense, a thankless job.

The shortcomings in education, highlighted in recent months by Soviet scientific achievements, were discussed a short time ago on the floor in an illuminating and penetrating fashion by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. As I understand the problem, the basic difficulty does not lie primarily in the methods of education, although they can stand much in the way of refinement. It does not even lie in the educational plant, although that, too, is in great need of improvement.

The more fundamental problem, I believe, lies in our concept of education—or perhaps, I should say, in the debasing of these concepts. We have lost sight of the ultimate purpose of the education of freemen. That purpose, as I see it, Mr. President, is to open minds to the pursuit of truth. We have lost sight of free educations' highest ideal, which is to enrich the spirit of mankind by pushing back the frontiers of his understanding.

Education, in its finest sense, is not for the filling of the pocket, for the production of ever more fantastic military weapons, or even for the service of the State and industry. In the age in which we live these may be byproducts of education. They are not, however, the ends which will inspire the few men of genius which this or any other society has in its midst.

For too long we have alternately ignored, ridiculed or hounded those few who think in terms of the finest purposes of learning and have something to give in those terms. For too long we have neglected to search out and encourage young people who might contribute groundbreaking thought and new ideas, not only in the realm of physics and engineering, but in all aspects of human

endeavor. I tell the Senate that if the well-springs of creativity dry up in this Nation, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves.

A billion-dollar or ten-billion-dollar crash program in education may produce new schools and better pay for teachers, both of which are needed, but it will not produce an Einstein, an Edison or a Shakespeare. An understanding and an appreciative society and government, however, may help to bring them forth to pour their unusual talents into the progress of the Nation and mankind. A rethinking of the ends and methods of education at all levels may encourage the development of the self-discipline and the talents and skills that are necessary for a life in freedom in the second half of the 20th century. Let us take the first step now by recognizing that our educational house is not in order and that it is up to us to put it in order.

THE NEEDS OF DEFENSE

Mr. President, I turn next to the question of defense. As it presents itself today, this question arises in connection with the Soviet military menace. In my opinion, matters of defense would be a major source of national difficulty even if the Soviet menace were considerably less potent than it is. The difficulty was with us before we launched our earth satellite. It was with us before the Soviet sputniks indicated the potential dimensions of Russian military power. It may well be with us even if that power should be neutralized or should decline.

We have seen reports from time to time, in the press and elsewhere, that all is not well with the policies and organization of the defense services. Distinguished Members of the Senate, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for example, have stressed the seriousness of this matter. A step has been taken here and a step there in the direction of improving the services. Yet in all these years we have followed a policy of inertia, compounded of military and civilian smugness which I trust will not be fed even further by our recent and belated achievement in the penetration of space.

The heart of the difficulty, I believe, is to be found in the fact that we have gone on year after year handling matters of defense in patterns that were developed largely during World War II and immediately thereafter. Here in Congress, we have in the postwar years appropriated funds approaching 500 billions of dollars for defense. In some years we have appropriated more funds and in some years less. But, despite these vast financial commitments, we have failed heretofore to reexamine defense policies in the light of the rapid advances in science. We have failed to rethink these policies in the context of those fundamental questions which arise in connection with the military in any free society. We have not asked ourselves what part of the total security of the Nation we expect the regular military forces of the Nation to provide. We have not asked ourselves whether the Military Establishment is now organized to play that part and to play it effectively.

We have had a limited introduction to these neglected questions from the President in his state of the Union message. We have heard a brilliant exposition of the ultimate significance of these questions in a statement by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], at the outset of the session. The unanimous report of his Subcommittee on Preparedness has thrown additional light on the subject and I have no doubt that we shall hear more from that source during this session.

I want to add only a general comment to the issue at this time. It seems to me that our security as a nation depends upon multiple sources of strength, not merely organized military power. That is as true today in the age of missiles as it was in the age of muskets. If history teaches us anything, it is this: The extinction of freedom and then of the Nation may well lie at the end of an obsessive search for absolute security through the Military Establishment.

I want to say, too, that, in my opinion, the military in this country functions best when it maintains a high degree of inner discipline and responds unquestioningly to the control of the President, his civilian agents, and the acts of Congress. If this control is inept, it is for the people to change it, not for the military to bypass it.

I want to say, further, that in my opinion the military makes its most dedicated contribution to the Nation when it concerns itself essentially and quietly with the problems of warfare. The Defense Establishment and its military commanders do not belong in politics, domestic or international. It is improper for civilian officials to project these commanders into politics and it is improper for these commanders to project themselves into politics while they are still in uniform.

In matters of advanced scientific and technological research, the Defense Establishment may play a distinguished part, and research of this kind may have military applicability. Generally speaking, however, it is not the best site for the control and direction of creative scientific research.

I want to say, finally, without prejudging requests for funds, that I am doubtful that the problems of our Defense Establishment will be corrected by billions more in appropriations. We may find it necessary to vote larger appropriations as an interim measure. However, I shall continue to entertain serious questions as to the efficacy of expenditures until we understand more clearly the role of the military in the total security of the Nation, until civilian control is once again firmly and clearly established over the Defense Department, and until the undisciplined and unmilitary disorder in the Pentagon is ended.

THE DOMESTIC SITUATION—NEGLECTED DIMENSION OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I have gone on at some length discussing what are essentially domestic issues. There are others of a similar nature which might be considered at this time. I do not raise them because they lack importance. I do not do so because, as I noted earlier, my statement today is directed primarily to foreign policy.

My purpose in beginning these remarks as I have was not only to call attention to the persistence of domestic difficulties which have importance in themselves to the people of this country but also to emphasize their significance as a factor in our relations with other nations. These domestic difficulties are in a very real sense the neglected dimension of foreign policy. We have looked without and above for the danger signals, and well we should. At the same time, we have overlooked the warning signs within. These inner difficulties do not disappear simply because there may be more complex difficulties confronting us from outside. Internal difficulties cannot be swept out of sight by sweeping the skies with a radar screen. If we are free men, in spirit as well as words, we shall not put them aside. We shall face them and do the best we can to deal with them. We shall recognize them in all humility, for what they are, measurements of our own national shortcomings as a free society. We shall see them, as they are, limitations on our total national unity and strength and, therefore, on our position in the world.

This country shall not survive in recognizable form in the world of today and tomorrow, much less lead it, if we build Maginot lines out of alliances and bases around the world and stud the sky with artificial stars, only to permit disunity, inertia and fear to produce decay at the core. We will survive and we may lead if we face honestly our economic, moral, intellectual, and military shortcomings at home and act with determination to meet them.

That is the first requisite for the survival and growth of the United States. It is not the only requisite. We shall not remain a nation with hope for future generations of Americans and with a message for the world unless, at the same time, we face the responsibilities and the difficulties of living on this earth of many nations, unless we face these responsibilities and difficulties with quiet courage, with wisdom and with deep human understanding. We will survive, grow, and perhaps lead, in short, only if we keep alive the meaning, the creative and the compassionate meaning, of a free America both at home and in the world.

THE NEED FOR PEACE

That, Mr. President, is the scope of the total problem which confronts us as a nation at the beginning of 1958. I have already tried to illustrate the domestic aspect of this problem. In the remainder of these remarks I should like to explore some of its international implications.

There is action we must take and which we have not taken in our relations with other nations and in the policies and programs through which we conduct these relations. There is a need for clearsighted action based on an awareness of the world as it is and not as we

would like it to be or as some may imagine it to be.

What is needed is action that stems neither from a bloated and stupid arrogance or a hesitant timidity. It must be honest action and courageous action. It must be action that seeks in a positive fashion to meet the greatest challenge of these years in which we live. The challenge, Mr. President, is to develop and to strengthen the one common interest of all peoples which outweighs their national differences, discords, and doctrines. That interest, Mr. President, is the preservation of the human species in a recognizable form of civilization. That interest, in short, is peace, not a peace of conquest or a peace of surrender but a peace with which decent men and women the world over, in Russia no less than in the United States, can live.

THE MISLEADING CONCEPT OF SITUATIONS OF STRENGTH

Let me say that we shall not get that kind of peace unless the Russian leaders as well as our own recognize its urgency for all mankind. Let me say further, however, that we shall not get it in any event unless we ourselves also rethink the basic premises of our foreign policy.

We have operated through the years—through two administrations—on the theory that we might best seek peace by building situations of strength. The premise is valid enough, for weakness will not gain a meaningful peace. Where we have gone astray, however, is in our concept of what constitutes strength in an international sense. Strength is more than military equipment and alliances. It is more than the loud words, the Pyrrhic victories of the propaganda war; it is more than breast beating. It is more than money for aid programs.

Strength is, perhaps, more than these tangible things, an understanding of the world and its complexities. It is an understanding of what moves not only the lips of political leaders elsewhere but the hearts of peoples throughout the world. Above all else, it is an ability to apply our total national strength in the light of this understanding for ends that serve both ourselves and the rest of the decent mankind.

Through the years, we have had the military strength and the bases and we have had the propaganda and the breast-beating. We have spent lavishly abroad on military and economic aid. Yet what has happened in these years? Once we had a monopoly of the A-bomb, and now it is gone. Once we had a monopoly of the H-bomb, and now it is gone. These presumably were positions of strength, and they are no more. Once earth satellites, with their implications of advanced military technology elsewhere, did not swing across our horizons. That, if not a position of strength, was at least not one of weakness. Two devices from elsewhere sped above us before ours finally left the ground.

There was a time when Soviet influence was remote from the vast arc of underdeveloped nations that stretches from Africa to the Pacific, and that, too, presumably was a situation of strength. Although we have spent billions of dollars for aid, and we have propagandized and we have had our breast-beaters in that region, Communist totalitarianism is now much in evidence throughout the area. Once the ties of the North Atlantic Alliance were close and intimate, and that, too, was a situation of strength. Now the alliance founders on rocks of aimlessness and narrow, short-sighted national interest.

We may well ask ourselves, Mr. President, what are the implications of these developments of recent years? Have they not reduced the concept of situations of strength to a catchphrase, to a will-o'-the-wisp? Does the continued pursuit of this concept by the same methods, by the same slogans, suggest the existence of a sound policy? Or does this pursuit merely serve to cover an unwillingness of our national leadership to face the realities of the world and as an excuse for doing today what we did yesterday and what we will do tomorrow because we know not what else to do?

I suggest, Mr. President, that we have lost sight of the fact that strength is a many-sided thing; that it has not only international aspects but domestic elements as well; that it has military and nonmilitary facets; that it is not only money but methods. I suggest, Mr. President, that in our international relations we have failed in great measure to realize that if men do not live by bread alone, much less do they live by aid, propaganda, or missiles alone. I suggest that the desperate but narrow search for situations of strength by ourselves as well as the Russians is leading civilized mankind ever closer to the moment of extinction.

I suggest, finally, that this concept as it is now being pursued is self-defeating. It has left us, in a real sense, weaker than we were ten years ago, although the arsenals are filled with new and more powerful weapons, although the number of alliances and bases have multiplied, although we now have a satellite in the heavens. Ironically, it has also had the same effect on the Russians whose arsenals are also filled with new weapons, who have also managed to make new converts in various parts of the world, and who also have satellites in the skies. I say this because 10 years ago it would have been possible for the United States to reduce much of the Soviet Union to fire and ruin by military action. And 10 years ago the Russians could have spread great damage in the Western World if not in the United States by military action. But it is doubtful that either side, 10 years ago, could have completely obliterated the other, for all practical purposes, as a nation. Today, it is possible for each side to end the civilized existence of the other and to bring down the rest of the world in the process.

Who is stronger in these circumstances? Who has gained from this competition? The truth is that neither has become stronger in the sense of its capacity for national survival. The truth is that both countries in the search for situations of power and strength have ended in situations of profound weakness.

The concept of seeking situations of strength, on our part at least, began as a positive device for building a durable peace. It is ending as a last-ditch hope of staying alive or at least not dying under a rain of missiles unless our enemies also go into oblivion with us. Today, we, no less than the Russians, are clinging to civilized life by our fingertips.

A NEW CONCEPT OF POLICY: POSITIONS OF PEACE

It is time to ask ourselves, Mr. President, whether that is enough for ourselves and mankind. Is it time, perhaps, to move on to a positive concept, to the concept of a policy that seeks to put together not only situations of strength but positions of peace? Let me illustrate, Mr. President, with one highly significant incident, the fundamental difference that this latter concept implies, the difference between what we are now doing and what we ought to be doing in foreign policy. I refer to the NATO conference last December. That was indeed a time, Mr. President, for greatness. It was a time when not only the Europeans, but also the peoples of the world awaited a clear reaffirmation of the meaning of a free America. It was a time when our own people looked for a clarification of the doubts that have grown in recent years as to the value of close ties with other nations. Perhaps these expectations were too high. But it was a summit conference, Mr. President, called on our initiative, and great things are expected of summit conferences.

At this point I wish to express my respect for President Eisenhower's dedication to duty in going to the NATO conference. His insistence upon undertaking the mission in spite of the illness that he had suffered just prior to the meeting warrants the gratitude of the Nation.

It was fortunate that he went, because the President's appearance at the conference was a contribution to foreign policy that could have been obtained in no other way, by no other man in the administration. His attendance—rekindling, as it did, the remembrances of the close cooperation and the mutual dedication of the war years—served to gain time for constructive action to hold together the North Atlantic Alliance.

Let us not underestimate the importance of that contribution. But, by the same token, let us keep it in perspective. What was obtained by this personal act of the President, I repeat, was time for action, not the necessary action itself.

I ask the Senate to recall for a moment the circumstances of the NATO Conference and its results. The western nations met at a moment when the Soviet Union had put into the international equation a new and radical factor, by launching the two earth satellites. That demonstration had a profound effect on existing evaluations of Soviet scientific and military progress. It revealed, as never before, the degree of distortion on which many of our defense and foreign policies had been based. The demonstration, moreover, was coupled by new appeals for peace from the Soviet bloc and by new ideas for achieving it. That

we may have regarded these appeals as bogus is beside the point. The fact is that these two acts which linked scientific progress with peace had an enormous appeal to the peoples of the world who are weary of the constant threat of war.

In these circumstances, what came out of the NATO Conference? The only tangible achievement was a somewhat reluctant reendorsement of the doctrine of building situations of strength in its narrowest sense. This time, it took the form of approval of American proposals to place missile bases in those western European countries willing to accept them. All else was a repetition, in well-known platitudes, of general hopes of cooperation.

Mr. President, agreement on the placing of missiles in advantageous defense positions was an important achievement. It was not, however, a cure for the ills of the western alliance. It did not begin to fill the urgent requirement for constructive and creative leadership. It did not meet the needs of the hour. It did not meet the challenge of the new age, over the threshold of which the Soviet earth satellites had already passed, and which we now have passed.

It may still not be too late, Mr. President, to take the action which might have been taken at the NATO Conference, but was not taken. In the light of our own recent achievement, the present moment may be even more propitious. It may be now or never, if we are to move from the negative doctrine of building situations of strength to a positive policy of seeking positions of peace. Nowhere is the necessity for this change more clearly indicated than in dealing with the problems of the rapid advance of science and technology, and, most especially, with the exploration of space.

As a minimum, Mr. President, this country might well have proposed at the NATO meeting, and may still propose, the extension of the International Geophysical Year, in which both the Soviet nations and ourselves are participating, into a decade of worldwide scientific cooperation.

That is only the beginning, Mr. President. This country—indeed, all countries—must face the fact that the universe unfolding beyond the earth presents problems of such vast and challenging dimensions that they call, not for competition, but for the cooperation of all mankind.

The need of the hour, as I see it, Mr. President, is for a sharing of the genius, the labor, and the cost of the exploration of space. The need is not for platitudes on cooperation, while the race for advantage goes on beneath the platitudes. The need is to have men and women of many nations work together in the same laboratories, on the same proving grounds, and on the same scientific devices.

It is time for this common effort to begin. It is an effort which might well start among the NATO members, but no nation willing to participate in good faith ought to be excluded from this great venture.

I realize, Mr. President, that there are immense problems in the way of negotiating agreements for an undertaking of this kind. There are deep fears and suspicions to be overcome. There are dangers of the loss of military or commercial advantages—real or illusory—for us and for others. Yet, Mr. President, are these difficulties of any greater complexity than those in the case of the difficulties which surely will confront all nations within a few years if action along these lines is not taken, but if, instead, a pell-mell rush for national advantage moves into outer space?

A COOPERATIVE EXPLORATION OF SPACE

Mr. President, I do not know whether the Russians will rise to the challenge of this moment in human history. I, for one, hope that they will. There is every reason to believe, however, that if our Nation acts with the boldness and the positive leadership that the hour demands, other NATO nations at least will be with us. The cost, the effort, and the sacrifices will be less to all if we join with them in this great endeavor. And the achievement will belong to all. I believe that this country, no less than any other free nation, would prefer to have the scientific devices which from now on in increasing numbers will carry mankind beyond the confines of the earth, bear the label, not of one nation, but of all nations willing to contribute to the effort.

THE BASIC NEED

Mr. President, I have cited this one example of a positive policy of building positions of peace. There are others in connection with every other aspect of foreign policy in which a similar revision of thinking seems to me to be essential. In subsequent remarks, I may turn to some of these questions—to the question of the divided countries of Asia and Europe, to the question of Eastern Europe, to the question of the Middle East, to the question of negotiations with the Russians.

However, the first need—the basic need, as I see it—was well put by President Theodor Heuss, of West Germany, a few weeks ago, when he said: "The main thing is to get sober and disentangle oneself from the web of slogans and ideologies." That advice applies to us with no less urgency than it does to other nations. It applies to the scientific field, above all others, because the advance in this field has made most of the slogans obsolete, and is compelling a revision of the ideologies. Unless we see the world as it is at this hour, and as it is likely to be tomorrow, unless the Russians and others help to make it free from self-generated and propaganda-imposed delusions, we shall not make the choices that must be made if human history is not to come to an end. We are faced with choices that involve the life or death of civilization. Each act in foreign relations by every nation adds to one side or the other of the balance. In these acts, we are deciding more than immediate questions. In the last analysis, we are deciding, Mr. President, whether the world is to be a dead planet, spinning in swift silence through the endless time and space of the universe; or whether this noble, but brief, human experience on earth shall be carried to the stars.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1040) to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood of urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE FRENCH ATTACK UPON SAKIET-SIDI-YOUSSEF

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was with a sense of shock and disappointment that we learned of the attack by French forces upon the Tunisian town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef.

Tunisia is an independent nation, and is a member of the United Nations.

The United Nations, as I have pointed out on earlier occasions, cannot have one rule for small aggressors and another for the large ones.

It was for this reason that, as a delegate to the United Nations and as a United States Senator, I expressed disappointment when, during the Hungarian revolt, Tunisia and most of the other Arab States, on December 5, 1956, voted against or abstained from voting on the resolutions to condemn the Soviet aggression at that time.

I pointed out that the small nations had even more of a stake than the large ones, for they were more likely to be victims.

Even though Tunisia may have been blind to the need of United Nations effective action during the Hungarian crisis, nonetheless we cannot condone this French action against an independent Tunisia. France, by such short-sighted action, will likely not only rally the Arabs of Africa and the Middle East against her, but will also alienate public opinion around the world.

The friends of France around the world will hope that such incidents will not be repeated.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, if the Senator from California

will permit me to associate myself with his remarks on the Tunisian incident, I should like to add this statement: The news ticker has just carried the news story that the State Department has authorized Ambassador G. Lewis Jones to investigate first-hand and report on the French bombing of a Tunisian village Saturday.

I ask unanimous consent that two news items be included in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the news items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The State Department has authorized Ambassador G. Lewis Jones to investigate firsthand and report on the French bombing of a Tunisian village Saturday.

A State Department spokesman said Jones will visit the village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef near the Algerian frontier, at the invitation of President Habib Bourguiba.

Bourguiba invited all chiefs of diplomatic missions in Tunisia to visit the scene.

The announcement followed a new conference today between President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles on the situation in Tunisia. The United States already has termed the episode profoundly disturbing.

White said, in answering questions, the Department had insufficient information at present to determine whether the French planes which bombed the village were given to France as American military aid for defense of the Atlantic Pact area.

He noted that France also has bought with its own funds American defense supplies, including planes.

Jones' mission will be to advise the Department of the accuracy of French reports that the planes concentrated their fire on military objectives from which Algerian rebels allegedly fired on French planes.

White said Dulles would meet at 4 p. m. with Tunisian Ambassador Mongi Slim. This appointment was arranged at the mutual request of both parties to discuss the incident.

White declined to spell out the Government's position on the French view that they have the right to exercise hot pursuit of Algerian rebels who flee across the border into Tunisia.

Mr. MORSE. It is certainly reassuring that the minority leader, in his characteristic manner, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, where I have the privilege to serve as a colleague, once again has spoken out against aggression, as he has so many times in the past.

We must wait until all the facts are before us, and I am willing to do so, but on the surface what happened appears to be an unconscionable act of aggression on the part of the French, which rightly disturbs all of us who love peace.

I shall devote a rather considerable part of this afternoon to a speech on American military policy. In the course of my remarks I shall have something to say about the Tunisian incident. Let us not forget that up until now the Tunisians have been among the most loyal allies of the United States in all Africa. What disturbs me is what I consider to be the misuse of American military equipment by the French. Attempts will be made by lying Communists to read into the act of the French some sort of collusive action on the part of the United States. I am glad the minority leader has stood up and made his position very clear, because the Tunisians are going to discover, I am sure, that the American people hold no brief for this course of aggressive action on the part of France.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

NATIONAL WOOL ACT EXTENSION BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS IN SUPPORT OF S. 2861, NATIONAL WOOL ACT EXTENSION BILL, SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, FEBRUARY 6, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I appear here this morning in support of S. 2861. Because the committee must hear a good many witnesses this morning, I shall keep my remarks brief and to the point.

In section 702 of the National Wool Act of 1954, Congress declared:

"It is hereby recognized that wool is an essential and strategic commodity which is not produced in quantities and grades in the United States to meet the domestic needs and that the desired domestic production of wool is impaired by the depressing effects of wide fluctuations in the price of wool in the world markets."

The same provisions of law declared it "* * * to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security and in promotion of the general economic welfare to encourage the annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool, grease basis, at prices fair to both producers and consumers in a manner which will have the least effect upon foreign trade."

Sections 703 and 704 authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to obtain this level of domestic production by use of incentive payments. The payments, when added to the national average price received by producers, are to provide producers a national average return equal to the support level set by the Secretary.

Congress thus recognized that certain impediments, which are inherent in the nature of the wool industry, interfere with the natural price mechanism to such an extent, that the market alone cannot be relied upon to guarantee an annual domestic clip of 300 million pounds. For example, an incentive must be provided during the period of expansion of this industry, if producers are to be able to incur increased costs of (1) acquiring additional rangeland, (2) carrying out range improvements on presently held lands so as to increase forage yields, and (3) obtain competent herders at wages comparable to what these people can get in other occupations.

All these things must be done and growers cannot, over the relatively long period of time it takes to increase sheep numbers and thereby wool production, by themselves finance such an undertaking without at least a guaranty of receiving 100 percent of parity.

For this reason, during the 1955 and 1956 marketing years, the actual payment rates were set at levels (19.2 cents per pound and 17.7 cents per pound, respectively) which when added to the national average prices received in the market place (42.8 cents and 44.3 cents respectively) would give growers a total return of 62 cents per pound, or 106 percent of parity. Preliminary data provided by the USDA indicates that the total return for the 1957 clip probably will be between 100 and 101 percent of parity.

I think it is appropriate for the committee to evaluate the progress which the industry has made during the past 3 years toward expanding production upward so as to provide an annual domestic clip of 300 million pounds of shorn wool. In this connection, I think it well to call to the committee's attention the last paragraph of the Department of Agriculture's favorable report on S. 2861, which reads as follows:

"With regard to the progress being made toward increased production of wool in accord with the intent of the act, sheep numbers and wool production continue at low levels. Shorn wool production in 1957 is estimated at 226 million pounds compared with the 300-million-pound goal under the act. The net decline in wool production the last few years has been primarily due to reductions in sheep numbers in Texas and several of the Western States where severe drought conditions prevailed. Due to the nature of the enterprise, year-to-year increases in wool production can be expected to be only gradual even under most favorable conditions."

Concerning the effect of the drought, I would point out to the committee that wool production in the Western States for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957, at 112.2, 111.0, and 107.3 million pounds, respectively, was well below the 10-year average (1946–55) for the Western States of 112.8 million pounds.

Other factors not mentioned in the USDA favorable report on the bill now before the committee, which served to mitigate the effect an incentive payment program normally would have upon productions, include these: First, when the Wool Act of 1954 became effective, the Commodity Credit Corporation had some 150 million pounds of wool in its inventories. This served to depress market prices which made growers move cautiously in the direction of increasing sheep numbers. Second, this effect upon domestic production was reinforced by the then low prevailing world price for wool.

On the other hand, several things have occurred recently which in my opinion point to much better prospects for gradually increasing domestic wool production to an annual clip of 300 million pounds. That is, of the incentives provided by the National Wool Act are extended to growers.

First, the drought has been broken, and western range conditions are the best in several years. Second, there is some indication that a buildup of flock and herd numbers is beginning to take place and that shorn-wool production, although sheep and lamb prices in 1958 may not average much differently than those in 1957, will be up somewhat in 1958. Third, only a few weeks ago the Commodity Credit Corporation disposed of the last pound of its wool stocks, which were acquired under the nonrecourse loan program prior to passage of the National Wool Act of 1954.

There are, however, several problems which may prevent realization of the Congressionally expressed goal of getting an annual domestic clip of 300 million pounds, unless the Congress takes appropriate steps to remedy them. First is the need to insure that adequate funds will be available to make incentive payments to growers.

There is some doubt that the present method of providing these funds will be sufficient in the years immediately ahead, as the following portion of the USDA's report on the bill before you implies:

"Under the act, the total payments are limited to 70 percent of the specific duties collected on wool and wool manufacturers since January 1, 1953. These amounts have ranged from 25 to 35 million dollars a year—$28 million last year. Through March 1957,

which includes the years 1953 and 1954 plus the first 2 years of the new program, the total was $128 million. Payments totaled approximately $58 million the first year and around $53 million the second. Deducting these $111 million in payments from the amounts available for payments, leaves a $17 million balance for the current and later years to cover payments in excess of duty collections."

For this reason, I suggest that the committee consider amending the bill before it, so as to make 70 percent of the ad valorem duties, as well as the specific duties on wool imports and manufacturers, which have been collected since January 1, 1953, available for use in making the incentive payments. If this were done, I have been informed, that it would increase the size of the fund by nearly 60 percent.

I realize there has been some objection to the self-help promotional program authorized by section 708 of the National Wool Act. This criticism seems to come mainly from those people who prefer a program of publicity, research, and information conducted on a national basis for all meat products by one organization. The sheep industry, however, seems to feel that such an approach, as far as it is concerned, is and would be inadequate, since sheep are dual purpose animals, whose major products, wool and lamb, require an entirely different promotional effort than do other forms of livestock.

In this connection, also, I want to point out that the American Sheep Producers Council, the promotion organization authorized to carry out the approved program, has been handicapped in its efforts to increase wool and lamb consumption at better prices to growers by the drought, which caused heavy marketing of cattle, as well as sheep and lambs, and resulted in lower returns to growers. To date the administrative costs incurred by the council have been modest. Through December 1957, they amounted to only 4.7 percent of total disbursements of nearly $3 million. As of the same date, receipts in excess of disbursements are slightly in excess of $3 million as well. In my opinion section 708 should remain as part of the National Wool Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a copy of a letter to me, urging extension of the National Wool Act, from the Governor of the State of Utah, George D. Clyde, as well as a similar one to me from the Utah State department of agriculture be printed in the hearing record.

I conclude my remarks with an expressed hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shortly will be able to report S. 2861 to the Senate. I thank you for your courtesy.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, January 17, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Member of Congress,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I have recently reviewed the report to Congress from the American sheep industry. I have long been aware of the problems of the sheepmen in Utah and have watched with interest the effect of the incentive payment program provided by the National Wool Act. I am sure it has been helpful to the sheep and wool industry. It has brought stability to the industry and in many cases prevented the liquidation of longtime sheep operators. The sheep and wool industry is not entirely out of the woods, but it is improving. I believe an extension of the National Wool Act is essential to continued improvement and stability of this industry.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. CLYDE,
Governor.

EXHIBIT 2

THE STATE OF UTAH,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salt Lake City, January 29, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: We, the Utah State Department of Agriculture, would like to be placed on record at the hearings to be held February 6 and 7, as very much in favor of the continuation of the 1954 Wool Act.

The sheep industry was very much in favor of a protective tariff that would protect the industry from imports of wool coming into this country and sold below the cost of production in the United States.

Inasmuch as it was impossible to get a tariff high enough to protect the industry, the 1954 Wool Act was passed. We feel that the act has saved the sheep industry from bankruptcy.

When foreign wool is allowed to be purchased in this country at prices lower than the cost of production, the sheep industry would be in jeopardy and would result in sheep numbers being reduced to a point where we may find ourselves in a bad position so far as national defense is concerned. We all know that wool is a very important product in times of war; in clothing our soldiers as well as our people at home.

The sheep industry plays an important part in our agricultural economy in the Western States. The crop can be harvested from many millions of acres of mountain ranges and desert lands by sheep that would otherwise go to waste.

Anything you can do to secure the passage of this bill will be greatly appreciated, as the future of the sheep industry is dependent upon such legislation.

With very best regards.

Yours sincerely,

ALDEN K. BARTON,
Livestock Commissioner.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. SAYYID HASSAN TAQIZADEH, MEMBER OF SENATE OF IRAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is honored to have as its guest today the Honorable Sayyid Hassan Taqizadeh, a distinguished member of the Senate of Iran.

Senator Taqizadeh is known as the elder statesman of Iran, and served as the former president of the Iranian Senate from 1949 to 1957. He also represented his country as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's from 1941 to 1947. He was elected as a member of the first Iranian House of Representatives in 1906, and served throughout the years to 1949. He is an authority on Iranian literature and constitutional theory, and assisted in drafting the Iranian Bill of Rights.

Senator Taqizadeh is a guest of the Department of State under the Smith-Mundt Act.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The present occupant of the chair extends the greetings of the Senate to our distinguished visitor, and welcomes him.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. I prefer not to have a quorum call. As the Senator from Montana knows, I never ask for an audience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make it clear that the Senator from Oregon did not ask for a quorum call; it was my suggestion. I thought, in view of the speech about to be made, there ought to be more Senators present to hear it.

Mr. MORSE. They can read it in the RECORD. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may make a remark?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to yield, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will not lose his right to the floor, if he will yield to me in order to protect his right.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely want to make it a matter of record, sir, that I am leaving the Chamber at this moment not because I do not wish to listen to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, for I know they will be valuable and well worth listening to. As the Senator has noted, the Senate has given consent to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to continue this afternoon the hearings it has been holding. I am a member of that subcommittee, and I have been called to the meeting of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to be able to say to my friend from Wyoming that I can always count on him to do his bookwork. He reads. I do not have any doubt that if the Senator finds anything of merit in anything I say this afternoon, he will give it his usual very fair consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with the first of a series of foreign policy speeches which I shall deliver during this session of Congress, as I seek in my humble way to direct the attention of the American people to what I consider to be some dangerous shortcomings and trends in American foreign policy, I desire to address myself for a few minutes to another subject matter.

I am very much concerned, Mr. President, about what we read in the papers concerning the investigation, on the House side, of the Federal Communications Commission.

I wish to make it very clear, Mr. President, that I do not speak critically of individuals in the House of Representatives. I recognize that there is a long established rule of courtesy by which Members of one House do not discuss the other, although the rule has been frequently violated by some.

As a Senator, Mr. President, I have a duty, as I view my position, to express my concern when either the House of Representatives or the Senate follows a course of action which I believe is not in the public interest.

Let me make very clear at the outset of my remarks in regard to the Federal

Communications Commission problem that I do not know the facts about the counsel for the House committee, but if he is guilty of any irregularity whatsoever, Mr. President, then there is no doubt, in my judgment, that a new counsel should be obtained. But I do not intend to be diverted from consideration of the real issue by any conflict or contest which may have developed over on the House side of the Capitol with regard to a counsel.

What I propose to ask, Mr. President, is: What are the facts about the operations of the Federal Communications Commission? Do we find here a Commission which has on it some members who are guilty of a conflict of interest? If so, the situation is perfectly clear; they should have been removed before now.

I should like to know what the White House has been doing about this matter. I should like to know what evidence can be presented as to any White House investigation. It seems to me that there has already been enough documentation in the newspapers of the country to raise the eyebrows of anyone who, in a political campaign made reference to the expression "clean as a hound's tooth." I think the American people have the right to say, "Mr. President, what are you doing about it?"

I recognize, Mr. President, that one of the greatest muckrakers of all times is Mr. Drew Pearson. To me, the term "muckraking" as it is used in American journalism is not a bad term, because American journalism has the duty to muckrake when there is muck to be raked. Mr. Drew Pearson has been riding herd, so to speak, on this particular matter. Although I know he is fair game for many politicians, and although I know that it is a common practice for politicians, when some disclosure has been made by Mr. Pearson, to reply to it with name calling, I wish to stand on the floor of the Senate today and thank Mr. Pearson for his muckraking in regard to this matter, because I have a hunch that if he had not stirred it up it would have been whitewashed before now.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask my good friend from Oregon, who has had far greater legislative experience than I, and who is perhaps a little better accustomed to some of the rather peculiar methods for conducting both legislative and executive business in the Capital City of Washington than I, whether he shares my view that it was probably a good thing for the other body to institute an investigation of the relationships of the so-called executive agencies—although in fact many of them are, as the Senator knows, legislative agencies, despite the fact that their members are appointed by the President—for the purpose of determining whether those agencies were in fact carrying out the spirit as well as the letter of the laws which they were set up to administer.

Mr. MORSE. My answer is that I think it was the clear duty of Members of the House of Representatives to do so. I am glad they started the inquiry. I wish they would give clear assurance that they are going to finish it, although I intend to say something about what I think is now the duty of the Senate with regard to this matter.

I want it clearly understood that I think the House was following a very wise course in starting the investigation in the first place.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield further, I, too, am aware of the salutary rule of both Houses of Congress which requires Senators and Representatives to refrain from criticizing the other body or any Member thereof, and I do not want my remarks to be considered either expressly or by implication as a criticism of any Member or any committee of the other body. With that necessary qualification, I ask the Senator whether it is not his view that that type of investigation should be pressed without fear or favor in order to develop all the pertinent facts, regardless of where the dust may fall, until the American people have been given an opportunity to read in our free press just what kind of a job those regulative agencies are doing, and whether those who have been appointed to serve thereon, all of whose appointments must be confirmed by our body, are in fact doing their duty to the public.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with all the implications of the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to hear my friend from Oregon develop the alternative which he indicated a moment or two ago, as to what should be done if, in its sound judgment—which I do not criticize—the other body should perhaps determine not to go as deeply into this subject as some of us originally hoped it would.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to discuss that question later. I wish to return to the remarks I was making with regard to the work which Mr. Drew Pearson has been doing in connection with this subject. It is similar to work he has done in connection with other subjects, when he has disclosed malfeasance in Government.

In my judgment, he is carrying out the journalistic tradition at the highest level. I look upon the newspapers of the country as the most effective policemen for clean government. I think the journalistic profession owes a great obligation to the American people to see to it that, under the great guaranty of a free press, which is precious to the rights not only of journalists, but of every American citizen, the journalistic profession will never hesitate to disclose corruption in Government.

I shall discuss this question in greater detail in a few minutes. I believe that what Mr. Pearson has done in this instance, as in other instances in which he has disclosed corruption in Government, is a great public service.

I hold no brief for Mr. Pearson. Like the rest of us, he makes his mistakes. I think he would be the first to admit it if what he thought to be a fact proved to be fiction. I have noticed also his inherent fairness when he finds that the lead he has been following does not prove to be factual. When that is the case, he has been fair enough to say so in his column.

I know the piercing point of his pen, because he has stuck it in my veins more than once, and written with my blood. However, that is a journalist's duty. I believe that in the disclosures he has already made in his columns which have been published, and in one which has not been published, but has been censored, he has given clear notice to the White House and the Department of Justice that they should have been on the job in connection with the present charges. I shall refer to this censored column before I conclude my remarks.

We should not forget that it falls within the duty of the Department of Justice to act as the President's legal adviser. When malfeasance creeps into the Government, the Department of Justice should go to work in connection with such questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know none of the facts relating to the charges which the Senator from Oregon has been discussing, except as I have read them in the press. However, is it not true that the Comptroller General, the head of the General Accounting Office, has indicated that there have been some misdeeds in connection with the administration of the affairs of the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. MORSE. I have not read the transcript of his testimony before the House committee. My judgment is based entirely upon what has appeared in the press. However, the press has published stories to that effect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The thing which disturbs me, not alone in connection with the present instance, but in connection with many things which have happened during this administration, has been the apparent lack of interest on the part of the press as a whole, and sometimes, I think, a complacent feeling on the part of the American people. What a contrast with the situation which existed only a few years ago, when charges much less serious than those of the present were played up in great headline streamers.

Mr. MORSE. There was talk about impeaching the President. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I remember it.

There is another difference. I can remember that it was Democrats who exposed certain conditions during a Democratic administration. I can remember, as the campaign progressed back in 1952, that the present President of the United States, while he was a candidate, said that there was only one issue in the campaign, and that was corruption. That is what he put his finger upon. He said that was the sole issue. As the Senator has said, in that campaign the present President of the United States said that anyone associated with him or

his administration had to be "as clean as a hound's tooth."

I have often thought what a fine thing it would be if the recollection of the people of the United States could be refreshed from time to time with regard to what was originally meant by the old saying "clean as a hound's tooth."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that I should like to advise the President that taking tartar off a tooth is sometimes a painful process, but there is a great deal of tartar on the teeth of this administration, which had better be cleaned off; and the sooner the better.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a brief observation?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I recall with the greatest pleasure the magnificent campaign which our distinguished colleague from Alabama made in 1952, when he was a candidate on our party's ticket for the office of Vice President of the United States. I am sure he will remember that in the course of the campaign, during which he followed very actively the comments and speeches made in the campaign by his opponents as well as by his colleague and himself, at Rock Island, Ill., on the 17th of September 1952, the present President of the United States, then a candidate for office, said:

> They say, "Why can't we have a Government of which we can be proud?" And we can have. In fact, we are going to have it. It is merely a matter of establishing integrity right in Washington through which we will draw into that Capital and into all of the Federal Government the finest brains and the finest men of the highest standing that there are in all this broad land.

I am sure my friend from Alabama remembers that speech, as well as many others, in which there was talk about the charge that the standard of performance in Washington was somewhat less than the highest, and in which our friends across the aisle promised to restore a high sense of integrity.

Let me say to my friend from Oregon that I hope that in the effort to determine the standards of the independent agencies and of the individuals appointed by the President, whose nominations are confirmed by the Senate, and who are now engaged in administering those agencies, the executive arm of the Government will follow the same high standards which it laid down on the political hustings before it was elected to office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been some reference to the hullabaloo which was stirred up during the Truman administration, with regard to mink coats—not beaver, but mink coats—deep freezes, and, if true, other forms of corruption.

I have never told this story publicly before, but I believe that, as a matter of history, it should be told here and now. I refer to the reaction of the then President of the United States to the charges which I have referred. I made a certain statement during a lecture at the University of California at Los Angeles, in the fall of 1951, at the time when President Truman was proposing to appoint Judge Murphy, of New York, to come to Washington and head a special investigation commission within the Department of Justice to look into the charges of alleged corruption in his administration.

In the course of my lecture at the University of California at Los Angeles I said that if the problem was to be handled in that way, I could not think of a better man to do the job than Judge Murphy, but I said, "that is all I can say for it, because in my judgment this is not the procedure that ought to be followed." I said that in my judgment a matter such as that should be cleaned up by the Attorney General of the United States; that under the Constitution of the United States it is the Department of Justice which has the obligation to see to it that clean government is maintained under any administration.

I came back to Washington, and a few days later I took part in a radio discussion—which some might call a debate—with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the then Senator from Michigan, a very dear friend of mine, now deceased, Blair Moody. Mr. WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, was my associate in that discussion. In the course of the discussion, I kept pressing my opposition in the debate with the question: "Don't you think it ought to be done by the Department of Justice?" I say good naturedly that I never got a satisfactory answer to my question. However, it was an interesting discussion.

A few nights later, while I was sitting in my living room at home, around 9 o'clock, my telephone rang. I went to the phone, and the person at the other end said, "The President wishes to speak to you." The President came on the phone, and he asked me if I would come down to his office the next afternoon at 3 o'clock. I told him that, of course, I was at his command. He suggested that I come in through the southwest gate of the White House and park my car outside his office and come in through the back door, because he wanted to talk to me prior to his discussion with the press. As I came in and sat down, and after the salutations, he said, "You are right, WAYNE. That is why I called you. I offer you the appointment of Attorney General of the United States, because if there is any corruption in my administration, I want an independent man to ferret it out."

I spent a long time with the President, trying to get him to see that it would be a great mistake to do that; that it should be done within his administration by an administration man, not by someone from the outside. He refused to take "no" for an answer, and he asked me to think it over and give him a written answer the next day. I did that. I have from him a handwritten reply which someday I think will be a great historic document, after both of us have left the scene.

President Truman impressed me on that occasion, as he has on all occasions, as a man so dedicated to clean government that when it became clear to him there were those who might be betraying a trust they owed his administration, he was for bringing someone from outside his party to clean it up. I shall never forget the great lesson President Truman taught me by that incident. I think it is quite clear what his attitude was in regard to those charges. As he said on that occasion—and I feel he was right:

> I am satisfied that 99⅗ percent of the people working in my administration are law-abiding, wonderful public servants.

He added:

> We may have a bad apple or two in the barrel, and I am for getting those apples out.

I remember the particular phrase he used:

> I am for letting the chips fall where they may.

That is the kind of President Harry S. Truman was.

I wish to say that in this administration the time is long overdue for someone to "let the chips fall where they may." I have said before and I repeat, when history writes up the Eisenhower administration, one of its judgments will be that it made an honest administration out of Harding's.

As I turn to a further discussion of the Federal Communications Commission investigation on the House side, I should like to make this further statement. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said that he would await with interest the suggestion that I might make in regard to what I think ought to be done. Ordinarily when one body of Congress starts an investigation, I believe it ought to be allowed to pursue it to the end. However, unless what we read in the papers can be cleared up very quickly on the House side, I do not believe the Senate of the United States can justify a further delay in conducting its own investigation. Such an investigation could be carried on by either the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Although both could conceivably have jurisdiction, I believe it should be the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

However, if the matter cannot be cleared up quickly on the House side, the Senate has the duty to proceed with an investigation of its own.

It seems to me that the situation in the regulatory agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission, very much resembles one which confronted this body some years ago during the administration of another Republican President, Mr. Hoover. I refer to the Federal Power Commission and its investigation.

At that time, members of the Federal Power Commission were imbued with the idea that they were working only for the electric-power companies. Power sites had been handed out all over the Nation to Andrew Mellon's Aluminum Corporation of America, to the Insulls, to the entrenched utilities. Finally, the Hearst newspapers exposed these giveaways and almost simultaneously, Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, a Republican, with help from many Republican and Democratic Senators, initiated an investigation of the electric-utility lobby.

This disclosed the fact that not only were the waterpower sites in the Nation

being given away on long-term leases without any real consideration of the best interests of the public, but it also revealed that the schoolbooks of the Nation and even the university textbooks of the Nation had been in some cases subsidized by the utility lobby.

This investigation also showed that certain newspapers had been heavily influenced—in fact, had been purchased by the lobby.

It seems to me that the present situation is quite similar. The television licenses which are being handed out by the Federal Communications Commission are limited, just as the waterpower sites of this Nation are limited. There are only so many to go around. Those who get these licenses can profit immensely. We know that some of these stations have been resold at tremendous profit. Just recently, a station in Philadelphia, WCAU, I believe, owned by the Philadelphia Bulletin, was sold to the Columbia Broadcasting Co. for a reported $20 million. Apparently, the FCC has intended for these grants to run indefinitely. Apparently, the FCC intends that these grants shall be bartered back and forth regardless of the fact that they belong to the people of the United States.

In some ways, I think that the television and radio licenses which are handed out by the FCC are more valuable and more fundamental than the waterpower sites of the Nation. They go to the very heart of America—namely, the right of the American people to know. They go to the heart of one of the basic freedoms of this Nation, a freedom which is guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, namely, the freedom of the press, to which I have already referred.

I regret to say that of late this freedom has come to mean, in the minds of some people, a freedom not to inform the public, but a freedom to make money. That is why I have been heard to say on the floor of the Senate and on the platforms of America that, with some great exceptions, by and large the press of America has done a Pravda job for the Eisenhower administration; it has done a coverup job for the Eisenhower administration, just as effectively as the Russian Tass. I happen to believe that if freedom of the press is to be the great guaranty it ought to be, the press ought to give the American people the facts. The press should not assume to decide, upon a sort of self-imposed censorship basis, what it will give the people and what it will not give the people.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to recall to the attention of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, some comments he made about the Federal Power Commission. It is my understanding that the original intent of the investigating committee of the other body was to take a look at all the regulatory agencies, of which the Federal Power Commission would be one. I stress my hope, which I trust my colleague shares, that they will take a very good and careful look at the policies, the relationships, the sociological attitudes, and the political philosophy, of the Federal Power Commission today, particularly with respect to what in my judgment is one of the most iniquitous pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress, but vetoed by that great President, Harry S. Truman, and which is apparently about to come before Congress with, at least judging by what one reads in the newspapers, the implied backing of that very Power Commission which is supposed to protect the interests of the consumers.

As my good friend from Oregon knows, I am referring to the iniquitous proposed natural gas legislation. In my humble judgment, having been the mayor of a great city, the consumers of gas would have been gouged had such legislation been signed and placed on the statute books. The Federal Power Commission in that instance was certainly not carrying out its statutory duties to protect the consumers of the country against a great monopoly.

I wonder if my friend would not agree that perhaps, if it becomes necessary, our committee should take a good and careful look at the present Federal Power Commission and its policies which, I suggest, have not changed a great deal since the days to which my distinguished colleague has referred.

Mr. MORSE. I am at present engaging in what one would call self-inhibition, because if I really got started on the issue the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised, I am certain I would delay for hours the major speech on foreign policy I intend to deliver before the day is over.

I want the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that when we get into the natural gas fight this year, I will be there under his banner and leadership, because I look to him and to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and other Members of the Senate as my leaders in a fight, once again, to protect the consumer interests of the country.

I know this will be a very vigorous and historic debate when we get to it; but we ought to prepare here for it. This is a case in which I have no doubt that there ought to be dual investigations, because the matter is so vital to the welfare of the people of the country. I think there should be a House investigation and a Senate investigation, and that the Members of both Houses ought to be on their way with them.

I think this is a raid on the pocketbooks of the consumers of America. I have a duty, as I see it, to stand up and fight as long and as hard as I can in supporting the hands of my colleagues who will take the leadership in this great battle.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Before asking the question, I wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon for the great contribution he is making by this speech today. I thoroughly agree with him.

Since the Senator from Oregon has mentioned the possibility of asking for a Senate investigation, I wonder if he has considered whether this might be a proper area in which the Committee on Government Operations should take action.

The attention of the public has been spotlighted on the investigations being conducted by the so-called McClellan Special Committee to Investigate the Labor or Management Field. That committee is composed 50 percent of members from the Committee on Government Operations and 50 percent of members from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It seems to me that consideration might be given to asking the special committee to examine into this subject, because it is in a position to do a good investigative job. Has the Senator from Oregon given that matter any thought?

Mr. MORSE. No, I have not given it any thought; but to give a curbstone opinion, which a lawyer really should not do, I think there may be a basis for believing that that committee would have jurisdiction.

In matters of jurisdiction, I always check, first, with the Parliamentarian of the Senate. The remarks I have already made are parliamentarily sound, because either the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or one of the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary unquestionably has jurisdiction, if it wants to press for an investigation. Offhand, it seems to me the Committee on Government Operations also would have a basis for the exercise of jurisdiction.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is certainly involved in the matter. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the days when freedom of the press was inserted in the Bill of Rights, we had many small and courageous newspapers, printed in the Thirteen Colonies, some of them no bigger than one sheet of paper. They were turned out on a hand press by courageous men who dared stand up and fight for what they stood for. They dared disagree. They dared take the offensive against the Government. This was the reason why they were given a special freedom and why that freedom was written into the Constitution of the United States. It was not a freedom merely to make money for themselves.

The other day there was a newspaperman in my office. He was a Nieman fellow, believe it or not, from Harvard. He said, "I simply do not understand your criticism of the press. I do not understand why you are so critical of the press. Do you have any idea what is involved financially in operating a newspaper today?"

That Nieman fellow did not know what he was saying to me, unfortunately. He sought to argue in support of the fallacies I have been criticizing. He based his argument on the idea that newspapers have become big business. And so they have.

But I think we had better reflect on the original purpose of the protection and guaranty in the Bill of Rights, so

far as freedom of the press is concerned. Unless the press is willing to make whatever financial sacrifices are necessary to run a free press, if that is what really is entailed—and I do not accept that premise of the Nieman fellow; but let us assume it for the sake of argument—unless journalists and publishers throughout the country are willing to make financial sacrifices by way of repayment to a free people for the guaranty of freedom of the press, they should stay out of the newspaper business in the first place.

There is a great need for the journalistic profession of the country to return to the obligations clearly imposed upon them and vested in them when our forefathers gave them in the Bill of Rights the guaranty of a free press.

I am afraid that as of today that freedom has been forgotten by a great many publishers in the newspaper business, when it comes to the publishing of the truth.

On the floor of the Senate earlier today, as I criticized a newspaper in my State for deliberately falsifying in an editorial, I said, that in my opinion old Fighting Bob La Follette summarized the whole code of journalistic ethics in the Biblical quotation which he always ran at the masthead of the Progressive magazine. It is still run there by the successor editors. It reads:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free.

I think it is important that the journalistic profession of the country return to that maxim of ethics.

There are outstanding exceptions, of course. There are men who still realize that they have an obligation to inform, an obligation to disagree. But when we see the tremendous pyramiding of power that comes to the dissemination of information through not merely newspapers but radio and television, then it is a matter for this body to note and to worry about.

We also see magazines of tremendous circulation, such as Time and Life and Fortune, which have also gone into the television business. They have acquired stations throughout the country in order to pyramid the information they give to the public. In many cases, I regret to say, they give distorted and warped information. That is why I so frequently refer to the Luce publications as "loose" publications. I have come to recognize them as loose propaganda, and also as publications which are steadily trying to cover up the black deeds of this administration with an allegedly white journalism. But it is very tinted and tainted journalism, for the most part.

Perhaps no magazines in this Nation have given a more distorted picture of the political scene than have Life and Time. Yet at the same time they have been given by this Republican administration, which they have rewarded, great benefits in the form of television licenses.

We have also seen quite recently that certain industries have gone in for television. National Airlines, which cannot operate without a license from the Civil Aeronautics Board, has also received a license from the Federal Communications Commission. The railroads are not permitted to go into the bus industry or the steamship industry; but an airline has now been permitted to go into the television industry, although this grant is entirely dependent upon the Government. The manner in which National Airlines received this channel in Miami, Fla., is one which is under investigation by the House Legislative Oversight Committee, and I understand that the investigation has revealed very damning evidence regarding one Commissioner. I understand that the evidence shows that the President's brother-in-law, Col. Gordon Moore, also may have been involved in swinging this TV license to National Airlines.

We have also seen that the Crosley Co., which is a subsidiary of American Aviation, received a TV license in Indianapolis. Mr. George E. Allen, a close friend of President Eisenhower, and a copartner with him in farming at Gettysburg, as well as cobridging with him over the bridge table, is a director of this vast industrial combine, which now has been benefited not merely by a TV license in Indianapolis, but also with licenses in Cincinnati and Dayton. Are we therefore drifting toward a situation in which big industry more and more helps to control the minds of America?

I have also been concerned about the situation existing in many cities where only one newspaper supplies news to the people, and where in some cases that newspaper also owns a television station, and perhaps a radio station. In Rochester, N. Y., the Gannett newspapers control the news dissemination; yet at the same time they were given a TV license under circumstances which were under investigation at the time when Dr. Schwartz found his tenure of office so difficult in the Legislative Oversight Committee.

When a TV station must occasionally apply to the Federal Communications Commission for permission to have its transmitter enlarged or its location moved, naturally the station owner is sensitive to Government control. He wants to please the FCC. Therefore, he tends to favor the Government in power and the members of the FCC.

This may explain why last week there was such biased and one-sided coverage of news regarding the very important revelations made by the House Oversight Committee. Some of the news accounts I saw indicated that Commissioner Doerfer was a hero, rather than being guilty, not only of accepting fees from the TV industry, but also of charging the same expenses to the Government at the same time. A man in that position is not a hero. The American public knows he is not a hero. Yet very few radio or TV newscasts put Mr. Doerfer in the proper perspective. I have also been informed that some networks deliberately censored the news regarding the investigation of last week involving Chairman Doerfer. I have one notable and very important illustration—that of WTOP, in Washington. This station is owned by the Washington Post and Times Herald, a very fine newspaper, which, however, is in a position where it can dominate a considerable amount of news because it also owns a powerful radio station, as well. I should think that a paper in that position would lean over backward to protect the sacred position given to it, to keep the public informed; that it would do its utmost to report news, even when critical of its own policies, of its own personnel, or of its own family. However, I was surprised to find that an eminent broadcaster on WTOP, Mr. Drew Pearson, to whom I have already referred as one of the outstanding muckrakers in American journalism, had his program last Saturday cut. I have asked Mr. Pearson for copies of his program and I find that all references to the Federal Communications Commission were censored from his broadcast. I shall read some excerpts from the television broadcast which he would have given if it had not been cut. It seems to me that it is not only important but is fundamental that the American people know about these deletions. Of course, under provisions of rule XIX of the rules of the Senate, I shall eliminate from my report on the broadcast any reference to any Member of Congress which would have been made by Mr. Pearson in his broadcast.

Mr. Pearson's broadcast which was cut and censored read in part as follows:

Now ladies and gentleman, the Congress of the United States is only as good as the men who are in it. And I want to call the roll of the men who want honesty in Government and who don't seem to want honesty in Government. Last week, Chairman John Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission, supposed to be honest and impartial in protecting the public's interest, admitted after much breast-beating that he had received $1,060.87 for a 5-day trip to Oklahoma City and Spokane, then turned round and collected a good part of this from the Government. He also admitted, between breast-beating, that he had taken one trip to White Sulphur Springs and St. Simons, Ga., expenses for himself and wife paid for by the TV industry, then turned around and collected from you and me the taxpayers; also that he had taken trips to Pinehurst, N. C., and had spent 6 days being wined and dined on the British Bahamas by a big TV owner, then flown in the latter's private plane to Salt Lake City. This is the man supposed to represent the public, not the big telecasters.

Elsewhere in his proposed telecast, Mr. Pearson had included the following:

I would like to ask the new Attorney General, William Rogers, what he intends to do about this double-charging of Uncle Sam. Are you, Mr. Attorney General, going to set up one law for Chairman Doerfer, the Republican, and another law for Lamar Caudle, Democrat, or are you going to apply the laws equally and impartially as your contribution to making democracy live.

Mr. President, I believe it is unfortunate if, in connection with the dissemination of public information, we have reached a point where freedom of the press would be violated by having a telecast cut in that manner.

When I turn on my television or radio set, I should like to know whether I am listening to censored news or whether I am listening to an expression of freedom of the press, as guaranteed in the bill

of rights, a vital part of the Constitution of the United States.

I should like to suggest to our very fine colleague from California, Mr. JOHN MOSS, that he investigate the influence which certain publishers are exerting on the press. I should like to have him investigate particularly what influence the Federal Communications Commission is having on newspapers which own either radio or TV stations. It would be especially appropriate if Mr. Moss and his committee would investigate the news coverage given to the Legislative Oversight Committee and its revelations. The newspaper publishers of the Nation, and particularly their editors—of whom some very fine ones have testified regarding censorship by the Government—should also be concerned about their own censorship.

Just last week, I noticed that Mr. Russell Wiggins, of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, testified before the Moss committee regarding censorship by Government. Mr. Wiggins is one of the finest editors in the Nation, and he has done an excellent job of campaigning against censorship.

Mr. President, I wish to add that I think Mr. Wiggins in the last many months, as he started what was almost a one-man crusade against Government by secrecy and against governmental censorship, is owed the gratitude of the American people for his journalistic courage. That is the journalistic courage of old; it is the journalistic courage that characterized some of the newspaper editors in our colonial days, when with just a hand press they turned out one-sheet newspapers pointing out derelictions in the administration of a democratic government.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the leadership that Mr. Wiggins has given in opposition to government by secrecy will stand everlastingly to his credit. However, I am disappointed to find that within his own jurisdiction there is the evidence, as I have been told today, of censorship. I am disappointed that such censorship has taken place, so I am informed—and I believe I am reliably informed—in connection with Mr. Wiggins' own television station. If so, his own television station was grossly and flagrantly guilty of censorship. Whether that censorship was indirectly influenced by the FCC, whether it was a whim of the television station manager, or whether it was the policy of the Washington Post and Times Herald, I do not know. But this is something which I think it is appropriate for the Moss committee to investigate, and about which it should properly inform the Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, I do know that an American audience which turns on its television sets is not treated fairly if the programs are censored and if the audience is not informed of that fact. That is what the television stations owe to their listeners. But, Mr. President, they do not get that. To the contrary, they are getting the impression that they are receiving accurate, entirely uncensored information.

So, Mr. President, in closing my remarks on this matter, I wish to say that the Congress of the United States cannot condone such action. The Congress must measure up to its responsibility in connection with this matter. In my judgment, the situation has now become one of such great public concern that committees in both Houses of Congress should proceed with a thorough investigation of these charges. Let us sift the facts from the fiction. Let us find out what the evidence is.

If in many of the Government agencies there are men who have been betraying their public trust, then I believe it is incumbent upon the Eisenhower administration to get the tartar off the hound's tooth.

I shall turn now, Mr. President, to the speech that I had intended to make first today. When a group of us met this morning and listened to allegations in regard to what is going on in connection with the Federal Communications Commission investigation, I considered it my duty to say what I have said in the speech which I just delivered.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

IS THE SENATE HEEDING THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF ITS OWN SPECIAL STUDIES ON FOREIGN AID?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to the subject, Is the Senate Heeding the Findings and Recommendations of its Own Special Studies on Foreign Aid?

In July of 1956, the Senate created a Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, consisting of the entire Foreign Relations Committee and ranking members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. The purpose of the special committee was to study exhaustively the entire foreign assistance program and ways in which it does or does not serve the national interest, so that the Congress may have a clearer picture in forming a realistic and useful foreign aid program.

Specific assignments were made to private research organizations on a contract basis. They included academic centers, like the center for international studies at MIT; the research center in economic development and cultural change at the University of Chicago; management specialists like Jerome Jacobson Associates and Louis J. Kraeger & Associates; and private research organizations such as the American Enterprise Association, Inc., and the National Planning Association. A total of 12 contracts were entered into, at a cost to the Senate of $143,000.

In addition, 10 private citizens were asked to conduct surveys all over the world to find the strengths and weaknesses of American foreign aid, and extensive hearings were held in Washington by the special committee itself. Altogether, the taxpayers spent about $275,000 just to evaluate foreign aid and recommend changes in management or policy. Another useful study available to Members of Congress is a monograph published by the Princeton Center of International Studies, Some Perceptives on American Military Assistance, by Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., a professor at Princeton University.

Yet the careful work of these objective, nongovernmental groups has had little impact to date on America's foreign aid program. The general conclusion of the committee's studies was that military and economic assistance to foreign nations is in our national interest; but also that it requires clarification of purpose and revision of its organization if it is to continue to be in our national interest. The Senate paid little heed to these studies last year in approving the Mutual Security Act of 1957. It cannot justify repeating that mistake again this year. My opposition to the committee bill last year was because it did not apply the findings and recommendations of these special studies and the committee gave no good reason for not doing so.

Critical to the effectiveness of foreign aid is the role it plays in helping our military allies keep up the strength and vitality of their armed forces. Military aid and accompanying defense support have made up the bulk of foreign aid since the Korean war. Military aid consists of the weapons of war; and defense support is a short-hand term for the additional money for army pay, clothing, construction of roads, communication facilities, and so forth, it takes for some of these countries to maintain a military force beyond their existing financial capacity. In the words of the law, defense support consists of the commodities, services, financial, and other aid specifically designated to sustain and increase military effort. Like military aid, this aid goes only to the nations with which we share a mutual-defense treaty. Thus, defense support may be economic, but it is necessitated by the military force, and exists to maintain that force rather than to develop the resources of the recipient nation.

I want to discuss today some of the findings and warnings about the future contained in these studies. In particular, I shall refer to the two on military assistance prepared at the request of the Special Committee on Foreign Aid by Columbia University's institute of war and peace studies, and the systems analysis corporation.

I want to say first, as a lawyer, that I am talking about evidence prepared by experts. I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues in the Senate. They have a considerable amount of expert knowledge on foreign affairs. But I do not speak disrespectfully of my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. President, when I say they are not the best qualified experts on the subject. At best, we all can be best described as sincere students of the subject, and as students of the subject I think we should turn to the true experts on the subject. Unless Senators can advance good reasons why the experts are in error, I think we owe it to the American people to follow the recommendation of experts.

Here, to the tune of $275,000 of the taxpayers' money, we had conducted a series of studies by the experts, who

came forth with a series of recommendations as to what is needed to improve our military- and economic-aid programs. The sad fact is that in the bill passed by the Congress last year, for the most part we gave little or no heed to the recommendations of experts. Thus the title of my speech today, as I challenge Senators once again at least to find out, before they vote here in the Senate, what the experts have recommended, and the evidence on which the recommendations of the experts have been based.

What I shall present is not the whole picture of what these various organizations found out about foreign aid, or even about military aid. It will not constitute a conclusion of general findings, and will not deal at all with the advantages that may be gained by the United States even in the same areas and countries where its bad effects are discussed.

In short, what I shall attempt to do today will be to present a compilation of the defects and shortcomings of military aid, as found by well-qualified students of foreign policy. It will be an abstract of warnings about it, and not a general summary of findings. In addition to the studies prepared at the request of the Foreign Relations Committee, I shall refer to the Princeton monograph, and to the reports by the Comptroller General of the United States to the House Government Operations Committee, which reviewed the efficiency of the military assistance program.

NONMILITARY PURPOSES OF ARMS AID: ARE THEY JUSTIFIED?

The general purpose of military aid is to strengthen non-Communist nations against Soviet attack. This heading was broken down into three variants by Edgar S. Furniss in his monograph published by the Princeton Center of International Studies. First, Furniss lists aid which would enable a nation to repulse Communist aggression. Second, aid to enable a nation to hold out against Communist aggression until other military forces can come to its assistance. Third, aid to supplement American forces stationed in the recipient nation to ward off a Communist attack.

With the exception of the military aid we send to the countries of Western Europe, there is no realistic basis for aid with the understanding that the recipient can thereby stand off Soviet aggression alone. Secretary Dulles said as much in the course of the hearings on mutual security in 1956. In discussing the Far East he said:

> Of course, we recognize the armed forces of these allies are not alone sufficient to withstand the full might of Chinese Communist military power backed by the Soviet Union. But we also maintain in the general area of the Western Pacific United States mobile striking power to back up local forces. The cost of this force is in our defense budget * * * the two costs complement each other. Neither would be sufficient without the other.

Aid that serves this purpose of strengthening a combined resistance to aggression is considered by the American people to be the only reasonable basis for it, judging from my mail and my conversations. But let me point out that it should logically be confined to the nations near the Soviet Union and its satellites. Surely no military aid to South America—and it amounts to about $40 millions a year—can be justified under this purpose. Nor can aid to Spain, Indonesia, or to Tunisia.

But there are other reasons for military aid that do explain why we send military equipment to these nations, having no effective part in the military resistance that might be offered in the event of a Communist act of aggression.

One is that it is supposed to prepare the way for American influence. To quote from Professor Furniss:

> A prime example of the provision of aid in order to acquire military influence is, of course, Spain. In return for the right to construct both naval and air bases on Spanish soil, a program of military as well as economic aid was instituted.

The 1955 report to Congress on the mutual-security program contained this statement:

> The United States continued to furnish Spain's army with tanks, antiaircraft and antitank weapons, and various types of communication equipment. Spain's Navy received a net tender in addition to mine harbor defense.

In exchange for these weapons, we were given permission to construct air and naval bases on Spanish soil.

On February 4 of this year, there was released a report from the General Accounting Office to the House Government Operations Committee on the efficacy of those bases in Spain. Its report makes clear that the taxpayers are not getting their money's worth.

The Comptroller General deserves the great tribute which I wish to pay to him. He, incidentally, is really an officer of the Congress. He is one of the most courageous men in public service in America today. This man of great daring and great dedication to the trust of his job is worthy of our praise, in my judgment.

The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] knows very well that in the recent past this man has been willing to stand up and warn the Congress, and through the Congress the American people, of the great waste in this administration. He is the kind of public servant other public servants should emulate.

What did the Comptroller General say to the House committee? He declared that the base being built at San Pablo, "has no operational value." Had the Air Force not insisted on construction, said the Comptroller General, nearly $6 million would have been saved.

I remember that last year in the foreign aid debate I stood on the floor of the Senate and decried the millions of dollars of waste in the American military aid program. I received bitter, castigating letters from those who want to wrap the flag around themselves but do not want to face the facts as to what is going on in America's military aid program.

I am referring now to the Comptroller General of the United States pointing out to the American people that at one base, which has no operational value, we are wasting $6 million of the taxpayers' money.

We have to get the facts out to the people, first, because the press has done such a "snow job" on American public opinion that the people have been inclined to accept as true the propaganda of this administration. Every time this administration is about to raid the Treasury of the United States for military funds, they plant a scarecrow on every front lawn in America, figuratively speaking. They frighten the American people into believing they are about to be destroyed. The result is this kind of waste.

I digress further to say, Mr. President, that we see this same result in the whole nuclear program. Surely; I am receiving criticism because I have been saying across America—and I repeat here on the floor of the Senate today—that we ought to turn the program over to the scientists and have the scientists give the instructions to the military men, instead of the military men giving the orders to the scientists. Thereby we would save for the American people hundreds of millions of dollars.

We did that, thank God, on the Manhattan project. As a result we were successful on the project. We ought to do the same with the missile project, because the scientists and not the military men happen to be our experts in this field. And we do not have too much time.

Once again I say, Mr. President, it is simply good government to have the expert job done by the expert. I give the military men their due, but the military job is to carry out orders and instructions of a civilian government, not to give the orders and instructions to a civilian government. That is why I would turn the program over to the scientists. Then we would start to eliminate the kind of waste the Comptroller General of the United States pointed out in his testimony to the House Committee on Military Aid.

Another base, at Torrejon, is near Madrid and was constructed "largely on the initiative of Spanish authorities who wanted a base near the national capital for air defense purposes and as a show place for at least one jet fighter squadron."

Those are not my words; those are the words of the Comptroller General.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, on which committee the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is one of my able colleagues, I know—and I have warned the people of this country for months—about the horrendous waste of millions of dollars in the military-aid program. The Senator from Louisiana is also aware of those facts.

I shall have something to say before I finish this speech about some of the amendments which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] offered last year. I stood shoulder to shoulder with him because the Senator from Louisiana, who was my chairman in 1952 when we investigated the operation of NATO and saw great waste so far as our military

bases were concerned—and so stated to the Senate when we returned—knows whereof I speak this afternoon. But there are not many voices being raised in America in opposition to the military junta which has come to dominate the economic and military-aid program of our country. It is time that the power and control of this American military junta be brought to an end, and in this session of Congress we who are trusted with the high obligations of our office take out of the budget the millions and millions of dollars of great waste under the flag-waving slogan, "Security of our country."

I yield to no one in this body in defense of the security of my country, but we are not going to make this country secure if we permit the Eisenhower administration to continue to mismanage the financial resources of this country. The greatest defense weapon we have happens to be a strong economy.

Mr. President, I will take the testimony of the Comptroller General any time over the statements of the President of the United States on this subject, because the President has demonstrated time and time again he simply does not know the facts, and that he doesn't make the effort to find them out.

I am not interested in making a politician's statement. I am interested in facts. The facts are so against the President of the United States in regard to this matter that it is shocking to me that Congress is not doing something about squeezing out the water from the military and economic aid program.

All told, the cost of these Spanish bases will reach $483 million when completed. Is it worth that price to have even influence with Franco?

And if influence is what we are buying, one might question that we are getting our money's worth even in that. On October 7, 3 days after Sputnik I was put into the sky, Franco's loyalty if it can be called that, underwent a notable revision. In a speech he said, "We cannot ignore the political importance of the fact that a nation has succeeded in launching the first satellite. This could not have happened in the old Russia; it was bound to happen in the new Russia. The achievement of great exploits requires political unity and discipline. Whether we like it or not, this could not have happened in countries which are divided and without order.

"We must not let ourselves be blinded by passion," said Franco. "We must distinguish between what is evil and what has real and effective value. I say that what has effective value is political unity, continuity, authority, and discipline."

We know the kind of discipline Franco is talking about. It is not the discipline of a democracy, not the discipline that goes along with a free society under democratic processes, but a dictator's discipline.

If Franco is not to be blinded by passion, apparently he is willing to be blinded by cash. Let us never forget that friendship that is bought will not stay bought because sooner or later there will be a higher bidder. Russian achievement with missiles may well have outbid us with Franco.

Much the same can be said for Tito's Yugoslavia, which since sputnik has moved closer into the Soviet orbit by recognizing the puppet rulers of East Germany. We should remember that the only reliable allies are those who believe in freedom and will fight for it; it is with them that we should arrange our mutual defenses.

I think it is time to reassess the value of our bases in Spain. Does the age of missiles and the basing of missiles in the British Isles and possibly elsewhere in Europe reduce the need for bases in Spain?

Let us be frank. We proceeded with the Spanish handout, first, over the open opposition of the British, and then in the face of their forced silence. They have never been happy about it, because they recognize who are the allies upon whom we can count when the chips are down. I happen to be one who believes that when the chips are down we cannot count on any dictatorship in the great contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

Are the Spanish bases worth the price we pay of arming a dictator with weapons that probably will never be used against a Communist aggressor?

A second example is Saudi Arabia. In the House hearings last summer, William Roundtree, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern affairs stated:

* * * We agreed with the Saudi Arabia Government in 1951, at the time the agreement for the use of the airfield at Dhahran was negotiated, that we would provide on a reimbursable basis military items required by Saudi Arabia for its armed forces.

That was in 1951. Since then, under the Eisenhower doctrine, Saudi Arabia has become eligible for grants of military aid, as well as its purchase. What do Senators think the appraised value of oil in Saudi Arabia is? Only billions. Here we are, living under an administration which is pouring out, by way of gifts to that completely totalitarian state, millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money to maintain the military forces of a dictatorship. We ought to have our heads examined. It is pure fantasy. It does not make common horsesense. I have a mare that knows how to open farm gates. She has more sense than this policy reflects. There is no commonsense to our policy. Saudi Arabia has billions to support its own military machine.

Oh, it is said that if we do not do it, the Russians will come in. It is said that if we do not give, or at least sell, weapons to these dictators, the Russians will. Who is being kidded? Not the dictators of oil states in the Middle East. They know that such arguments help them to obtain handouts. But they also know that if we were to let them swim in their own oil for a couple of years, and really devise a mutual-security program—if that is what they want—a program under which they would pay their own way, they would jump at the chance, for the simple reason that they know that if the Russians move in, they move out.

All the talk to the effect that if we do not arm Arab dictator States they will make some deal with Russia is but another form of international blackmail; and I use language which I think can be understood. What the Baghdad-pact countries did to Secretary Dulles the other day was but another form of international blackmail. Such a policy ought to be stopped.

In short, we are arming the totalitarian government of Saudi Arabia in exchange for military bases on its territory. We need a reassessment of the need for those bases and of the price being paid for them not just by us but by their own people, too. Frankly, it is my personal conviction that the price is too high. The United States has never been a country to trade human freedom for military power, yet that is exactly what we are doing, in my opinion, in Spain and Saudi Arabia.

Another painful example of our military aid being put to uses having nothing to do with communism is the French campaign in Algeria. In the hearings on the Mutual Security Act of last spring, the following discussion took place between Senator Fulbright and General Guthrie, Director of the European Region of the Office for International Security Affairs:

Senator FULBRIGHT. How much of the aid for France goes to Algeria?

General GUTHRIE. It would be difficult for me to say. You mean the equipment? The hardware?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes.

General GUTHRIE. Everyone knows that a good deal of the hardware we have delivered in the past has gone to Algeria, and even France reports that it cannot determine exactly which rifle or truck it acquired as a result of the aid program, but I am safe in saying it is a substantial portion of the equipment in Africa.

That policy is costing us friends in Asia and Africa. I sat in a parliamentary conference in India, as chairman of the American delegation, in December. It is tough going when we try to answer the criticisms of the African and Asian delegates about the American military aid program, which places the aid in the hands of countries which use it to keep down freedom We had better take a long, hard look at these criticisms. We had better get it out of our heads, and quickly, that our professions are accepted as facts. In that parliamentary conference I found great criticism of American military aid programs.

I had conference and conversation after conference and conversation with delegates from Asia and Africa. As I said earlier this afternoon, this weekend brought a shocking example of misuse of American military aid. The use of American planes by the French in their attack upon a Tunisian village points up the fact that our military aid is often being used for purposes that do not serve American defense interests. I quote from the New York Times of February 9, yesterday:

French spokesmen in Paris and Algiers acknowledged that a raid had been made by 11 United States-built B–26 medium bombers and 14 jet and piston engine fighters, including 6 United States-made aircraft, in reprisal for the shooting down of a French

reconnaissance plane over Algeria by anti-aircraft fire from Tunisia earlier today.

A special correspondent for the Times, Thomas F. Brady, reported in the same newspaper that at least 67 persons were left dead or dying from the raid, and 90 wounded were in the hospitals of the area. I submit that the substance of the American people can and must be put to more useful purpose than the suppression of Algerian rebels, and raids of the kind that occurred in Tunisia.

I pointed out earlier this afternoon that people of Tunisia area have been among our best friends in Africa. We have a job of foreign relations to do with regard to this incident, unless I completely misread the attitude of our associates at the parliamentary conference in December. I say that because in many parts of Asia and Africa people are greatly concerned about the uses to which American military aid is being put under one pretext or another. The use that disturbs them the most is the fact that in places it is being used to suppress freedom. Once before I commented upon the reply I received from the Secretary of State at a hearing befor the Committee on Foreign Relations, when I tried to elicit from him his rationale for the foreign aid program to countries which use it to keep down freedom. He said, in effect, "Well, one reason for it is to help a government keep down dissident groups."

That is an interesting phrase. Mr. President, we must watch these fellows for the semantics they use. That phrase would give the impression, by implication, that he means Communist groups.

The fact is that the fight for freedom in many nations of the world is a fight put on by dissident groups who are as opposed to communism as we are.

So I said in substance, "Mr. Secretary, if I understand you correctly, and were I a citizen of one of those countries, with my deep convictions in and dedication to human rights and the dignity of the individual, might I not find myself in a position where the United States of America, the greatest democracy on the face of the earth, would be sending in weapons for use against me?"

That is what we are told. That is why again this year, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I make a plea for a reappraisal of the military foreign aid program.

We had the announcement not long ago that the Secretary of State—the announcement was somewhat garbled, but this was the best meaning we could finally get out of it—will follow a policy of arming at least some American bombers with nuclear warheads.

Mr. Nehru had something to say on this subject, in our debate in India, when he pointed out that as Russia and the Western Powers engage in the international game of armament leapfrog, he did not know whether Russia was ahead or the United States was ahead. He thought probably the truth was that on some things Russia was ahead, and on other things the United States, but that on all things pertaining to armaments, the Western Powers and Russia are engaged in a game of international leapfrog with today the United States and our allies ahead, and tomorrow Russia ahead, but that eventually the game will lead to the brink, with the last leap taking us all over the brink of oblivion.

Then he pointed out the great concern of his people with respect to the statement of policy that we are going to have circling in various trouble spots of the world American bombers loaded with nuclear warheads.

There is still a great deal of controversy as to whether such bombs can go off by accident. Certainly they can go off by design. Certainly they can go off if some people in a military junta believe, after they have stirred up an emotionally tense situation—that this is the time to make the great sacrifice.

It may very well be that we are dealing with just that kind of situation in Tunisia today. I do not know what the facts are. I am certainly glad that the State Department will investigate the situation. However, it is possible that some triggerhappy officer followed a course of action which was not a course of action wanted by his government. The danger is that when such persons are put in that position, and can, in a triggerhappy hysteria, create this kind of unfortunate, international incident, the peace of the world is threatened. If it is bad enough, a large part of the world, so far as its inhabitants are concerned, will pass into oblivion because, as Nehru pointed out, the leap will be over the brink.

A second nonmilitary purpose of military aid is to protect our lines of communication and our access to raw materials. The best example of this purpose is in South America. It was put forth in 1954 by Assistant Secretary of State Henry Holland before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

> This program [military aid to South America] has very limited and specific objectives. In time of war we would rely heavily on Latin American raw materials to maintain our economy in full production, and the Latin Americans would, in turn, rely on us for imports which they would require to maintain the stability of their economies. The maintenance of this vital trade in time of war will be dependent on protection of the inter-American sea and air routes of communication and certain strategic installations. The purpose of this program, then, is to provide Latin American countries with the type of equipment and training they will need in order to assume a part of the burden of safeguarding such lines of communication and installations.

One might well ask, safeguard from what and whom? As Professor Furniss points out, there is a gap resembling a chasm between the stated purposes of the Latin American military programs and the ends they actually serve. Says Professor Furniss:

> The geography of the area and the strength of the 20 American Republics make fantastic the supposition that an annual commitment by the United States of from thirty to forty million dollars, even for an indefinite period of time, could bring the individual Latin American military establishments to a point where they could resist any (equally fantastic) Communist aggression by themselves, with United States help after a timelag, or even with whatever United States forces were actually on the spot.

I have quoted from page 29 of the monograph by Professor Furniss.

I have not heard anyone to date—certainly not on the Committee on Foreign Relations or in the Senate—question the expertness of the Princeton study, any more than I have heard anyone, in committee or in the Senate, question the expertness of the studies conducted by the University of Chicago, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or Columbia University.

As I reach the conclusion of my speech, I am basing my case—until someone can show me it has holes in it—on the evidence of experts, not on the opinion of politicians.

South America is in no danger of external Soviet aggression; internal subversion has not been eliminated by military aid, as we saw in Guatemala; in some South American countries our military aid has been used in struggles between rival "juntas" having nothing to do with communism. Yet from 1949 to 1957 we spent $175 million to arm Latin American countries, in addition to the arms they have purchased from us. I suggest that it is time we re-study the question of military aid to South American countries, perhaps with a view of shifting to more economic assistance through the Organization of American States.

Another discernible purpose of American military aid is to build military strength to preserve internal order. This is a purpose hard to bring out explicitly from administration spokesmen, probably because of the onus that attaches to the kind of order our aid is promoting in many parts of the world. The prime object of strengthening nations against external aggression sometimes carries over as an argument for its continuance in countries far from Russian borders on the ground that the country is threatened by internal seizure. This purpose for aid has been applied to Latin America, and to countries in both the Near and Far East. As George V. Allen put it in the 1956 mutual security hearings:

> We desire sufficient military strength in the area [the Near East] to insure stability. We don't want situations where the Soviets or anyone else can capitalize on turmoil or chaos.

So stability—not freedom, not progress, not opportunity, but merely stability—is the professed object of much of American military aid.

I quote in part from the Columbia Institute study:

> It may be of little importance whether local rebel groups are Communist led or even avowed Communists. Unfulfilled nationalist aspirations and demands made in the name of social justice can, whether or not exploited by the Communists, create turmoil, disorganize national life, and undermine the stability of governments, thereby serving Soviet, whether Russian or Chinese, purposes. For this reason, military assistance policies in many Asian countries have emphasized the creation of internal-security forces. Even where the armed strength developed is no match for the Chinese or Soviet Russian military power that could be

pitted against it, these forces are helping to meet a local threat which is real and imminent.

To get stability often requires that we seek and preserve cooperation with local ruling organizations; that we buy cooperation and friendship, even if it means upholding the hand of a military or aristocratic junta. That this has been the case in the Near East is obvious from many examples. It has been true in Latin America, where the government has done some monumental juggling to keep "friendly" governments in power—governments friendly to us, anyway, regardless of how friendly they are to the liberties of their own people.

Professor Furniss cites the interesting case of Colombia. The Colombian army helped to restore order on behalf of a conservative government when the leader of the rival liberal party was murdered in 1948. Subsequently, the army seized control by a coup from the Conservatives it had put in power. Later, another army faction seized control from the first. Colombia has been eligible for American arms, both by grant and purchase, since 1952. Yet communism, either foreign or indigenous, has not been involved in this struggle for power.

To sum up the purposes of military aid which are unrelated to defense against overt Soviet aggression, I quote again from the Columbia Institute of War and Peace Studies:

In Latin America, for example, the military forces that are trained and equipped through the United States aid program are conceived to have strategic value in Western Hemisphere defense. In the event of general war, they could relieve United States forces, which would almost certainly be hard pressed on other fronts, of the task of patrolling sealanes and guarding airbases and other critically important facilities. In both peace and war, they have important internal security functions. The recent history of Guatemala clearly illustrates that Soviet-directed Communist challenges are possible in the Western Hemisphere; and this being true, the granting of arms aid to some Latin American countries may be important in enabling them to combat the threat of subversion. Some of these countries may wish to build and maintain their armed forces for other reasons as well: to maintain a dictator in power; to be adequately defended against a neighboring country with which there is a longstanding border dispute; or for prestige reasons (or possibly only vanity reasons), to have a few pieces of shiny modern equipment to parade on national independence day.

These nonmilitary purposes of our aid I respectfully suggest should be reexamined this year along the lines of the Columbia University study.

REASSESSMENT OF DEFENSE ROLE OF ALLIES

One of the major findings of the special Senate committee studies was that military aid has made it possible for the United States to enjoy the addition of Canada and our allies in Western Europe to the American defense system. The addition of the military forces of Great Britain, France, and West Germany, to mention the major powers, to our American forces is an addition the Nation could not possibly replace with American forces over a long period of time. Moreover, the geographic advantage we have in the use of advanced bases in Europe is irreplaceable at present, lacking as we do the advanced ballistics missiles apparently in the possession of the Communist world.

To paraphrase the words of Columbia University's Institute of War and Peace Studies, the coalition of our military forces with those of Western Europe gives the United States a striking power that an exclusively American investment could not produce.

But the recent NATO summit conference and its conflict over missile bases on European soil accented the primary recommendation of the special committee last year that the role of our allies in the total defense pattern be reassessed. It was the principal recommendation of the special committee regarding military aid that there be a new study by military experts and by the appropriate Congressional committees of the new demands upon western defenses imposed by the nuclear-missile age.

Let me quote the exact words of the committee report:

With respect to legislative authorizations for military aid, the committee believes that the need for this program stems from the needs of national defense which in turn are governed in large measure by the state of weapons development and the general international situation. There is no doubt that a program of military aid is now needed. As already noted, however, it is not clear to the committee whether military aid is well adjusted to our total strategy of defense.

And again:

The committee further recommends that the appropriate standing committees of the Senate make a broad inquiry into the relationship of military aid to the strategic concept of the defense of the United States in order to determine the effectiveness of the interrelationship and to make recommendations on permanent policy with respect to military aid.

It was because of the recommendation of the special Senate committee, based in part on this Columbia University study, that I joined with my colleagues in the Committee on Foreign Relations this year, particularly with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is on the floor at this time, in offering a substitute resolution, calling for what we termed a high-level review of the foreign policy of the United States, including, of course, a review of the economic and military aid program, to seek the facts.

As my two colleagues from the Committee on Foreign Relations who are at present in the Chamber will testify, upon their insistence and encouragement a resolution was unanimously approved by the committee, and we are now conducting that review. It is a review which, I think, augurs well for sound legislation at this session of Congress in respect to the problems I am raising this afternoon.

It is my judgment that as a result of that review, the Senate will be in a better position this year to implement some of the recommendations it ignored last year, after it spent $275,000 of the taxpayers' money for special studies by the experts who were assigned to the job of evaluating the operations of American military and economic programs.

The committee applied that same recommendation to defense support, which, together with military aid, constitutes the great bulk of foreign aid. We should note that this was a presputnik recommendation. Even before sputnik, the special committee found inadequate the adjustment of our defense strategy to new weapons.

Before another mutual security bill is acted on, I believe the Foreign Relations or Armed Services Committees, or both together, should make this reevaluation and should call upon the Department of Defense for its assistance and advice. The new request for the military and supporting-aid parts of the foreign aid bill is $2,665,000,000, out of a total program of $3.9 billions. That is too much money, in my judgment, to ask the American people to spend, without being able to justify it as money spent in the best interest of American security. At least, Mr. President, we who are Members of the Senate have the duty of telling the American people how we justify the taking of any action which is contrary to the recommendations of the experts we have hired to study the operation and effects of the program.

ADDITIONAL WARNINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In addition to a new assessment of the relationship to our American defense forces and those of our allies, the Congress should examine the specific findings of the special committee and its task-force groups on military aid and defense support. I am particularly concerned by their findings on arms aid to non-NATO countries. Columbia University's Institute of War and Peace Studies compared military aid to NATO countries with our aid to Asian and Near East countries. It found great differences: The NATO countries have worked out a comparatively integrated command for common defense; there is almost no likelihood that our weapons will be turned on other NATO members; their defense efforts are based on established systems of production which no longer need additional support from us; Western nations have long military traditions, and have largely succeeded in harmonizing their military establishments with democratic institutions.

According to this study, none of these characteristics are found in the nations of the Near East and Asia which we are assisting.

Based on this Columbia University study and one by the Systems Analysis Corp., the special committee of the Senate warned of three problems already evident in military assistance; and I point out that they apply primarily to nations outside NATO.

WASTE IN ILL-SUITED EQUIPMENT

The first problem is the suitability of the level of military aid and the types of arms being provided to less developed countries. The committee's studies found that in many cases military aid is ill adjusted to the requirements and capabilities of some recipient countries, particularly the less-developed ones. In

these studies there is evidence that the types of equipment supplied to some nations are poorly suited to the terrain, and that in some of these countries the forces supported by military aid may be excessive.

In addition to the studies to which I have been referring, the House Government Operations Committee has released a report, dated January 16, 1958, on the review by the General Accounting Office of the military-assistance program. The key committee finding dealt with this point, and I quote from it in full:

The Comptroller General concluded that the military-force objectives approved for United States support in certain countries are not realistic in terms of the country's manpower and financial capabilities; that these objectives are not always mutually acceptable to the country concerned, and are not always motivated by military considerations.

This is a serious indictment of the fundamental policies under which this important program is administered. It leads to the logical questions: How well have the objectives of the mutual-security legislation been accomplished? How much of the $24 billion appropriated by Congress for this program has been wasted?

To leave these questions unanswered with no corrective action would be scandalous at any time, but particularly now when the President is requesting increased appropriations for the mutual-security program which he says is one of the major weapons in the fight of the Free World for survival. Obviously, a complete review is called for by the appropriate Legislative committees and the Executive. The Congress and the people of this country must be assured that there is a sound and proper basis upon which the Executive expends billions of dollars in behalf of our mutual security. Many studies have been made dealing with the overall objectives of the mutual-security program, but this is the first time a comprehensive, independent audit of the program has been made.

This committee does not in this report evaluate the merits or demerits of the objectives of the mutual-security program.

The conclusions of the Comptroller General mean that the United States has given military end items to some countries to equip a total force which is either beyond (1) the manpower capabilities of the country to raise; (2) the technical manpower capability to maintain; (3) the economic capability of the country to sustain, even if such a force could be raised; or (4) the desire or willingness of the recipient country to fulfill or comply with the military objectives assigned for it. It means further that the maximum military effectiveness of the countries involved could have been developed with less United States aid than that which has been furnished, or which will be furnished in the future so long as such an unrealistic basis is used for programing military assistance.

Mr. President, this excerpt is from House Report No. 1281, of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, which includes the text of the conclusions and recommendations of the General Accounting Office on our military-assistance program.

In my opinion the committee is entirely correct in calling for some answers to these critical conclusions before Congress enacts another mutual-security program.

NATIONALISM FED BY AMERICAN ARMS

The second question raised by our Special Senate Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program was as to the possibility that competition for arms aid among recipients is adding to the cost of the program to the American taxpayers. There is no question that aid intended for defense against communism is stimulating among recipients and their neighbors nationalistic rivalries which have nothing to do with communism.

I cite as perhaps the worst example our military aid to Pakistan. The issue between India and Pakistan over Kashmir has been fed by American military assistance to Pakistan. It has caused that country to use its meager economic resources to support a top-heavy military structure, and has forced India in turn to match Pakistan's force with its own, as the two dispute control of Kashmir. Thus, two nations who urgently need to raise the living standards of their people are, instead, diverting resources to military establishments directed against each other; and this has occurred in part as a result of American policy.

In 1956 the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], then Ambassador to India told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

It is true that the difficulties between India and the United States grew chiefly out of United States military aid to Pakistan. As you know, there were grave difficulties between India and Pakistan after partition. There were riots and bloodshed during the transfers of population, and since then there has been the dispute over Kashmir—from India's point of view, a cease-fire had been obtained between Pakistan and India in Kashmir, and India considers it an unfriendly act that the United States placed military supplies in the hands of a country with whom they had actually engaged in warfare and when a cease-fire had only been secured. India also believes that to the extent of our military aid to Pakistan, they must increase their own defenses. They must take the limited resources which they want to devote to economic progress, and put it into defense. This they resent very much.

Here I wish to say, parenthetically, that I fully appreciate Pakistan's fear of the superior manpower and military potential of her neighbor, India, and her feeling that unless she is supplied by us with modern military equipment, such as jet bombers, to offset India's inherent supremacy, her security is threatened.

However, it would be more in keeping with America's dedication to peaceful procedures for maintaining peace if we had exercised greater leadership in seeking to get the leaders of India and Pakistan to pledge themselves to a nonviolence policy, so much in keeping with the Indian philosophy, with the definite assurance by the United States of our assistance in case one nation were militarily attacked by the other.

It is my opinion that the exercise of American leadership in such an approach to Pakistan's problems would have produced less tension in that part of the world than a program of military aid.

SECRECY VEIL OVER MILITARY AID

One of the shocking results of this military-aid program has been the secrecy surrounding it. The problems I have discussed so far are directly responsible for this extreme secrecy, which violates, in my opinion, the vital tenet of democracy that a people must be informed in order to make sound judgments.

In the course of the committee hearings last year, I made an issue of the secrecy stamp on information concerning our military aid to individual countries, information that is available to Members of Congress upon request, but which is not to be made public. The result was a memorandum from the International Cooperation Administration explaining why country-by-country military aid is kept secret. Four major reasons were given: First, that the disposition of this military power is a part of American national defense and information about it would be of great value to the Communist world; second, the Communist bloc conceals its own military assistance while emphasizing its economic aid, and information on the amount of United States military aid would be of great propaganda value to them; third, jealousies and resentments arise among recipient nations and knowledge of a greater amount of aid to a neighbor would lead to competition among them; fourth, advance revelation of proposed aid figures would reduce the negotiating power of the United States in agreeing on the final assistance we will provide.

Two statements by mission chiefs in support of secrecy were included as follows:

One Ambassador, for example, stated that the government to which he is accredited was already aware of greater United States military assistance efforts in neighboring countries but that any publication of official figures in this regard would encourage it to increase pressure on the United States for greatly increased assistance without regard to the country's absorptive capacity. * * * An Ambassador in another region, to give another example, felt that the release of figures in any category would be very prejudicial to American interests by giving impetus to a competitive armament race in his region. He felt that it would also create untold problems for the future if we tried to explain the differences in aid levels among countries in his area.

I ask consent to have printed at this point the full text of the ICA memorandum, which appeared on pages 510–512 of the Senate hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1957.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CERTAIN MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM FIGURES ARE CLASSIFIED

The executive branch believes that, whenever possible, figures on the mutual security program should be unclassified and fully available for public discussion. With this in mind, the executive branch periodically reviews its classification policy with a view to declassification of as much mutual security program data as possible.

Nevertheless there are a number of reasons for the continued classification of certain individual country figures. Somewhat different reasons obtain for the classification of military assistance figures and of nonmilitary assistance figures. The two categories will be considered separately.

The reasons for the continued classification of a number of military assistance country figures are obvious. Military assistance to foreign countries is designed to contribute directly to our own national security. For

the same reasons that we are not willing to reveal the planned disposition around the world of our own forces and of arms and equipment to be provided them, we believe it is in the national interest not to show in detail the disposition of our contributions to the military forces of our friends and allies. This is a clear security consideration.

There is also a consideration relating to Soviet propaganda beamed to the Free World. The official release of military assistance figures for all recipient countries would provide the Communist bloc with an authenticated basis for propaganda contrasting their "peaceful" economic assistance with our military assistance. It is obvious that the Communist bloc itself carefully conceals the magnitude and character of its military assistance to its allies and satellites and will continue to do so. It does not seem to this Government to be wise to furnish the Communists with propaganda material, however false its basis may be. Communist bloc representatives on the armistice commissions in the Far East could make particularly effective use of official United States data.

There is also a sound psychological reason for continuing to classify country military program figures. However ill-founded and unreasonable they may be, jealousies and resentments do exist among recipient nations as to the comparative amounts of assistance they receive. Revelation of country figures in a form which would permit comparison among the recipients would probably promote acrimonious discussion which would not be in the national interest of the United States. The disclosure of proposed (illustrative) program figures, before they are approved by the Congress, would create in the minds of the people of the recipient countries a presumption of a commitment by the Government of the United States. Subsequent reductions in the programs by the Congress, or later by the executive branch, would create resentment which this Government would prefer, if possible, to avoid.

Some of the same considerations which have been cited above with regard to the classification of military assistance figures also apply to the classification of certain nonmilitary assistance figures. The executive branch wishes to avoid invidious comparisons among recipients of nonmilitary assistance. With regard to proposed (illustrative) nonmilitary programs, this Government wishes to avoid the possibility of resentment occurring in the event the final programs approved are less than those initially proposed.

A further consideration relating to both the military and nonmilitary programs is that revelation of proposed program figures would reduce the negotiating strength of our representatives abroad in agreeing with foreign governments on the magnitude and nature of the assistance we will provide. In virtually every country program and project, it is our policy to obtain contributions in cash, goods, or services from the host government. Knowledge of the level of aid contemplated by the United States Government would give the host-country negotiators a considerable advantage.

The executive branch position with respect to the classification of figures in the mutual security program for fiscal year 1958 was reached after careful consideration of all pertinent factors. Earlier this spring, the Department of State asked all chiefs of diplomatic missions accredited to countries to which we give military assistance for their opinion on the subject of classification of military assistance figures. Some chiefs of missions stated that as far as their countries were concerned, there would be no objection to the declassification of past program figures or delivery figures. A number of chiefs of missions felt strongly, however, that even past programs and delivery figures should continue to be classified. One Ambassador, for example, stated that the government to which he is accredited was already aware of greater United States military assistance efforts in neighboring countries but that any publication of official figures in this regard would encourage it to increase pressure on the United States for greatly increased assistance without regard to the country's absorptive capacity. He felt that invidious comparisons and acrimonious discussions, would probably also result from publication of the figures. An Ambassador in another region, to give another example, felt that the release of figures in any category would be very prejudicial to American interests by giving impetus to a competitive armament race in his region. He felt that it would also create untold problems for the future as we tried to explain the differences in aid levels among countries in his area.

The overwhelming majority of chiefs of missions who were consulted on this subject felt very strongly that figures on proposed military assistance programs should continue to be classified for the reasons that have been given above.

The executive branch will continue to declassify mutual security program figures whenever it is possible to do so. It believes very strongly, however, that for the reasons given above, a number of individual country figures should continue to be classified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these first objections to publication are rendered meaningless by the admission that most nations already know what everyone else is getting in way of military equipment. If they do, it is more than likely that the Communists know, too. The fact is that only the American people are ignorant of the use to which their money is being put. Moreover, if competition is likely to result from information on military aid, it would result from information on country-by-country economic aid, which is already public. If it is true that competition for military aid among the recipient nations is building up, or likely to, that is warning in itself that the program must be kept in close check. I believe the American people should exercise that check, and to do so, they must have the facts and the information. The purpose of military aid is to strengthen the common defense, and we must see to it that our substance is not used for any other purpose. The recipient nations surely realize that fact but if they do not, it should be impressed upon them.

IMPACT OF MILITARY AID ON ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The third question concerning military aid raised by both the committee and by Professor Furniss' monograph—and unanswered by Congress to date—is the extent to which insufficient consideration is given to the impact of arms aid as a factor in generating increased needs for supporting aid. The creation of a military establishment with American military aid beyond the capacity of a country to maintain out of its own resources creates a demand for supporting aid from this Nation in addition to the hardware itself. Thus, the decision to send military equipment may be only the first stage; the equipment itself may necessitate additional commodities or cash to sustain it, and may retard the development of the recipient country's economic resources.

The most disturbing factor of all to me is the degree to which a concentration on military power robs these nations of the economic and social gains they must make if they are ever to become independent and self-sufficient.

Let me quote a paragraph of the analysis by the Columbia University Institute:

The situation in much of Asia differs sharply in degree if not in kind (from that in Europe). The margin separating current levels of living from bare subsistence is narrower. A country's own contribution to its military buildup, manpower, food, and clothing, has less relation to capital accumulation and economic development than to current consumption levels. Asian manpower may appear abundant, but in nonindustrial areas the techniques of production require such a large labor input that the "huge pools of manpower" not gainfully employed are largely fictional. The transfer of substantial numbers of the most able-bodied citizens to the Armed Forces might simply result in a failure to produce enough food. The total impact of military assistance on economic life, far from relieving pressure on the economy, can in fact be such as to require additional economic (defense support) aid from the United States. This latter form of aid would probably be needed to counter the inflationary effects of military aid. So used, it would do little to promote longer-run economic development. Thus, the underdeveloped countries of Asia, to a much greater degree than those of NATO Europe, may have to postpone greatly valued economic advancement to achieve higher levels of military strength. Generally speaking, American military assistance to Asia does not tend to promote both objectives at the same time, as to some extent it has in Europe.

The case of Turkey is especially well documented. Turkey is often cited as a kind of showcase for military aid, on the ground that one Turkish soldier is much cheaper to put in the field than one American soldier. Statistically speaking, that is true, and I have favored helping Turkey maintain adequate military forces as a part of NATO, and to prevent active aggression. As a matter of fact, I was the first Member of the Senate to endorse and uphold the Truman Doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947, when those two nations appeared to be threatened by Communist aggression.

But what is the prospect for the future in Turkey? Unlike the other members of NATO, there has been no phasing out of defense support to Turkey, as was anticipated in 1953. The other nations of NATO have developed economically to the point where they are able to maintain their military contribution to NATO out of their own productive capacity, permitting a closing out of American defense support. Those who subscribe to the theory that our foreign-aid program is a success in Turkey because of the relatively cheap price for arming a Turkish soldier overlook what her outsized military establishment has done to her economy over the years.

I quote in full the record of Turkey cited by Professor Furniss:

A second, admitted, deleterious effect stemming from military aid is, of course, economic dislocation. Perhaps the most obvious case is found in Turkey. "In 4 years Turkey can maintain that kind of armed force (desired by the United States and Turkey) without economic aid," said Harold Stassen in 1953. A year later Stassen was

still hopeful: "The Republic of Turkey continued to show exceptional progress in its economic strength, and in its military capability." The time when Turkey would not need economic help was no nearer, however, said Norman S. Paul, Regional Director, Near East, South Asia, and Africa, of the Economic Cooperation Administration: "We hope that the aid can be reduced over a period of years and that within 4 or 5 years the Turkish economy will be able to support this large military effort." By 1956, however, all optimism concerning either the soundness of Turkey's economy or the date of the advent of future economic stability had vanished. John B. Hollister was forced to inform the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the combination of the demands of the defense establishment and the costs of accelerated development have brought about serious economic strain.

So, to compensate for that strain, we send Turkey defense support, another name for the economic aid needed to maintain a topheavy armed force. I do not belittle Turkey's contribution to NATO; she is a firm opponent of Soviet aggression or subversion; her army is relatively well organized. She is a great ally. Yet her ability to withstand aggression is very limited, and to the extent it exists at all, it is causing severe strain to her economy, and potentially an additional expense to the United States.

In his report for the Special Committee To Study the Foreign-Aid Program, Norman Armour had this to say about Turkey and I quote excerpts from it:

Turkey's economic situation today is an extremely difficult one. Its combined internal and external debts total about $2 billion and credit with other countries is shrinking. Its currency is grossly overvalued and there is a serious shortage of foreign exchange. * * *

One stated objective of United States military aid is to help Turkey in the defense of the Middle East. Frankly, it is difficult to understand fully what this really means and to what extent this objective differs from the stated objective of deterring Soviet aggression. Turkey is the southern flank of NATO. Beyond Turkey lies Iran. As a member of both NATO and the Baghdad Pacts, Turkey is supposedly a link between Europe and Asia. It is, in a sense, a United States military objective to strengthen this link. But, up to the present, there is little evidence available that would indicate that this link strategy has developed very far. One important question, is, for example, what plans exist for NATO to provide assistance to Turkey if Turkey goes to the defense of Iran or any Baghdad neighbor, not having herself been attacked? Or, for that matter, to what extent would Turkey be militarily prepared to give such assistance?

It will not be easy to bring this link strategy into actuality until agreement is reached, and more coordinated action is taken by the United States, by NATO, and by the Baghdad countries themselves. * * *

Turkey's own defense budget is about 23 percent of its total budget. There can be little doubt that these large outlays for defense have been a contributing factor to the nation's present economic instability. * * *

I submit that Congress should get convincing answers to these questions before approving more military aid to Turkey. Because military aid was necessary and desirable to meet a Russian threat 10 years ago does not mean it is necessary and desirable in perpetuity. These studies indicate that Turkey is slipping back economically, and there is little evidence that she can support her armed forces without ever-growing American defense support.

The same is true of Thailand. To quote Professor Furniss:

Thailand, the firmest, most friendly ally of the United States in Southeast Asia, was as early as December 1954 admitted by American mutual security authorities to be in difficulties. Pointing out that the Thai military budget had more than doubled between 1950 and 1954, the Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program of December 31, 1954, stated: "Continuous expenditures for defense purposes not only have siphoned off resources which would otherwise have gone into the country's development, but also have put added strains on an economy weakened in the last 2 years by declining export receipts from rice, rubber, and tin."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the thought has occurred to the Senator that when the strongest allies we have—countries like England, France, and West Germany—make the decision that they simply cannot afford a certain level of defense expenditure, they cut down to the level they think they can afford, but so long as this country takes the initiative and we say a certain level of defense is desirable in such countries, no matter what it costs and no matter what the burden is, the only answer is for the United States to go in and pick up the check.

With respect to some of these things—for example, such things as troop pay, helping to build roads, and helping to build the economy of a country, so that the country will be able to better support troops—looking at the worldwide picture, there is no end to how much money could be spent. If we try to arrive at some particular level that the friendly nations of the world should have, we are presented with such a problem that we might as well pick a figure out of the air. There is hardly any beginning point or ending point.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The Senator has brought out these points in the committee meetings. I am sure the Senator will permit me to say that he has pointed out the fact that some of the allies he has mentioned—particularly the British—have reevaluated the military potentials of possible enemies, and have also reevaluated the need for changing military practices. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, we are pretty slow in doing that in this country. We are still continuing a great many programs, particularly with other nations, which are now obsolete.

The British months ago proceeded to cut their budget, because they found it possible to do so by cutting some obsolete military procedures also. I think the Senator from Louisiana is quite correct in the position he has been taking in our committee, that at least we ought to offer some answers to the Chicago University study, to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology study, to the Columbia University study, to the Princeton University study, and to these other studies, on the basis of which I have made the speech this afternoon.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, he has not yet touched upon the fact that in the field of defense support this country uses a practice of sending commodities rather than sending dollars, but we permit the country which receives those commodities in effect to sell those commodities for the local currency. In doing so we permit them to appraise the commodities at the so-called fixed exchange rate, which invariably places the local currency far above the position it should have in relation to the American currency.

The result is that certain local merchants oftentimes wind up receiving a great portion of the funds intended to go for the benefit of the public in general in those nations.

The Senator knows that the committee investigated that subject. I signed the so-called report on the foreign-aid program because it was agreed, among other things, that such practice should be stopped.

Mr. MORSE. Everyone on the committee signed it.

Mr. LONG. After the committee members unanimously agreed that such procedure should be stopped, the committee refused to do anything about it.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will tarry with me 5 or 6 minutes longer, I shall discuss some of the positions that the Senator took last year in the committee as he offered his amendments on the subject. I certainly hope that his defeat of last year has not in any way dampened the Senator's ardor for another fight this year.

I want to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I think there are many more with us this year, because in the intervening months many more of our colleagues have had the time to go into these special studies, and many of our colleagues realize now that the positions the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon took last year were positions of great merit. Unless we can supply the American taxpayers with the answers to the criticisms of these expert studies, we cannot justify the continuation of what I consider to be a very wasteful program that was so inherent in the foreign-aid program the Congress adopted last year.

As the Senator knows, I opposed that program all the way through, offering amendment after amendment based upon these expert studies, until the last step in the parliamentary procedure. After we got the final conference report from the House and it became clear that it was the best we could do for that year, the Senator from Oregon voted for the final conference report. I served notice then that this year I would do my best to be more successful in accomplishing some economies in this program than the Senator from Louisiana and I were last year.

Mr. LONG. The Senator must know it is a rather distressing thing to have

the committee members unanimously agree, "Here is where a lot of money is being wasted," and then, when the committee is urged to do something about it, to have the committee decline to do so, after the committee unanimously agreed the practice should be stopped.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is most unfortunate.

Mr. President, on my recent trip around the world I spent some time in Thailand. A short time before I arrived the Government was seized by a military coup d'etat, made possible, in part, by economic instability.

As Professor Furniss puts it, the question is whether the economic damage of military aid outruns its benefits. "From Turkey around to Japan," he states, "the determination to remain aloof from international communism must ultimately rest on the constructive alternatives that are offered to the peoples concerned."

I now raise the question, How constructive is military aid? Except in Western Europe, it is not proving to be progressively cheaper. As we contribute weapons to a nation economically incapable of supporting the military establishment we think it should have, we find we must add defense support to shore up the military establishment. We may increasingly find, too, that the stability of governments under this condition is weakened, not strengthened, by a siphoning off of its economy to support armed forces. We are often running the risk, too, that our arms may be used against a neighbor friendly to the United States.

Instead of a reevaluation taking into account these factors, the administration has presented Congress with increased requests for military aid. The total new-money request in the administration budget is $3.9 billion ($1.8 billion of which would be for straight military aid, the rest for defense support, economic aid, and technical assistance), compared to the $2.7 billion for the current fiscal year, divided $1.3 billion for military and $1.4 billion for the other aspects. Without any reevaluation, without providing any answers to the questions raised by these studies, the administration is asking Congress for half a billion more in military aid than it got last year.

In order that Members of Congress may know some of the findings of these special studies on the effects and goals of military aid, I ask to have printed at this point "Part VIII. Conclusion" of the Princeton Monograph; Section X. Characteristics of an Effective Military Assistance Program by the Institute of War and Peace Studies of Columbia University; and "A. Conclusions" from the military assistance study by the Systems Analysis Corp.

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

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing examination of the present configurations of American military aid programs suggests the following conclusions:

(1) The argument by both military and civilian leaders that military aid is part of the defense cost of the United States should logically be carried further, into an analysis of the political and economic costs of the program. Except for a few isolated instances, there have been no critical appraisals of past or suggested programs by either the executive or the legislative branch. Suggestions that military aid be separated from economic aid, placed directly and solely in the hands of the Defense Department, and justified before the Armed Forces Committees of the House and Senate might very well worsen rather than improve the existing administrative situation. Because military aid is such a small portion of total national defense costs, it would quite naturally fail to receive the attention it deserved if it were controlled entirely by the Department of Defense. Specifically, it would be even more difficult than at present to ascertain whether the programs, when added to the national defense budget, were marginal or even submarginal in the increment they brought to national security. As a corollary to this, it would seem that the executive unit for political control, the International Cooperation Administration, is badly in need of strengthening. An important step toward that goal would be to accept the need for policy guidance in foreign aid matters at the highest level of the State Department and to cease regarding the Agency as an unwanted stepchild.

(2) There is a gap between the annually avowed purposes of military aid and the actual uses for which that aid is designed and to which it is put. With Western Europe now only a partial exception, and in a few years probably no exception at all, American military aid has a definite internal, national focus so far as the recipient countries are concerned. Aid also serves as a channel for the entrance and preservation of direct American influence. These uses contrast sharply with public platitudes concerning collective strength. The collective strength in which the United States plays a part is political, economic, and even at rare times moral. The military power which American aid has engendered in our allies may have served as an ingredient in the general strategy of deterrence. Not to be overlooked, however, are its use and abuse for internal political purposes. Perhaps, as the short era of bipolarity passes, military aid may become a counter, as ally threatens and even fights ally, but such eventualities can hardly be part of the American grand design. In other words, there would seem to be serious danger in self-deception. However important it may be to pretend for the sake of international diplomatic etiquette that American aid bolsters collective military power, leaders of the United States should not attempt to deceive either themselves or American public opinion on the end results of aid programs.

(3) Despite the accomplishments of military aid, such programs will have a deleterious influence if the economic cost either to the purveyor or to the recipient is felt to be too high. A factor common to the receivers of American largesse, whether in Europe, the Near East, or Southeast Asia, is that the price of large military establishments is rapidly exceeding their economic capacities. There is, then, a consistent disparity between the so-called force levels that American military leadership feels are essential for the successful accomplishment of the internal and external missions of these countries and what America's allies feel able to maintain. The governments concerned are confronted with the uncomfortable choice of seeking more American aid, with all that this implies in the way of augmented American influence, or of reducing their own armament burdens even at the expense of important political support. Adoption of the first course is now complicated by the rising opinion in the United States that the total of foreign aid is far too large. Seekers after more assistance may therefore be offered either more military help or economic aid in the form of loans which, by demanding economic improvement to provide the wherewithal to repay, in effect will force the recipients to adopt the second course of action open to them at the outset: Domestic economic concentration and reduction of military expenditures.

(4) The shift in Communist and American attention to the underdeveloped countries compounds the problem just presented. With only a very few exceptions, the struggle between the two antagonists is an economic, a political, even a psychological, but not primarily a military one. For military defense, internal security forces are certainly needed, but no feasible expansion of them could endow these countries with the capability of resisting external invasion either alone or even until direct American power appeared on the scene. Furthermore, on the mainland of Asia the countries surrounding the Communist hinterland that are seeking strength to perform this difficult feat are paying an increasingly heavy price in the lack of progressiveness in their internal economies. From Turkey around to Japan, the determination to remain aloof from international communism must ultimately rest on the constructive alternatives that are offered to the peoples concerned. The choice must be made by the national governments; it cannot be made for them by the United States, however benevolent our intentions, however well-stocked our cornucopia. Lip-service paid to this obvious proposition has tended to make of it a first-class cliché—like all clichés, a substitute for thought, not a guide to national policy.

(5) With new weapons and a logically derived defense strategy, the United States will in coming years have decreased need for the military power of our allies. The factor which holds out most promise for transcending the negative effects of past military policy is the rapid development of new weapons systems. As these become operational, the structure of deterrence will come to rest on fewer foreign bases farther away from the centers of Communist power. There is danger that consequent American statecraft will be viewed abroad as a return to fortress America, an abandonment of countries deeply committed to the anti-Communist coalition. Such concern is already evident in Western Europe. Skillfully presented and properly negotiated, however, American policy may to foreign eyes have the noninconsiderable asset of diminished direct intrusion in the form of defense sites. The concurrent development by the Soviet Union of comparable weapons systems may work in the same direction, to increase the utility of American bases far removed from the Communist periphery as those nearby come under pinpoint threats. These enforced military postures would thus produce a highly desirable separation of the two antagonists, so that they would not clash at points all over the globe with the risk of accident-provoked conflict. Indeed, the military forces of our allies may ultimately not be required for even so-called brushfire wars. With the exception of Great Britain, therefore, their mission may finally be recognized, as has been suggested above, as being the police function of maintaining internal security.

(6) The increasing problem of American statecraft is to ease the transformation from the bipolar world of the cold war to a world in which both neutralism and nationalism are significant and accepted forces. The import of the foregoing is to deny with respect to much of the world the prevalent military view that total commitment by as many countries in the world as possible is a viable

ingredient of national statecraft. The result of such a demand, when applied to non-European countries, may be either superficial acceptance subject to repudiation in a crisis, or outright rejection in favor of an uncommitted, neutralist course of national action. In the past, the effect of military aid has frequently been viewed as the prevention of either of these results. But the technique utilized in Western Europe does not appear to be applicable to other, underdeveloped areas. Furthermore, events of the past year should have increased doubts as to the depth of operational commitment even on the part of America's allies in Europe. At the rise of nationalism and neutralism the United States need not take alarm, if the civilian leadership bears in mind the basic, most fundamental reason behind the abandonment of our own isolation: Concern for the freedom of the rest of the world—concern, that is, for the ideals and ideas developed by other civilizations, even though they be profoundly different from our own and only partially understandable by us. The only commitment the United States requires is that other cultures be allowed to work out their own development in their own way.

X. Characteristics of an Effective Military Assistance Program

The role of the military assistance program has been described in terms of its major immediate objectives, the military strengthening of our allies; and of its overriding objective, the improvement of the United States own national security and of the benefits which accrue from fully integrating military aid into the weapons system of foreign and military policy. Its role has also been examined negatively, in terms of ways in which it is unsuitable to use military aid.

There has thus been an implicit if not an explicit characterization of an ideal program. Of course, the need for aid may be too urgent to withhold any particular grants until all criteria of efficiency have been perfectly satisfied. After all, one of the requirements of an effective program is that the aid arrive in time. Some of the other characteristics listed below, when stated in general terms, are little more than truisms.

1. Whatever level of sacrifice the United States accepts for the maintenance and promotion of national security, allocation between expenditures on our own forces and on foreign aid should be such that the last dollar spent on each purchases a comparable amount of benefit to our foreign and military policy objectives.

This is not always an easy principle to apply. So long, however, as the foreign aid program remains at about one-tenth that of the defense budget, an extra percent or two added to or subtracted from the defense budget could, if a corresponding sum were taken out of or put into the foreign aid program, have very significant effects. At whatever point the overall ceiling for security-oriented expenditure is set, from then on the object should be to get the best bargain for the defense dollar. Executive presentation and Congressional consideration should be in a form that continually promotes a comparative analysis of the increments to our national security which would flow from small transfers back and forth between the two types of expenditures.

2. To be effective, the program must be logically related to United States national policy and military strategy.

It must be based on the same assumptions regarding the probable enemies, their intentions and capabilities, as those which underlie the size, composition, and character of our own Armed Forces. Where the creation of deterrents and the possible fighting of less-than-total wars is a joint operation with allies, there is an obvious need to relate the kind of forces we are helping other countries build to our own plans for the use of United States forces under various contingencies. If, for example, the armed forces of a distant ally were being scaled up only to the point where they could delay but not stop the aggressor, yet the organization, deployment, and mobility of our own forces were such that our help could not conceivably arrive in time to make a difference, there would be an obvious disjunction between the military aid program and our own strategic planning.

To take a less abstract example, if there is American reluctance to be the first to embark on direct atomic air strikes on the centers of the enemy's power, a strategy which assigned only a trip-wire function to NATO forces in Europe would be ill conceived. So would any plan which fell short of defending Europe in Europe. On the other hand, if we have resolved, and made clear our resolve, to protect Europe primarily by strategic airpower, though this involves even an added risk of atomic retaliation by Soviet airpower on our continental homeland, any effort more than necessary for the trip wire might conceivably yield greater security if applied elsewhere. Presumably, we ought to avoid an in-between level of preparedness which is logically related, neither to a plan to defend Europe in Europe nor to a plan to defend it by hitting the octopus in the eye.

A less dramatic application of this principle might occur in a decision as to whose forces are to have the newest equipment or as to whether equipment especially developed for the military aid program should be supplied. If there is some real prospect that an ally manning our frontline defense against the Soviet world could do a larger share of the job if he had newer or special equipment, we should be careful not to be niggardly in supplying him.

3. An effective program must make political and economic, as well as military, sense.

Military assistance and other means being used to support foreign policy objectives ought to be mutually supporting and ought to be fully coordinated both in Washington and in the field. This is especially important in the case of the military assistance effort because of the economic, political, and social problems that follow in its wake. A military aid program oriented and managed as though the only consideration were the achievement of short-run military ends would be self-defeating. This applies with respect to all geographical areas, but is particularly important in the case of the underdeveloped countries in Asia.

4. The program must involve as little improvisation as possible and therefore should be forward-planned on a 3- to 5-year basis.

Because rearmament in peacetime is inevitably a slow process, it is desirable to plan the operation over a 3- to 5-year period in advance. Dependence on annual authorizations and appropriations is to some degree inhibiting in any instance where the "product" has little utility until it is completed. In the case of military assistance, what is being "constructed" is a situation of strength and, much as in the case of a large carrier being built by the Navy, little effect can be realized against an already prepared opponent (or even one who is just one jump ahead) until all the essential pieces are put together.

The plans for rebuilding the defense of Western Europe, projected after the passage in 1949 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act and particularly after the Korean aggression, were made on the 3- to 5-year basis. The possibility existed that a semi-prepared Europe would actually increase the danger of attack from the Soviet Union, which might not want to sit idly by while the military balance was being swung against it. The several-year basis of United States planning increased the willingness of the countries of Europe to risk this interim danger.

For reasons set forth previously, equally long-range planning for Asia is highly desirable, but we have also seen that it is much more difficult and that successive crises in Asia have so far made it practically impossible.

5. For the program to continue to be effective, the interallied consensus has to be continuously maintained; and the instrument of military assistance itself should be used toward that end.

Especially with the NATO countries, military assistance can achieve its results only on the basis of a broad consensus as to overall policy, strategic principles, and burden sharing. As a general proposition, there is nothing illogical or unsuitable in using military aid as a bargaining device to maintain and extend the consensus. It is especially appropriate where pressure must be exerted to assure that our allies make fully effective use of the equipment we have provided. The United States key role as the primary source of military aid has in fact given our Government an effective bargaining base even in dealing with our European allies whose degree of dependence on American aid is by now so much less than that of several of the Asiatic recipients.

One caveat is in order: The indispensable condition of any bargaining with military aid is that the assistance be withholdable. If, in reality, the suspension or termination of aid would be unimaginable, then this instrument is of limited bargaining use. But if the balance between prospective gain and loss is such that we could apply this extreme sanction, as we can where, for example, we are negotiating for base rights in a country whose armed forces we are not placing great reliance upon, then there is every reason to bargain forcefully with military aid. One ought not, however, to dissipate this power on objectives with tenuous relation to basic security interests or of relatively low priority.

6. Public judgment concerning military assistance must be made more sensitive to underlying trends that increase or reduce the need for aid, and less dependent on fortuitously timed crises or dramatic Executive presentations.

One clue to the difficulty which the average Member of Congress experiences in voting military-assistance funds is the great difference between the practically unanimous vote in favor of the defense budget (as it finally emerges on the floors of the Senate and House) and the much more divided vote on military-aid funds. Since both are to achieve security objectives, the disparity in the vote strongly suggests some misunderstanding either at Congressional levels or back home among those whom the Members of Congress represent.

Stalin helpfully dramatized the Soviet threat in 1948 and 1950 by the Czech coup and the North Korean aggression. His successors may not repeat this error.

The willingness of the American public to sustain the military-aid program over the long haul will probably depend on public perception of the relationship this effort bears to national security. A well-informed and discriminating public opinion concerning military aid would make it politically feasible for the executive and legislative branches to be equally discriminating in their judgments. This would provide protection against public opinion overreacting in the face of sudden crisis or, and this is even more pertinent with respect to military assistance, withdrawing essential support for military aid during periods when tensions are apparently, but only apparently, easing. A greater effort in public education might

in the end contribute more to the long-run success of the military-aid program than any other investment of effort or funds of corresponding size.

Although, to be effective, the military-aid program needs to be insulated against day-to-day changes in the world political scene, it must at the same time respond to slower, more permanent changes. The situation is one where some short-term inflexibility is not only inevitable but necessary, yet where long-term rigidity would be self-defeating. This, too, requires a discriminating and informed public opinion.

MILITARY-AID PROGRAMS—I. SUMMARY

The mutual defense assistance program has proved a valuable deterrent to Communist expansion. Military aid, perhaps more than any other expenditure, has strengthened the free nations against immediate external aggression or internal subversion and has thus prevented further attrition of the free world.

Since inception of the program in 1949, the Congress has appropriated about $24 billion for military aid of which less than $16 billion were actually expended. In the same period, more than $226 billion were spent in support of the Armed Forces of the United States. This comparatively small outlay in military aid has further stimulated the will to resist of our free world allies, who now spend about $6 of their own for every military aid dollar spent by the United States.

Built and partially supported by military aid appropriations, there now exist free world air and naval forces nearly equal in size to those of the United States and ground forces 10 times larger than the United States Army. In addition, the program has helped to provide the United States with a network of friendly bases from which to strike immediate retaliatory blows against an aggressor.

Any similar expenditure for United States defense could not have provided the same increment in military force capabilities as that provided by the mutual defense assistance program.

This positive effect, however, should not be construed to mean that the military aid program has worked perfectly. This is not the case. Errors have been made and funds have not always been spent wisely. In fact, a great part of this report is devoted to an examination of areas for improvement.

On the other hand, considering the very magnitude and urgency of the military aid effort and the many limitations placed upon the small number of personnel charged with program implementation, our military aid program has achieved creditable results to date.

Detailed conclusions and recommendations are included at the beginning of sections III through XI of this report. The major conclusions and recommendations reached in this study are outlined briefly below:

A. CONCLUSIONS

1. Military aid has achieved its original objectives by strengthening significantly the defensive capabilities of the nations throughout the free world.

2. If free world security is to be maintained, military aid must be continued until the danger from militant communism subsides.

3. Extension of military aid without the adoption of a long-range program will perpetuate the many present limitations in program effectiveness.

4. To date, the military-aid program has not been accepted on a level of equality with other measures designed to meet national security objectives.

5. Because of the lack of permanency in the program, no general solution has been found to the problem of adjusting military aid to the fact that most of the equipment delivered in the early stages of the program is now either obsolescent or worn out.

6. Present mutual-security legislation appears too detailed in many points, and some of its provisions hamper the application of the act in world areas where it would be most effective in stemming Communist infiltration.

7. Interagency coordination in planning is complex and time consuming. Recent changes have been undertaken to improve the situation, and there presently is some evidence that a favorable trend is developing. There is also some indication that closer association with Congress at an earlier point in the planning cycle may be desirable and may result in less reprograming at a later stage.

8. In some instances the length and complexity of the programing cycle appears to have delayed the timely delivery of military aid.

9. In the past, the pricing policy of the armed services resulted in a reduced number of equipment items delivered to the recipient countries from the funds allotted to the program by the Congress. The overcharge on military-aid items may have exceeded $1 billion. A new pricing policy, enacted by the Congress in July 1956 is now being implemented. However, its effects will not be felt for at least 2 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was with the warnings contained in these studies in mind that I voted as I did on the 1957 Mutual Security Act and the appropriations under it.

As a result of the findings of these groups, our special committee has recommended to Congress, for example, that authorization continue on a yearly basis, at least until the administration and Congress have more clearly in mind the objectives of foreign aid.

Because the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ignored that recommendation, I voted:

First, for the Long amendment deleting a second-year authorization for defense support;

Second, for the Morse amendment deleting second- and third-year authorizations for the development loan fund until it could be set up through separate legislation.

Although the Senate defeated these amendments, the House version of the bill included them, in large part, and the final act became law with single-year authorizations for military aid and defense support and a 2-year authorization for the loan fund.

Because the special committee further recommended as a result of these studies that continuous review of arms aid be made with a view to reducing it, a recommendation ignored in the sums proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, I voted:

First, for the Ellender amendment reducing the authorization for military aid by a half billion, from $1,800,000,000 to $1,300,000,000;

Second, for the Senator Long amendment reducing it from $1,800,000,000 to $1,700,000,000;

Third, for the Senator Long amendment reducing the defense support authorization for fiscal 1958 by $90 million, from $800 million to $710 million.

On the subsequent appropriation bill, I voted against an Appropriations Committee amendment raising the House figures for military aid by $225 million, from $1,788,800,000 to $2,013,800,000. Again, the House largely prevailed, and the final agreement was for $1,878,800,000.

Apparently the House of Representatives gave more weight to the work of this special Senate committee than did the Senate itself.

I am making this speech today so this material will be before Congress as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the devout hope that it will not again be ignored by the Senate and by the administration.

Within a few days, I shall address the Senate again on another phase of foreign aid—economic aid for long-range development. I shall again set forth some of the criticisms and suggestions made by these same groups for the kind of economic assistance that we should emphasize. There will be a suggestion or two of my own, as well.

Apparently, the administration is concerned—belatedly—that the Soviet Union is making more friends than we are among the underdeveloped nations of the world by recognizing ahead of us that these people want and need a better standard of living more than they want or need guns and jet aircraft.

That is why I took the position before the Parliamentary Conference in India that our policy should be one of sending bread and not bullets, to use a figure of speech to describe the kind of economic aid which I think should characterize the American program.

If the administration has, in fact, finally realized that those people want economic assistance and not bullets, it has done a totally inadequate job in proposing ways of providing it in its recommendations to the Congress this year.

The administration's chief complaint has been that so long as our expenditures on military forces remain high, money cannot be spent in adequate amounts for economic development.

There is contained in the material which I have just presented much that suggests that great savings can be made in military aid. It is time for the Congress and the American people to take heed of the warnings about waste in military aid brought out in these studies. The administration plainly has not done so.

In closing, let me make one thing perfectly clear, if it is possible to make it clear. I realize that when one speaks out critically about any phase of military and economic aid he will be misrepresented by those who seek to be demagogic about his position. I wish to make it clear that I am for military and economic aid, but I want it to be effective aid. I am for strong defenses for my country. I yield to no one in the determination to do what I can to keep my country so strong that Russia will always understand that she has nothing to gain but everything to lose by following an aggressive course of action.

I am convinced that within the military and economic aid program of the United States there is millions of dollars

of waste. There is much water to be squeezed out of the program, after which I think we shall have a stronger defense against communism. We shall be able to promote a stronger economy in the underdeveloped areas of the world if we take the course of action necessary to eliminate waste.

My plea to the Senate is to study the recommendations and findings of the experts. I ask Senators to analyze their findings, and if it can be shown that they are wrong or their criticisms outweighed by other factors, vote against their recommendations. But if their evidence stands up under analysis, as I think it will, then we in the Senate have the duty this year to see to it that we take the water of waste out of the Eisenhower administration's foreign-aid recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator did not discuss one other phase of economic aid, which is indirect, but involves a large amount of aid in many respects. I refer to the enormous payrolls and dollar expenditures in foreign countries as the result of the presence there of American troops. I have heard it estimated that the amount of American money going into the economies of some of our allies might reach as high as an additional $5 billion, on top of the approximately $5 billion a year which we are spending in foreign aid for those countries.

We were told in years gone by that we had to give money to those countries to help build them up, under the Marshall plan and other plans of that nature, in order that they might have a dollar balance with us.

Some people have completely overlooked the tremendous advantage and benefit to the economies of the countries involved in having United States troops stationed within those countries and those troops spending large amounts of money.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. I did not cover that point in my speech, but I stated I would in a future speech discuss the various studies made by certain institutions, for which studies we paid $275,000 of hard-earned taxpayer money. I said I would discuss, in a future speech, the shortcomings of the economic aid program. In the course of that speech I will deal with the section of one of the studies which comments upon the very point the Senator from Louisiana has raised.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is with great hesitance and reluctance that I would make any criticism in this Chamber of what goes on in the work of the House of Representatives. Yet what has been happening in the investigative program of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight has deeply concerned me.

I wish generally to associate myself with the remarks in that connection made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] earlier today.

There has long been needed a thorough investigation of the very important regulatory agencies of our Government. In that connection, the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, on December 24, 1956, filed a very interesting and objective report, which has not been given as much attention as it should have received. The subcommittee was headed by Congressman EVINS from my own State of Tennessee. He went into some of the things that have been happening in some of the regulatory agencies, particularly with respect to the way they have not worked, in many cases, in the public interest, and the delays which small-business men have experienced in getting consideration from some of the regulatory agencies. The report itself indicates that a thorough investigation such as has been planned by the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight is greatly needed. I recommend the subcommittee report to the attention of all Members of the Senate and the public.

Many Members of the Congress have been disturbed by the question of whether these agencies which wield such vast economic power and influence have been exercising that power with fairness and equality and without pressure or favors. There have been disturbing indications that some of these agencies, which are supposed to be beyond such pressures, have come under undue and improper influence of the White House and other parts of the executive branch of the Government.

Beyond this, for several years there have been rumors around Washington suggesting that improper influences have been exercised on some of these agencies by the industries they are set up to regulate and control. There have been rumors of improper and nonjudicial acts and associations on the part of some individual Commissioners.

It was for this reason that many of us greeted the formation of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight with enthusiasm. We hoped that it would do a thorough job without fear or favor.

It is a pity that conflicts in personalities and—if I may say it—politics, have now done so much to torpedo the work of that committee.

It had seemed to me that the investigation was at last beginning to tear away some of the secrecy which had surrounded some of the activities of these Commissions. It had seemed to me that, although bad judgments and dubious practices and, in some cases, evil and illegal practices and conditions might be revealed, that it was necesary to cut away the cancerous tissues to the extent to which they exist, in order to restore these Commissions to health and bring them back into public confidence, and to the confidence and respect of the Congress.

I am deeply sorry that Dr. Schwartz and the committee have been having so much difficulty getting down to the essential facts. Doubtless, the counsel made some mistakes. But I think that there can be little doubt that he has planned toward an investigation which would be extremely useful and effective. I think his purpose is good. Public morality will be the loser if there is now any interruption to the progress of this subcommittee's work.

I must say that the matter cannot be allowed to stand where it is. Too much has been stirred up, too many questions raised in the minds of the public and of Congress, to allow this investigation to become one in which a premium is to be placed on sweetness and light. There is a job to be done, and it must be done.

I hope that an appropriate Senate committee may also look into the actions of the FCC and other regulatory agencies.

I believe there is a great deal of work to be done by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able Senator from Tennessee for his very excellent statement, and desire to associate myself with it, with one qualification. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee has not violated the rule of comity which exists between the House and the Senate. I wish to say that the very points that have been mentioned by the able Senator from Tennessee appear in the RECORD of some months ago during the last session of Congress, when the Senator from Tennessee specifically pointed out the influence running from the White House to a regulatory body in connection with a hearing that was under way in the Dixon-Yates case.

I myself resisted the appointment of Mr. Kuykendall to the Federal Power Commission, because I believed there was loose handling by the FPC Commissioners of a gas-rate case in Colorado, involving some $40 million. An ethical question arose in connection with an ex parte hearing before one of the Commissioners after a trial examiner had heard evidence in the case and had ruled against a certain gas company. All of that, to my mind, emphasizes the necessity for a full-scale investigation of the regulatory bodies of this Government.

I took the liberty, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], of going into the official reporters' office and reading his statement and the colloquy which followed his statement. As I recall the gist of that statement, it is that the White House had responsibility here, too.

I recall that in the campaign in 1952, when President Eisenhower was a candidate, he said:

> Integrity in Government means bringing into the Federal Government by every channel that there is—

And I assume he meant more than a TV channel—

> both the elective and the appointive channels, the finest men and women of whatever race, color, or creed this country affords. Bringing in people who are so incorruptible themselves that we do not have to spend our time constantly searching for crookedness and venality in Government. It will not get there because they won't allow it to get there.

That speech was made at Winston-Salem, N. C., on September 26, 1952.

And let us examine what the candidate said a few days later in Bozeman, Mont., and then let us reflect on those words and relate them with the conditions which exist right now under the Eisenhower administration.

At Bozeman, Mont., on October 5, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower said:

> The things that have happened to us because we have had poor leadership are obvious. We have no peace abroad; we have great expenditure programs here; we have deficits in our budget; and we have shameful crookedness in high places and in low places in the Federal Government. All of that we must eliminate. That is what we want men and women to come to Washington to do; to be themselves so incorruptible that there cannot be corruption in Government.

I do not profess to pass judgment on the committee of another body or their problems, so ably described by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], but in view of the press reports, it seems to me that when in the regulatory bodies there is so much smoke, there must be some fire, whether it be in the field of power or communications. We find it running through most of the regulatory bodies.

A great columnist, Thomas Stokes, who has had 25 years' experience studying these matters, said some months ago that this is an area in government that needs investigation.

Coming to the field of monopoly, we find that FCC hearings on radio and television network operations will start on March 3. The basic purpose of the hearings is to determine whether a monopoly exists in the communications field.

A bill was introduced in the last session by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] relating to monopolistic practices by radio and television networks. The Bricker bill, S. 376, is intended to correct the condition and put networks under FCC regulation. I hold in my hand a valuable report on this subject prepared by Senator BRICKER and published in 1956 by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. And I emphasize that this is not a report by a Democratic Senator.

If there is special influence being applied in the Nation against the public interest, it seems to me that an investigation should be held to determine what those influences are and whether they may further retard competition.

If it is true—I do not say that it is—that the Commissions or their employees, whether they be the FCC or the FPC, are collaborating with the varied groups which they are supposed to regulate, it is time that the executive department, on the one hand, and Congress, on the other, began to investigate.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the position he has taken and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his forthright utterances on this matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his observations. I fully agree with him about the monopoly aspects he has described. This is a matter of tremendous importance to the Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to comment briefly on the fine addresses made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and on their references to the earlier able address delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

It is my feeling that we are confronted with a genuine crisis regarding ethics and morality in government. Unless I am mistaken, this is a matter which has plagued government on this continent for almost two centuries. Any person who reads the history of the United States can know that under all sorts of administrations, those of the two existing major parties and of the parties now defunct, the question of corruption, favoritism, and influence in government has racked and disturbed the American pepole.

It is my opinion that government as a whole is a living organism. I believe one branch of the Government cannot be isolated from another branch of the Government. I believe there should be a code of ethics in Government which will apply to the regulatory agencies, to the executive departments, to the White House itself, and to both branches of Congress. The code should demand the highest ethics, the highest impartiality, and the highest freedom from influence of every single one of us.

I have long thought that we in Congress cannot demand of those in the regulatory agencies, or in the executive departments, any higher level of conduct than we will insist upon for ourselves in both branches of Congress.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee and his able collaborator, the Senator from Colorado, for highlighting this question so vividly and so cogently.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to us. I believe it is particularly pertinent that the Senator from Illinois has yielded to us on this occasion because, unless I am mistaken, he has written, in a series of lectures he delivered at one of the colleges, one of the finest books on the subject of ethics in government.

The Senator from Illinois is also a distinguished teacher, and many of his own ideas in this field I have plagiarized, as it were, from his able volume in this realm.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the observations of the Senator from Oregon are very pertinent to this subject. I certainly echo what he said about the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

I think it needs to be pointed out again that this is not a partisan matter in any sense of the word. It should not be a question of one party on one side, and the other party on the other side. This should be the effort, as I am sure it will be, of all Members of Congress, regardless of whether they are Republicans or Democrats, to try to work toward disposing of any wrongdoing in the executive departments or commissions, and of insisting that there be the highest type of responsibility in the performance of their work.

Democratic wrongdoings were investigated by Democratic Senators and Representatives who were chairmen of various committees. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] headed an investigation of matters relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. All of us remember the work of the late Senator Hoey as the head of the Government Investigations Committee of the Senate. We remember the work of Representative KING and Representative CHELF concerning the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Democratic Senators have investigated, pointed out, and exposed such wrongdoing, even though it might have been committed by Democrats in the executive branch of the Government.

I hope the same spirit will prevail now, wherever it is found that regulatory agencies need to be investigated. This is a matter of great public concern, and party differences should not play any part.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I might remind the Senator from Tennessee that we must not forget the great service rendered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois in this very field many years ago. I agree with the statement of the Senator that such investigations should be nonpartisan; but let us remember that the mink coats and deep freezes were really very small fry.

Some of the things about which we read today run into the millions of dollars. We know the fruits of the giveaway programs. But, more important, when we consider the question of regulatory bodies, which are supposed to function in the public interest as arms of Congress, we see that the appointments come from the executive branch. The question is fundamentally this: Do the appointees serve the public interest, or are they serving the interests which they are supposed to regulate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Secretary Weeks announced yesterday on the program, College Press Conference, that the figures for January will show 4.5 million unemployed.

I understand that today when the staff of the Joint Economic Committee called the Department of Commerce to verify that statement, it was denied that Secretary Weeks made such a statement but that he had said that employment for February might rise to 5 million. In order to make certain whether he said what we thought he said, I had a tape recording of his interview played back, and a verbatim transcript of the questions asked and the answers he gave was made. I wish to read a transcription of the record of the questions and answers on this particular point:

Question. Secretary Mitchell has pointed out there are now some 4½ million people unemployed. How much more unemployment do you expect before an upturn in employment?

The answer, by Secretary Weeks, was:

I should imagine the way the cycle goes in unemployment—you see during January you always have a rise because of people temporarily employed over the Christmas season—we will have in the neighborhood of 4½ million in January and I expect it will go a little higher than that. I don't think much.

Assuming that that statement by Secretary Weeks of 4.5 million full-time unemployed in January is correct—and who should be in a better position to know, inasmuch as he has the Census Bureau under his charge; and the Census Bureau makes the investigations, and tomorrow morning it will announce what its findings show, and presumably Secretary Weeks was briefed in advance about them—the figure 4.5 million for the number of unemployed in January constitutes an increase of more than 1 million over the unemployment figure for December, and amounts to almost 7 percent of the available working force. In addition, an extremely large number of persons are working part time, and the figures in that connection should be taken into account, inasmuch as 2 men who work half time are the equivalent of 1 man who is completely out of work.

I have been making private computations of the equivalent numbers of full-time unemployed from this source, for several years. For December, they amounted to approximately 1 million workers, or 1.3 percent of the working force. Taking into account the number of those who, involuntarily, were employed only part time, we find that the total number unemployed is increased by over a million, or from 4.5 to 5.5 million. Thus, even if we estimate that for January the number of those who were employed only part time was the equivalent of 1 million persons entirely unemployed, we arrive at an unemployment figure of 8 percent.

I may say that I would expect the figure for involuntary part-time employment for January to be higher than the corresponding figure for December. However, I always try to be conservative in the estimates and computations I make.

I have always considered that when unemployment is between 6 and 8 percent, the warning signals have gone up and the situation must be watched very closely, indeed. When unemployment reaches 8 percent, there should be no question; it is then time to act. From the figures stated by Secretary Weeks and from a conservative estimate of the number of those employed part time and the equivalent in terms of the number wholly unemployed, not only are we in the danger zone, but the time to act has arrived.

I base this judgment not only on the amount of unemployment, but also on the fact that the industrial production index has dropped from 145, in August, to 136, in December; and the new figures for January will, no doubt, show a further decline. In addition, the surveys of expenditures for new plans and equipment show that some months ago industry and business intended to reduce these expenditures rather sharply during the first quarter of 1958, or by about $2 billion. These are now being still further cut down. Many of the more particular indexes, such as those for auto production and carloadings, are down from a year ago by 25 percent and 15 percent, respectively.

Because of the increase in unemployment, the decline in industrial production, and the rather sharp decline in expenditures for new plants and equipment, the present recession differs in nature from the 1948–49 and the 1953–54 recessions, which were essentially inventory recessions. The present recession gives every appearance of being primarily a capital goods or investment recession. This means that although we do not have too much plant and equipment for long-run, total expansion, we do have an excess of plant and equipment in relation to the goods and services which consumers are now prepared and able to buy. Although I do not believe that we are yet in, or need to have, a depression, we are nonetheless in a recession which, because of its nature, is potentially more dangerous than the two postwar inventory recessions. The reason for this is that a capital goods or investment recession potentially can snowball faster than can a recession caused merely by a decline in inventories. A cumulative breakdown in employment, production, and purchasing power is a danger that should not be ignored.

Mr. President, in this connection let me say that once these forces gather impetus, they behave in a manner very similar to that of a forest fire. Some of us have had the experience of fighting forest fires. When I was a boy, and was living in the State of Maine, I used to fight forest fires; and thus I became very well acquainted with their behavior. When a fire starts, it heats the surrounding atmosphere. That results in the creation of a partial vacuum. The partial vacuum causes a wind to blow, as more air moves into the area. That movement creates more hot air, which, in turn, creates more fire, which, in turn, creates a larger vacuum, which, in turn, creates more wind, which, in turn, creates more fire, and so forth. In short, from a slight initial blaze, a conflagration ultimately results. Under such circumstances, an irresistible force develops; slight changes during the initial stages give rise to great changes in the later stages.

In the case of the employment situation, once people become unemployed, they begin to purchase less. As a result, the stores sell less. As a result, they order less from the factories. The factories, in their turn, sell less; thus they begin to produce less. Thus they employ a smaller working force. As a result, the number of unemployed persons increases. In such circumstances, few plants install new machinery, inasmuch as they already have a large amount of unused machinery. Because of this there is always present a possibility during a recession of a cumulative breakdown. However, this is something that the present administration does not seem to understand.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. In the last few days our Antimonopoly Subcommittee, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, has received testimony which bears out in every detail what the able Senator from Illinois has so aptly described, namely—and such testimony has been given by representatives of the so-called automotive Big Three—in the automobile industry dealers are selling fewer automobiles, because there is less consumer demand. Inasmuch as the demand has decreased, the dealers are ordering from the factories smaller quantities of automobiles. Consequently, the manufacturers are reducing production. Today the steel industry is operating at about 55 percent of capacity.

We have found that when dealers fail to sell automobiles, and when the manufacturers reduce production, there is an adverse effect on the rubber, steel, and textile industries. As the Senator from Illinois has so aptly described, that development is similar to the condition he described, in the case of a forest fire: the small initial fire heats the surrounding air, which rises, and more air moves toward the fire, as a result of the creation of the partial vacuum, and thus there is a snowball effect.

In the case of industry, more and more persons become unemployed, and thus are not able to make the purchases they normally would make; and that causes inventories to increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

When so large a proportion of their plants and machinery is not utilized, the companies themselves do not wish either to invest their profits or to borrow money, in order to increase the size of their plants or to install new machinery, because they say that they have idle equipment, and that when business picks up, they can use the equipment which now is idle. As a result, the demand for

capital goods is reduced, and that helps create an even worse condition.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say that the only explanation given by the economists employed by the giant corporations—and I must say in all fairness to them that they seem to believe this—is that the consumers have in their hands enough money to enable them to purchase the products of the giant corporations, and that the only trouble is that at this time the consumers are more cautious.

But the other day I read on the financial page of the Washington Post, I believe, an article to the effect that Mr. Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, had stated that the recession was deeper and sharper than they had anticipated.

In connection with that statement, I am very much interested in what the Senator from Illinois has been informing the Senate. He has made a point which I do not believe has previously been called to the attention of the Senate, namely, that the figures in regard to part-time employment have not previously been considered in connection with the 4.5 million unemployment figure. I believe the Senator from Illinois said that the full-time unemployment equivalent of those in part-time employment was 1.3 percent of the American workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have had the estimates made; and I shall state later, for the record, the method by means of which the computations have been made. They show that in December, the number employed part-time were the equivalent of 1 million workers completely unemployed, and constituted 1.3 percent of the working force. Assuming that the figure did not increase from December to January, 1 million would be added to the 4½ million persons totally unemployed, thus making an equivalent of a total of 5½ million persons totally unemployed. But I believe that the amounts of part-time unemployment have increased from December to January. In my opinion, when the final computations are obtained—and we should obtain them in a day or two—I believe we shall find that in all probability the number of part-time employed has reached the equivalent of more than 1 million persons entirely unemployed, and that means that in January more than 1.3 percent of the working force was then employed only part time.

However, when the two are taken together, we find that the combined percentage is approximately 8. In my judgment, that means that the zone of possible danger has been passed, and that we are now at the point of actual danger.

Mr. CARROLL. As I read the press, I am reminded that the President of the United States seems to have changed his position. A while ago he said there would be no reduction in taxes. But, as I understand, the President now says there may be a tax cut, if one becomes necessary.

It seems to me that it was significant that the other day Mr. Harlow Curtice of General Motors, testified that he was advocating a tax cut. So evidently the recession is far more serious than appeared on the surface, and evidently it is far more serious than the administration has been willing to admit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true.

Because of all of these facts, and particularly because of the high unemployment figure, which is now either at or in excess of 8 percent, and because there appear to be no signs in the most up-to-date figures of a turnaround in the major economic indicators, I believe that the time has come to act.

I am therefore proposing that we cut taxes, and cut them now. I propose, first, that we either raise the individual exemption from $600 to $700 immediately, or alternatively, that we split the lowest tax bracket—which is now taxed at 20 percent—into two parts and tax the first $1,000 of taxable income at the rate of 15 percent, instead of 20 percent. This would mean a decrease in taxes on the first $2,000 of taxable income from the present $400 to $350. It would thus amount to a cut of $50 per person, or perhaps I should say, per person who pays income taxes.

These measures would give tax relief of approximately $3 billion and would give it almost immediatly, whichever of the two methods were used.

Second, I further propose that we eliminate the excises on a whole variety of consumer goods, such as electric, gas, and oil appliances, electric light bulbs, radio and television sets, phonographs, records, musical instruments, mechanical refrigerators, air conditioners, business and store machines, photographic equipment, matches, playing cards, toilet goods, luggage, handbags, wallets, sporting goods, pistols and revolvers, admission taxes—this would include the present tax on music—leases on safe-deposit boxes, and so on, as well as one-half of the excises on telephone, telegraph, radio and cable services, one-half of the local telephone service excise, and one-half of the excise taxes on transportation of persons and property.

Further, Mr. President, if it could be guaranteed—but only if it could be guaranteed—that the automobile manufacturers would pass on the cut in the form of lower prices to the purchasers of cars, I am ready to propose that the manufacturer's excise on passenger automobiles be cut in half.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I recall very distinctly the leadership the Senator from Illinois gave to the Senate when, earlier in this administration, we were faced with another recession. It was at that time that the Senator from Illinois was characterized as being one of the prophets of gloom and doom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And as one of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse.

Mr. MORSE. I remember that. The Senator was as sound in his economics then as I think he is today, and the Senator will recall that we had some specific proposals then.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The George amendment was one, in support of which I remember the Senator from Illinois made a brilliant speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And which the Senator from Oregon supported very vigorously, as did the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is now present on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. This is where we all came in. There is nothing new about this. It is the old story over again about an administration that follows a do-nothing policy, and the people suffer.

The Senator will recall that we took the position we did on exemptions and on excise taxes. It is my recollection that the Senator from Illinois joined me in the effort to bring about what was a recommendation on the exise tax matter which was made by the Committee for Economic Development in 1947. The committee was far seeing enough to warn of this oncoming trouble as far back as then.

I rise only to say to the Senator from Illinois I think there is no answer to the position he has taken. He has been so sound on the economic approach to this matter all through the years that I am proud to stand and speak this word of commendation and take this opportunity—I have scanned the entire remarks of the Senator in mimeographed form—to answer the old, bewhiskered clichés that are going to be thrown at him as brickbats: "Where are you going to get the money to run the Government?"

I had a conversation over the weekend with another fiscal expert. I follow his advice, too, although, as I have said many times, I am influenced by the economic leadership of the Senator from Illinois. The expert told me over the weekend that one of the great holes in the Eisenhower economic analysis these days is that the Government is not going to get the money it is planning on by way of Government revenues this year, because the policies of the Government itself are freezing out those sources of income.

I should like to raise the question, What is the answer to the argument that will be made that the Senator from Illinois would reduce taxes, which in turn would reduce the amount of money that would go into the Treasury of the United States? If we can get the American people to see the fallacy of that argument right now, we can win the fight which has to be won.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say there is nothing that will diminish tax revenues any more than would a full-fledged recession, because it would reduce the tax liability of the Nation, decrease corporate income taxes, and decrease individual income taxes. It would decrease the excise taxes, particularly those on liquor and tobacco, which I am proposing to retain. So I would say the best

way to keep revenue up is to keep production and income up.

Let me go further and say that in a pronounced recession or depression—and I emphasize those words—I am not afraid of deficit financing. During such a period the Government can borrow from the banks. The banks will create monetary purchasing power. That is what they do. That is commercial credit. They will lend this additionally created monetary purchasing power to the Government—and incidentally do quite well on it themselves—and it means that there will be a net addition to the total monetary purchasing power of the Nation. Because the amount of taxes will be rebated back to individuals, their expenditures will increase, and governmental expenditures in turn will not be reduced. The net result is expansion in the total monetary demand for goods of both the Government and individuals which helps to make good the immediate shrinkage in demand for goods and may, indeed, totally make good the shrinkage which results from the recession or depression itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me one more interruption?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I do not like to interrupt the Senator to present what the Senator knows is a very elementary rule of economics, but we have an educational job to do. The Senator will remember that when we fought for a similar program before, we pointed out—and I ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not think it is still true—that the tax savings which will flow from the Senator's proposals will flow right into the cash register tills of American businessmen on the main streets of America, and help increase the purchasing power which is going to be needed to help keep on the job people who otherwise would be unemployed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and that money would flow also into the pockets of the middle- and low-income people of the country, too.

Mr. President, I do not wish to pin roses on myself, but may I say in a period when inflation was the problem, I tried to have Government expenditures cut back and have either a balanced budget or a surplus. I believe that in periods of full economic activity the Government should not only balance its budget but have a surplus. But, during a period of pronounced recession and high unemployment, I think the Government should not remain neutral, but should throw itself into the breach by one or both of two methods: first, by a reduction in taxes to benefit consumers, or, second, by needed and necessary public works.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the problem of a balanced budget, is it not true that, when a country is sliding into a depression, it is completely impossible to balance a budget?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true.

Mr. LONG. If the Government fails to take corrective action in terms of stimulating the economy by additional spending, then the economy will continue to go down and the tax revenues will decrease so rapidly that it will be totally impossible to balance the budget, no matter how much one tries to cut down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I believe that was somewhat the experience of the Hoover administration, at the time the country was falling off into a depression and the administration kept trying to balance the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. By reducing expenditures they were only contributing to an even more pronounced depression.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana is completely correct. I hope we will not make the same mistake again.

In addition, Mr. President, I propose that the cut on the income tax be retroactive to January 1, 1958, and that it be subject to renewal on January 1, 1959; that is, that it run for only a year. I believe we should do this so that if the economy turns up and there is any danger of inflation by January 1, 1959, the cut could be suspended so that revenues would once again be increased. In other words, I do not propose to make this necessarily a permanent affair. It is intended as a stimulus.

It is not practical, however, to make the excise-tax cuts retroactive or to suspend them a year from now. I think that should be frankly admitted.

Mr. President, such action as this needs to happen now. The danger point in the recession has been reached. The administration and Congress, of course, should not rely exclusively on a tax cut to turn this recession around. In addition, we should increase unemployment benefits, which are at present scandalously low.

I had some share in the early campaign to adopt unemployment insurance in this country, which I was advocating in the 1920's. I had a modest share in writing a number of the State acts, and in the revision of the Federal act. I can say it was our intention that the unemployment benefits were to protect approximately half of the wages. Instead of that, by imposing maximum limits and other restrictive provisions, various States have cut down the average proportion of benefits paid to approximately one-third of the wages, so that there is not now provided as great a stabilizing force as we had hoped and planned would be provided.

I hope very much that the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and cosponsored by several other Senators a few days ago—I think a number of the Senators now present in the Chamber are cosponsors of that measure—will be speedily pushed, because this is something which will directly help the people who are out of work, and not merely those who are employed and in receipt of incomes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the recession should deepen, and if things get much worse, we should develop a public works program and provide all-out relief. No one should be allowed to starve in the United States. I state that as a basic principle.

In the meantime, of course, the Federal Reserve Board should pursue a vigorous monetary policy to ease credit, lower interest rates, and increase bank reserves.

The Federal Reserve can increase bank reserves of course, by purchasing bonds in the open market, and by crediting such purchases as deposits in the Federal Reserve System, which in turn will act as reserves based upon which the member banks can expand their loans, so that for every dollar of added reserves created by the purchase of bonds by the Federal Reserve, the banking system as a whole can create approximately $5.50 of additional credit.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has been cited by the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, and by the former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who played a major part in putting into effect the so-called tight money policy, as being one of the principal authorities whom they were following, or at least as being one of those who stated they were acting in consonance with what the Senator from Illinois had advocated on occasion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the recent past they somewhat embarrassed me with the fulsomeness of their praise. They tend either to praise me or to condemn me as it happens to suit their particular purposes.

Mr. LONG. The fact of the matter is that while from time to time they relied upon certain excerpts from speeches made by the Senator from Illinois to support their position, I believe the Senator is in a position to say, as of this time, there is no longer any basis whatever for or any reason whatever to continue the tight money, high interest rate policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree. What the situation now calls for is a reduction in interest rates, the purchase by the Federal Reserve of Government bonds in the open market, and the consequent making available to the banks of larger lending capacity.

There are a great many details in the creation of monetary purchasing power which must be considered. The Constitution gives to Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. We have delegated that power to the private banking systems, and I am not proposing to change that.

What has happened under the Federal Reserve System is that the Federal Reserve now gets 18 cents out of every dollar which the banks create. This is the Government's share, so to speak. Then the extra amount is created by the banks.

I am not going into the question of whether this monetary purchasing power should be created by the banks or by the

Government. Like Margaret Fuller, "I accept the universe." I am not proposing to change it. I simply say, first, I think the Government should get its 18 cents out of each additional dollar created. And I think that now is the time for the Federal Reserve System, instead of selling Government bonds, to buy Government bonds, and it should buy the bonds by crediting additional deposits of member banks on the books of the Federal Reserve. I think they should write up their deposits, so to speak.

That is the trick in banking which is commonly obscured and hidden from the public gaze, but that is how the credit is created.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, last summer and even during the early fall we were being told that the tight-money policy was being used to more or less temper a boom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. To level off the boom, it was said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. And to prevent inflation. It is now clear, however, that as of recent months the tight-money policy and the high-interest-rate policy have had the effect of actually driving us more and more into a recession, which the administration apparently is willing to concede is a recession, as of this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think in retrospect that the interest rates were probably raised too high for too long a period of time. I did not condemn the Federal Reserve Board at the time. I personally have no right to criticize the Board, therefore. Like the Board, I did not want inflation. But in retrospect I think it is clear that as related to the spring of last year and from then on, the statement of the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. Certainly, as of now, however, there really is no basis for any further argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There should be no argument now.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There should be no argument now.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. There has been one question which has bothered me a great deal, and that is a question which I asked during the Antitrust Subcommittee hearings of Mr. Harlow Curtice, the president of General Motors.

I should like to try to sum up his viewpoint on the problem. I asked Mr. Curtice whether, since his cars were not selling as well as expected, they had priced themselves out of the market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Curtice's reply, as I recall, was along the line that consumer purchasing power or personal income, according to the records and statistics, appeared to be adequate. He felt that there were tremendous sums in the hands of the consumers, but that there was caution, or perhaps selective buying, or perhaps a lack of confidence.

Does the Senator from Illinois believe there is that amount of money at the purchasing level?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, there are large savings deposits which could be drawn upon to finance current expenditures, just as there were immediately after the conclusion of the war. The Senator is getting me into deep water, but I am perfectly willing to enter.

Mr. CARROLL. The question disturbs me greatly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the primary cause of this recession—and it is the same as the primary cause of the great depression of 1929—is the fact that during the previous period business made large investments in plant and equipment, and therefore had a tremendous capacity to turn out goods. But for the total quantity of such goods to be sold, it would be necessary for prices to be reduced. However, American industry was and is so cartelized and so subject to control, in given lines, by 1 firm, 2 firms, 4 firms, or 6 firms, that they did not want to reduce their prices. Therefore we had a situation in which the capacity of industry to produce goods was greater than the ability of consumers to buy at the prices charged. I emphasize that last phrase—"at the prices charged." The goods could have been disposed of if the prices had been cut. But we did not have a competitive system. We had a quasi-monopolisitc system over large areas of the economy and prices were maintained. At those prices, the producing power of industry was greater than the monetary consuming power.

I think the situation has been a little more aggravated this time than it was in 1928 and 1929 although we do not yet have or need to have a general situation like 1929. I am talking of a particular aspect of the economy. At that time business maintained its prices in the face of falling costs and increasing investment. At this time business has been increasing its prices in the face of increasing capacity, which has, I think, aggravated the situation.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate very much the explanation of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, there will be some who will disagree with it. I offer it as my explanation. It seems to me to be substantially sound.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. As I have previously indicated, Mr. Curtice, notwithstanding his statement about the amount of money available, nevertheless recommended a tax cut. It seems to me, from the colloquy between the able Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that the purpose of the proposed tax cut is really to create purchasing power. In a sense, this is the "trickle-up" theory; is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Exactly so. This is the historic policy, I think, of our party. We believe in building purchasing power from the bottom up. The Republicans believe in pouring purchasing power in from the top, and letting a little of it trickle down.

I think the administration will come forward after a while with a tax bill. I do not want to prejudge it, but I rather suspect that the administration will come forward with a tax bill which will favor the upper income groups, corporations, and so forth, with the argument that what we need is to stimulate investment. Over a long period of time we probably need more plant and equipment, but at the moment we certainly do not need more plant and equipment, because, according to the business indexes, in January only about 75 percent of capacity was utilized, and production had fallen from some 82 percent of capacity earlier in the year, and from 90 percent 18 months before that. With such a large proportion of unused equipment, I cannot picture American industry immediately pouring in large quantities of additional capital for further machinery and buildings. I think industry will say, "Let us utilize more fully the productive capacity we already have."

I therefore believe that in the immediate situation the more important need is to build up purchasing power from the bottom, and through the middle layers. That would make the masses of the American people more prosperous. As the Senator from Oregon has said, that would help the small-business man, and even the big-business man.

Mr. CARROLL. With the small contribution we might make by means of a tax cut, we would really open channels of trade. The benefit would move upward, as has been the case historically.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. I do not believe that my proposal is the sole remedy. I do not guarantee that a tax cut would stop the recession. I do not wish to overstate my case. It seems to me that it is the most immediate and practical form of action for us to take, and it is the quickest action to become effective.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe this is a good place in the debate to point out the position which the Senator from Illinois and others of us took some time ago, when we were confronted with the problem of a series of steel price increases. The steel industry was not operating at full capacity. The steel industry was seeking to use a wage increase as a basis for an exceptionally large increase in steel prices. The record will speak for itself. It discloses the protests which we made at the time.

The Senator from Illinois will recall that we were calling for the adoption of a resolution for an investigation of steel prices, and we could not get it. I recall that on one of those occasions, the Senator from Illinois discussed the economic theory which he has advanced

this afternoon, and which I happen to think is unanswerable. The Senator from Illinois pointed out, when he and others of us were dubbed prophets of gloom and doom, that we could not continue price increases, not using the capacity for production of consumer goods, without sooner or later running into trouble. We are in such trouble right now.

I wish this economic lecture—because that is what it is—on the A B C's of economic phenomena, which produce recessions and finally depressions—could be heard in every neighborhood and community in the country at the consumer level. If the people could understand it, we would get some action.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my colleague from Oregon for his over-generous comments. I have been accused, on occasion, of lecturing to my colleagues. I hope the Senator will not label this address as a lecture. I do not intend to lecture to my colleagues in these matters. I have attempted only to discuss very frankly with my equals and superiors the problem as I see it. I do not believe that we can longer postpone dealing with it.

I know that there is a natural tendency on the part of any group which is in power to deny that conditions are other than rosy. However, in the long run we cannot escape the truth, and we cannot escape the facts. We cannot cover things up with adjectives. Therefore, I hope that we may go into this question realistically.

I am somewhat surprised that the Commerce Department should deny that Secretary Weeks said what we have heard with our own ears—a statement which was taken down.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two bills to carry out the proposals which I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 3263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first $1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; and

S. 3264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the provisions of the two bills, indicating the probable revenue loss from each proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Provision: Increase the personal exemption from $600 to $700, including the exemption for the aged, blind, etc., and increase the amount which a dependent may earn and remain a dependent; or split the first tax bracket of $2,000, now taxed at 20 percent, into two parts under which the first $1,000, of taxable income would be taxed at a 15 percent rate and the second $1,000 at the present 20 percent rate. The effect would be to reduce the tax on the first $2,000 of taxable income from $400 to $350.

Revenue loss—estimate: $3 billion.

In addition, both bills would repeal or lower certain of the existing excises. The provisions and the estimated revenue losses under existing legislation for fiscal year 1958 would be as follows:

Provision and estimated fiscal year 1958 revenue losses

(Source: The budget for fiscal year 1959, pp. 885–886.)

Repeal excises on:	*In millions*
1. Radio and television sets, phonographs, records, and musical instruments	$179.0
2. Mechanical refrigerators, quick-freeze units, and air-conditioners	44.0
3. Electric, gas and oil appliances	75.0
4. Electric light bulbs	28.0
5. Toilet preparations	102.0
6. Luggage, handbags, wallets	60.0
7. Admission taxes, including music	100.0
8. Business and store machines	93.0
9. Photographic equipment	22.0
10. Playing cards	6.9
11. Matches	6.0
12. Sporting goods, exclusive of fishing rods (estimate)	10.0
13. Pistols and revolvers	2.0
14. Leases of safe deposit boxes	6.0
15. Fountain and ball-point pens	10.0
16. Other	1.0
Total	744.9
Reduce present excises by 50 percent on:	
1. Telephone, telegraph, radio and cable services, leased wires, etc	142.5
2. Local telephone service	187.5
3. Transportation of persons	107.5
4. Transportation of property	238.0
Total	675.5
Total revenue loss estimated for excise reductions	1,420.4

Total revenue losses including excise reductions and personal exemption or splitting first bracket provision: $4.4 billion.

In addition, if it could be reasonably guaranteed that the automobile manufacturers would pass on a decrease in the excise on passenger cars to the consumer, I am ready to propose that the present manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles be reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent.

The estimated revenues from this provision for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 were estimated at $1.3 billion and $980 million, respectively. Therefore, cutting this tax by half would be a revenue loss to the Government and a decrease in the price of automobiles if it were passed on to consumers of approximately $500 million.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos the remarks made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and in the interest of some historical accuracy, at least, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point the following language:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to the faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

As the Senator probably knows, I have read from the Democratic Party platform of 1932.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apparently at that time the Democrats felt that it was not quite so sound to go on a spending orgy to solve the problems that were then confronting the Nation. I thought that in the interest of historical accuracy we might point that out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The language the Senator has read was contained in the Democratic platform of 1932. That turned out to be a mistake. When confronted with 15 or 16 million unemployed, who had been bequeathed to the Democratic administration by our Republican friends, the Democratic administration had the good sense to go back on the false promise the Democrats had made in 1932 and to operate under a deficit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not realize that the distinguished Senator was going to make a speech, although I am always interested in listening to him. Perhaps the Senator has readily available certain figures on that subject. I have sent for some material on it. Perhaps the Senator will recollect that after a considerable period of deficit financing, which occurred following the 1933 period, certain conditions obtained. Does the Senator have any figures as to the number of unemployed in 1938, 1939 and 1940, before we got into World War II, and what proportion that figure was to the total working force at that time, and how that squares with the theory that that is the solution to this problem?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no absolute figures, but the total amount of the unemployed varied from 15 million appreciably downward. In 1937 and 1938 the number of unemployed increased, and rose to approximately 12 million, and by

1940 it had fallen to between 8 million and 9 million, or approximately one-half the figure of the original period. Therefore, it certainly was not a complete remedy, and the program that I am advocating was adopted only halfheartedly, I might say. Further it should have been done much earlier and had it been done earlier the worst effects of the depression might have been avoided. Nevertheless, an appreciable improvement in conditions was put into practice. We do not claim to have a corner on all intelligence, or claim to be completely correct at all times. I simply say we have the ability to learn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of the RECORD, I should like to have placed in the RECORD what the deficits were under which the Government operated from 1933 through 1940, prior to World War II. Those figures will at least raise some warning signals that the mere expenditure of funds does not necessarily solve the problem, and, as the Senator has so frankly admitted, was contrary, to the doctrine for which his party was criticizing the prior Republican administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from California is correct in his reference to the platform of 1932. However, I should like to point out that unless we had carried out the expenditures, unless we had provided the relief, and unless we had provided public works, the depression would have been still more intense than it was, and that very dark and very unhappy things would have happened to democratic Government in this country. I wish to say that the Roosevelt administration helped to pull us out of the depression. I do not say that it pulled us out of the depression, but that it helped to pull us out of it, and that it prevented a revolution in this country.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to stress the last point. I happen to believe that what the Roosevelt administration did was to save the Republic. I happen to believe, also, that if we had not reversed the trend of the Hoover administration there would have been such disturbances in the country that the Republic itself would have been threatened. To point out how long it took, even the figures of the Senator from California show that such a crisis ensued that it took years and years, with ups and downs, to recover from the great errors which the Republican depression had caused.

I should like to ask a personal question of the Senator from Illinois. I am not alone in asking this question. It goes without saying that not one of us would wish to join with the Senator from Illinois in cosponsoring these bills, if the Senator from Illinois wished to introduce them without cosponsors. I recognize that there are times when a Senator may wish to do that. However, I have just talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] on this point. The bills are so in keeping with the philosophy of so many of us in the Senate, I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois would object if some of us asked him to permit us to cosponsor the bills with him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be delighted to have such good cosponsors as the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Colorado, as well as any other Senators on either side of the aisle, who wish to join me in sponsoring the bills. This is not a private monopoly.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois has been my leader on this subject for many years. He states economic views which I have espoused in and out of the Senate for some years, and I would be honored to be listed as a cosponsor on both bills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am honored to have the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Colorado cosponsor the bills with me. I may say that in advocating this program, we propose that we do not want to have a great number of unemployed in the future. It is easier to do it now than later, when it is too late.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I, too, wish to cosponsor the bills. I am confident that the Republicans, after 25 years, have learned a lesson. I am confident that the Republican leadership and the Republican administration will not let this Nation slip, as they did in the 1920's, into economic chaos. We have statements from the President and from the former Secretary of the Treasury. They have pledged that they will come forward with a tax program. I merely wish to support this type of tax program, which I think will best serve the interests of the country, in raising the purchasing power to where it ought to be. In other words, I am endorsing the trickle-up theory, which the able Senator from Illinois has so lucidly described.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am so anxious to get as many sponsors for the measures that I invite the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California, to join us. We worked together last year on the civil rights bill. I believe that at first he was a little suspicious of me, and I was a little suspicious of him. However we did work together for a month and I have great admiration for his patriotism and ability, and I would be very happy indeed to have the great Senator from California join us in cosponsoring the bills. I now extend this invitation to him and to any other Senators on the other side of the aisle who wish to join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The Chair might interject that the present occupant of the chair believes this might be a good time to pass the natural gas bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why introduce a discordant note into this apparent harmony?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bills may lie at the desk until the next session of the Senate, which I believe will be next Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I make that request so that other Senators who may wish to do so, may join as cosponsors of the bills.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at a subsequent date I shall have a complete set of figures to introduce; but because I think this question raises some issues of importance to the country and to the Senate, I point out that in 1938, after some 3 years of deficit financing, the number of employed was approximately 44,200,000. The unemployed numbered 10,400,000. The percentage of unemployed to the total work force was 19 percent.

In 1939 the total number employed was 45,800,000. The number of unemployed was 9,500,000. The percentage of unemployed to the total work force was 17.2 percent.

In 1940, the year before Pearl Harbor, when the United States became involved in World War II, the total number employed was 47,500,000. The number of unemployed was 8,100,000. The percentage of unemployed to the total work force was 14.6 percent.

The total work force of 47,500,000 in 1940 compares with a total work force now of, roughly, 65 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those are, substantially, the figures I gave out of my head.

I may say that we have a long way to go before we would reach the very depth of the depression into which we were plunged at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933. I hope that never again may this country experience what it had to go through during that 10-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished minority leader would find it possible to include in these figures the national income of 1930, 1932, and the later years for which he gave the figures of employment and unemployment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have them here. I have no doubt that those figures will be placed in the RECORD over the period of the next few months.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the Senator from California will place in the RECORD the figures of unemployment during those years?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have given the figures for the 3 years for which I had information. Subsequently, I hope to get the figures for the entire period of years.

Mr. CARROLL. If my memory serves me correctly, the national income in 1932—it might have been 1933—was approximately $40 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That figure is approximately correct and I ask unanimous consent that I may subsequently introduce at this point in the RECORD a number of tables taken from the January 1958 Economic Report of the President concerning the figures about which we have been talking. We should have the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

TABLE 1.—*Employment and wages—Noninstitutional population and the labor force, 1929–57*

Period	Noninstitutional population [1]	Total labor force (including Armed Forces) [1]	Armed Forces [1]	Civilian labor force				Total labor force as percent of noninstitutional population	Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force	
				Total	Employment [2]		Unemployment [2]		Unadjusted	Seasonally adjusted
					Total	Agricultural	Nonagricultural			
	Thousands of persons 14 years of age and over							Percent		
Old definitions: [3]										
1929	(4)	49,440	260	49,180	47,630	10,450	37,180	1,550	(4)	3.2
1930	(4)	50,080	260	49,820	45,480	10,340	35,140	4,340	(4)	8.7
1931	(4)	50,680	260	50,420	42,400	10,290	32,110	8,020	(4)	15.9
1932	(4)	51,250	250	51,000	38,940	10,170	28,770	12,060	(4)	23.6
1933	(4)	51,840	250	51,590	38,760	10,090	28,670	12,830	(4)	24.9
1934	(4)	52,490	260	52,230	40,890	9,900	30,990	11,340	(4)	21.7
1935	(4)	53,140	270	52,870	42,260	10,110	32,150	10,610	(4)	20.1
1936	(4)	53,740	300	53,440	44,410	10,000	34,410	9,030	(4)	16.9
1937	(4)	54,320	320	54,000	46,300	9,820	36,480	7,700	(4)	14.3
1938	(4)	54,950	340	54,610	44,220	9,690	34,530	10,390	(4)	19.0
1939	(4)	55,600	370	55,230	45,750	9,610	36,140	9,480	(4)	17.2
1940	100,380	56,180	540	55,640	47,520	9,540	37,980	8,120	56.0	14.6
1941	101,520	57,530	1,620	55,910	50,350	9,100	41,250	5,560	56.7	9.9
1942	102,610	60,380	3,970	56,410	53,750	9,250	44,500	2,660	58.8	4.7
1943	103,660	64,560	9,020	55,540	54,470	9,080	45,390	1,070	62.3	1.9
1944	104,630	66,040	11,410	54,630	53,960	8,950	45,010	670	63.1	1.2
1945	105,520	65,290	11,430	53,860	52,820	8,580	44,240	1,040	61.9	1.9
1946	106,520	60,970	3,450	57,520	55,250	8,320	46,930	2,270	57.2	3.9
1947	107,608	61,758	1,590	60,168	58,027	8,266	49,761	2,142	57.4	3.6
1948	108,632	62,898	1,456	61,442	59,378	7,973	51,405	2,064	57.9	3.4
1949	109,773	63,721	1,616	62,105	58,710	8,026	50,684	3,395	58.0	5.5
1950	110,929	64,749	1,650	63,099	59,957	7,507	52,450	3,142	58.4	5.0
1951	112,075	65,983	3,098	62,884	61,005	7,054	53,951	1,879	58.9	3.0
1952	113,270	66,560	3,594	62,966	61,293	6,805	54,488	1,673	58.8	2.7
1953	115,094	67,362	3,547	63,815	62,213	6,562	55,651	1,602	58.5	2.5
1954	116,220	67,818	3,350	64,468	61,238	6,504	54,734	3,230	58.4	5.0
1955	117,388	68,896	3,048	65,847	63,193	6,730	56,464	2,654	58.7	4.0
1956	118,734	70,387	2,857	67,530	64,979	6,585	58,394	2,551	59.3	3.8
1957	120,445	70,761	2,797	67,964	65,272	6,229	59,043	2,693	58.7	4.0
New definitions: [3]										
1947	107,608	61,758	1,590	60,168	57,812	8,256	49,557	2,356	57.4	3.9
1948	108,632	62,898	1,456	61,442	59,117	7,960	51,156	2,325	57.9	3.8
1949	109,773	63,721	1,616	62,105	58,423	8,017	50,406	3,682	58.0	5.9
1950	110,929	64,749	1,650	63,099	59,748	7,497	52,251	3,351	58.4	5.3
1951	112,075	65,983	3,098	62,884	60,784	7,048	53,736	2,099	58.9	3.3
1952	113,270	66,560	3,594	62,966	61,035	6,792	54,243	1,932	58.8	3.1
1953	115,094	67,362	3,547	63,815	61,945	6,555	55,390	1,870	58.5	2.9
1954	116,220	67,818	3,350	64,468	60,890	6,495	54,395	3,578	58.4	5.6
1955	117,388	68,896	3,048	65,848	62,944	6,718	56,225	2,904	58.7	4.4
1956	118,734	70,387	2,857	67,530	64,708	6,572	58,135	2,822	59.3	4.2
1957	120,445	70,744	2,797	67,946	65,011	6,222	58,789	2,936	58.7	4.3
Old definitions: [3]										
1956: January	118,080	68,691	2,916	65,775	62,891	5,635	57,256	2,885	58.2	4.4 3.7
February	118,180	68,396	2,906	65,490	62,576	5,469	57,107	2,914	57.9	4.4 3.7
March	118,293	68,806	2,893	65,913	63,078	5,678	57,400	2,834	58.2	4.3 3.8
April	118,367	69,434	2,879	66,555	63,990	6,387	57,603	2,564	58.7	3.9 3.7
May	118,537	70,711	2,865	67,846	65,238	7,146	58,092	2,608	59.7	3.8 4.1
June	118,632	72,274	2,844	69,430	66,503	7,876	58,627	2,927	60.9	4.2 4.1
July	118,762	72,325	2,836	69,489	66,655	7,700	58,955	2,833	60.9	4.1 4.0
August	118,891	71,787	2,840	68,947	66,752	7,265	59,487	2,195	60.4	3.2 3.6
September	119,047	70,896	2,827	68,069	66,071	7,388	58,683	1,998	59.6	2.9 3.4
October	119,198	70,905	2,823	68,082	66,174	7,173	59,000	1,909	59.5	2.8 3.5
November	119,344	70,560	2,828	67,732	65,269	6,192	59,076	2,463	59.1	3.6 4.0
December	119,481	69,855	2,826	67,029	64,550	5,110	59,440	2,479	58.5	3.7 3.8
Old definitions: [3]										
1957: January	119,614	68,647	2,817	65,830	62,890	4,943	57,947	2,940	57.4	4.5 3.8
February	119,745	69,130	2,817	66,313	63,434	5,199	58,235	2,881	57.7	4.3 3.6
March	119,899	69,565	2,816	66,749	64,049	5,442	58,607	2,700	58.0	4.0 3.6
April	120,057	69,773	2,820	66,953	64,472	5,758	58,714	2,481	58.1	3.7 3.6
May	120,199	70,777	2,821	67,956	65,467	6,663	58,804	2,489	58.9	3.7 3.9
June	120,383	72,742	2,819	69,923	66,892	7,547	59,345	3,030	60.4	4.3 4.2
July	120,579	73,056	2,823	70,233	67,546	7,804	59,742	2,687	60.6	3.8 3.8
August	120,713	71,838	2,839	68,999	66,619	6,827	59,792	2,380	59.5	3.4 3.9
September	120,842	71,056	2,819	68,237	65,921	6,519	59,402	2,317	58.8	3.4 4.0
October	120,983	71,303	2,786	68,517	66,240	6,838	59,402	2,277	58.9	3.3 4.2
November	121,109	70,796	2,729	68,067	65,078	5,817	59,262	2,989	58.5	4.4 4.8
December	121,221	70,480	2,688	67,792	64,652	5,391	59,262	3,140	58.1	4.6 4.8
New definitions: [3]										
1956: January	118,080	68,691	2,916	65,775	62,684	5,625	57,059	3,092	58.1	4.7 4.0
February	118,180	68,397	2,906	65,491	62,354	5,463	56,891	3,136	57.9	4.8 4.0
March	118,293	68,806	2,893	65,913	62,787	5,662	57,124	3,125	58.2	4.7 4.2
April	118,367	69,434	2,879	66,555	63,799	6,386	57,410	2,755	58.7	4.1 4.0
May	118,537	70,711	2,865	67,846	64,950	7,120	57,830	2,896	59.7	4.3 4.5
June	118,632	72,274	2,844	69,430	66,027	7,859	58,166	3,403	60.9	4.9 4.6
July	118,762	72,325	2,836	69,489	66,354	7,674	58,680	3,134	60.9	4.5 4.4
August	118,891	71,787	2,840	68,947	66,420	7,237	59,184	2,527	60.4	3.7 4.1

[1] Data for 1940–52 revised to include about 150,000 members of the Armed Force who were outside the continental United States in 1940 and who were, therefore, not enumerated in the 1940 Census and were excluded from the 1940–52 estimates.

[2] See note.

[3] Not available.

NOTE.—Civilian labor force data beginning with May 1956 are based on a 330-area sample. For January 1954–April 1956 they are based on a 230-area sample; for 1946–53 on a 68-area sample; for 1940–45 on a smaller sample; and for 1929–39 on sources other than direct enumeration.

Effective January 1957, persons on layoff with definite instructions to return to work within 30 days of layoff and persons waiting to start new wage and salary jobs within the following 30 days are classified as unemployed. Such persons had previously been classified as employed (with a job but not at work). The combined total of the groups changing classification has averaged about 200,000 to 300,000 a month in recent years. The small number of persons in school during the survey week and waiting to start new jobs are classified as not in the labor force instead of employed as formerly. Persons waiting to open new businesses or start new farms within 30 days will continue to be classified as employed. (New definitions series for periods prior to January 1957 are Census Bureau estimates under the old definition adjusted by Council of Economic Advisers to the new definitions.)

Beginning July 1955, labor force data are for the calendar week containing the 12th of the month; previously, for week containing the 8th.

Annual population data are as of July 1; monthly data are as of the 1st of the month.

For the years 1940–52, estimating procedures made use of 1 940 Census data; for subsequent years, 1950 Census data were used. For the effects ofthis change on the historical comparability of the data, see Annual Report on the Labor Force, 1954, Series P–50, No. 59, April 1955, p. 12.

Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: Department of Commerce, Department of Labor (labor force, 1929–39), and Council of Economic Advisers.

TABLE 1.—*Employment and wages—Noninstitutional population and the labor force, 1929–57*—Continued

Period	Noninstitutional population [1]	Total labor force (including Armed Forces) [1]	Armed Forces [1]	Civilian labor force				Total labor force as percent of noninstitutional population	Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force	
				Total	Employment [2]		Unemployment [2]		Unadjusted	Seasonally adjusted
					Total	Agricultural / Nonagricultural				
	Thousands of persons 14 years of age and over							Percent		
New definitions—Continued										
1956: September	119,047	70,896	2,827	68,069	65,774	7,376 / 58,395	2,295	59.6	3.4	3.9
October	119,198	70,905	2,823	68,082	65,955	7,168 / 58,785	2,127	59.5	3.1	3.9
November	119,344	70,560	2,828	67,732	65,084	6,190 / 58,893	2,648	59.1	3.9	4.3
December	119,481	69,855	2,826	67,029	64,306	5,105 / 59,199	2,723	58.5	4.1	4.2
1957: January	119,614	68,638	2,817	65,821	62,578	4,935 / 57,643	3,244	57.4	4.9	4.2
February	119,745	69,128	2,817	66,311	63,190	5,195 / 57,996	3,121	57.7	4.7	4.0
March	119,899	69,562	2,816	66,746	63,865	5,434 / 58,431	2,882	58.0	4.3	3.9
April	120,057	69,771	2,820	66,951	64,261	5,755 / 58,506	2,690	58.1	4.0	3.9
May	120,199	70,714	2,821	67,893	65,178	6,659 / 58,519	2,715	58.9	4.0	4.2
June	120,383	72,661	2,819	69,842	66,504	7,534 / 58,970	3,337	60.4	4.8	4.5
July	120,579	73,051	2,823	70,228	67,221	7,772 / 59,449	3,007	60.6	4.3	4.2
August	120,713	71,833	2,839	68,994	66,385	6,823 / 59,562	2,609	59.5	3.8	4.2
September	120,842	71,045	2,819	68,226	65,674	6,518 / 59,156	2,552	58.8	3.7	4.3
October	120,983	71,299	2,786	68,513	66,005	6,837 / 59,168	2,508	58.9	3.7	4.6
November	121,109	70,790	2,729	68,061	64,873	5,817 / 59,057	3,188	58.5	4.7	5.1
December	121,221	70,458	2,688	67,770	64,396	5,385 / 59,012	3,374	58.1	5.0	5.2

TABLE 2.—*Relation of gross national product and national income, 1929–57*

[Billions of dollars]

Period	Gross national product	Less: Capital consumption allowances			Equals: Net national product	Plus: Subsidies less current surplus of government enterprises	Less:					Equals: National income
		Total	Depreciation charges	Other [1]			Indirect business tax			Business transfer payments	Statistical discrepancy	
							Total	Federal	State and local			
1929	104.4	8.6	7.7	0.9	95.8	−0.1	7.0	1.2	5.8	0.6	0.3	87.8
1930	91.1	8.5	7.7	.8	82.6	−.1	7.2	1.0	6.1	.5	−1.0	75.7
1931	76.3	8.2	7.6	.6	68.1	[2]	6.9	.9	6.0	.6	.8	59.7
1932	58.5	7.6	7.0	.6	50.9	[2]	6.8	.9	5.8	.7	.8	42.5
1933	56.0	7.2	6.7	.5	48.8	[2]	7.1	1.6	5.4	.7	.9	40.2
1934	65.0	7.1	6.6	.5	57.9	.3	7.8	2.2	5.6	.6	.7	49.0
1935	72.5	7.2	6.7	.6	65.3	.4	8.2	2.2	6.0	.6	−.2	57.1
1936	82.7	7.5	6.7	.8	75.2	[2]	8.7	2.3	6.4	.6	1.1	64.9
1937	90.8	7.7	6.9	.8	83.0	.1	9.2	2.4	6.8	.6	−.2	73.6
1938	85.2	7.8	6.9	.8	77.4	.2	9.2	2.2	6.9	.4	.5	67.6
1939	91.1	7.8	7.1	.7	83.3	.5	9.4	2.3	7.0	.5	1.2	72.8
1940	100.6	8.1	7.3	.8	92.5	.4	10.0	2.6	7.4	.4	.8	81.6
1941	125.8	9.0	8.1	1.0	116.8	.1	11.3	3.6	7.7	.5	.4	104.7
1942	159.1	10.2	9.2	1.0	149.0	.2	11.8	4.0	7.7	.5	−.8	137.7
1943	192.5	10.9	9.9	1.0	181.6	.2	12.7	4.9	7.8	.5	−1.7	170.3
1944	211.4	12.0	10.8	1.2	199.4	.7	14.1	6.2	8.0	.5	2.8	182.6
1945	213.6	12.5	11.2	1.3	201.0	.8	15.5	7.1	8.4	.5	4.5	181.2
1946	209.2	11.7	10.0	1.7	197.6	.8	17.3	7.9	9.5	.6	.9	179.6
1947	232.2	14.1	12.2	2.0	218.1	−.2	18.7	7.9	10.8	.7	1.4	197.2
1948	257.3	16.5	14.3	2.2	240.8	−.2	20.4	8.1	12.3	.7	−2.1	221.6
1949	257.3	18.4	16.4	2.1	238.9	−.2	21.6	8.2	13.5	.8	.1	216.2
1950	285.1	20.5	18.0	2.5	264.6	.2	23.7	9.0	14.7	.8	.2	240.0
1951	328.2	23.5	20.3	3.1	304.8	.2	25.6	9.5	16.1	1.0	1.3	277.0
1952	345.4	23.9	21.0	2.9	321.6	−.1	28.1	10.5	17.6	1.2	2.0	290.2
1953	363.2	26.5	23.3	3.2	536.7	−.4	30.2	11.2	19.0	1.4	2.6	302.1
1954	361.2	28.9	25.6	3.3	332.2	−.2	30.1	10.1	20.1	1.3	1.7	299.0
1955	391.7	31.6	28.1	3.5	360.1	.2	32.9	11.0	21.8	1.3	2.1	324.1
1956	414.7	34.3	30.6	3.7	380.4	1.1	35.0	11.6	23.4	1.3	1.6	343.6
1957 [3]	433.9	37.1	33.3	3.8	398.8	1.6	36.9	12.3	24.6	1.3	1.7	358.5
	Seasonally adjusted annual rates											
1955:												
1st quarter	379.0	30.6	[4]	[4]	348.4	0.1	31.5	10.6	20.9	1.3	4.4	311.4
2d quarter	387.7	31.4	[4]	[4]	356.3	.7	32.8	11.3	21.5	1.3	1.4	321.5
3d quarter	397.0	32.0	[4]	[4]	365.0	0	33.2	11.0	22.2	1.3	2.3	328.3
4th quarter	402.8	32.6	[4]	[4]	370.2	.1	34.0	11.3	22.7	1.3	.1	334.9
1956:												
1st quarter	405.2	33.3	[4]	[4]	371.9	.8	34.1	11.1	23.0	1.3	1.5	335.8
2d quarter	410.8	33.9	[4]	[4]	376.9	1.0	34.7	11.3	23.4	1.3	1.3	340.6
3d quarter	416.7	34.6	[4]	[4]	382.1	1.1	35.1	11.5	23.6	1.3	2.3	344.5
4th quarter	426.0	35.3	[4]	[4]	390.7	1.6	36.1	12.3	23.8	1.3	1.6	353.3
1957:												
1st quarter	429.1	36.1	[4]	[4]	393.0	1.4	36.4	12.2	24.2	1.3	1.6	355.1
2d quarter	434.3	36.6	[4]	[4]	397.7	1.6	36.6	12.1	24.5	1.3	3.3	358.1
3d quarter	439.0	37.4	[4]	[4]	401.6	1.7	37.1	12.3	24.8	1.3	2.7	362.2
4th quarter [3]	433.0	38.2	[4]	[4]	394.8	1.7	37.4	12.3	25.1	1.3	[4]	[4]

[1] Accidental damage to fixed capital and capital outlays charged to current account.
[2] Less than $50,000,000.
[3] Preliminary; fourth quarter by Council of Economic Advisers.
[4] Not available.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.
Source: Department of Commerce (except as noted).

TABLE 3.—*Federal budget receipts and expenditures and the public debt, 1929–59*

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Net budget receipts [1]	Budget expenditures	Surplus or deficit (−)	Public debt at end of year [2]
Fiscal year:				
1929	3,861	3,127	734	16,931
1930	4,058	3,320	738	16,185
1931	3,116	3,577	−462	16,801
1932	1,924	4,659	−2,735	19,487
1933	2,021	4,623	−2,602	22,539
1934	3,064	6,694	−3,630	27,053
1935	3,730	6,521	−2,791	28,701
1936	4,069	8,493	−4,425	33,779
1937	4,979	7,756	−2,777	36,425
1938	5,615	6,792	−1,177	37,165
1939	4,996	8,858	−3,862	40,440
1940	5,144	9,062	−3,918	42,968
1941	7,103	13,262	−6,159	48,961
1942	12,555	34,046	−21,490	72,422
1943	21,987	79,407	−57,420	136,696
1944	43,635	95,059	−51,423	201,003
1945	44,475	98,416	−53,941	258,682
1946	39,771	60,448	−20,676	269,422
1947	39,786	39,032	754	258,286
1948	41,488	33,069	8,419	252,292
1949	37,696	39,507	−1,811	252,770
1950	36,495	39,617	−3,122	257,357
1951	47,568	44,058	3,510	255,222
1952	61,391	65,408	−4,017	259,105
1953	64,825	74,274	−9,449	266,071
1954	64,655	67,772	−3,117	271,260
1955	60,390	64,570	−4,180	274,374
1956	68,165	66,540	1,626	272,751
1957 [3]	71,029	69,433	1,596	270,527
1958 [4]	72,400	72,788	−388	271,200
1959 [4]	74,400	73,934	466	271,200
Calendar year:				
1946	38,568	71,080	−2,512	259,149
1947	40,389	37,955	2,434	256,900
1948	40,864	35,623	5,241	252,800
1949	37,514	41,106	−3,592	257,130
1950	37,306	37,728	−422	256,708
1951	52,979	56,337	−3,358	259,419
1952	64,840	70,682	−5,842	267,391
1953	63,841	72,997	−9,157	275,168
1954	61,171	64,854	−3,683	278,750
1955	63,358	66,129	−2,771	280,769
1956	70,994	67,216	3,779	276,628
1957 [5]	72,400	71,800	600	274,898

[1] Gross receipts less refunds of receipts and transfers of tax receipts to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, the Federal disability insurance trust fund, the railroad retirement account, and the highway trust fund.

[2] Excludes guaranteed obligations. The change in the public debt from year to year reflects not only the budget surplus or deficit but also changes in the Treasury's cash balances, the effect of certain trust fund transactions, and direct borrowing from the public by certain Government enterprises.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] Estimate.

[5] Estimated by Council of Economic Advisers from data through Jan. 15, 1958. May therefore differ from figures in Treasury Department monthly statement of receipts and expenditures to be released about Jan. 20, 1958.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: Treasury Department and Bureau of the Budget (except as noted).

Mr. CARROLL. I remember a speech by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in which he made some optimistic predictions for 1938, or it might have been 1939. But even he, with his great vision and great intellect, was mistaken. He had hoped that the United States would have a national income, in that period, of $80 billion, as I recall.

I think this comparison demonstrates, in terms of deficit spending and in terms of the national debt, that we must take a look at where we have been and where we are now. We must compare a national income of $40 billion then, as distinguished from a national income of $400 billion today. Is that not correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The gross national product is today around $433 billion, and the national income is probably $350 billion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am certain that the figures will all speak for themselves. An additional figure will be one relating to the dollar and its purchasing power with the necessary adjustments. But I have no doubt that as among the Senator from Illinois and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, all the figures will be made available to the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. I had hoped that we would have so clear a picture that it would be binding from now on as to what the facts are.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 10, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to authorize the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 13, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1958:

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–4, in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard F. Eiden	William H. Keel
Everett J. Mooring	Elmer F. Nelson
William C. Thornes	Arthur H. Scarborough
Francis S. Lamb	John J. Harbart
Cassius M. Fish	Ernest B. Gall
Roger F. Erdmann	Stephen P. Bunting
Edgar C. Hill	Michael Herko
Cyrus Gray	Robert F. Rittenhouse
Harry A. Vaughan	Richard C. Van Hine
John E. Cavanaugh	Raymond V. Herron
Carlyle J. Dennis	Burton Y. Frymire
John J. Gibbs, Jr.	Edgar S. Klock
Warren H. Wilmot	Christy R. Mathewson
William H. McBride	John A. Williamson
William G. Kincaide	Ralph F. Barnes
Earl F. Wallace	Harold W. Anderson

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–3, in the United States Coast Guard:

John S. Cameron, Jr.	John W. Stamback
William A. Mauch	George G. Twambly
Clavis W. Baum	Charles S. Rhodes
Frank J. Recely	Edgar G. Riggs
Ralph N. Larson	John Sacco
John T. Dailey	Robert P. Stalcup
Allen M. Wilson	Jesse Fowler
Howard H. Istock	Eugene H. Midgett
William R. Claborn	Elton W. Grafton
Martin J. Ruebens	Homer E. S. Williams
Carl L. Weaver	Jack K. Ridley
Raymond L. Barnett	Marion G. Rubado
John C. Tappen	Fletcher R. Peele
Lynn I. Decker	Manuel L. Bent
Daniel S. Bishop	Leon A. Anderson
Walter P. Stipcich	John Senik
George B. Schack	Foister E. Blair
Paul A. Woodard	Kenneth G. Fields
Moses McNure	William Keokosky
Woodrow F. Clookie	Nevette A. Gardebled
Albert DeCosta	John E. Giles
Albert J. Bates	George A. J. Michaud
Malcolm Versaw	Edward Petroski
Michael Kabaczy	Meredith D. Hazzard
William R. Gaither	Joseph A. Nartonis
Benjamin Dollinger	Earlie W. Shelton
William H. A. Herbst	Ernest R. Stacy
John W. Colby	Clemens F. Knox
Joseph L. St. Pierre	Elmer J. Nolan
Bernard A. Koebbe	Roy Huffstetler
Irving T. Bloxom	Frank Jakelsky
Gilbert Ortiz	Robert H. Wiggins
Henry T. Peele	Lawrence E. Wagner
Melvin F. Cramer	Roy I. Anderson
Ulmer C. Wilson	Barney M. Thomason
Lennith L. Groves	Henry E. Ask, Jr.
Ernest L. Killiam	John Kinnunen
James F. Beaumont	Carl K. Scarborough
Charles R. Ellington, Jr.	Roy V. Sogaard
Robert H. Burn	Phillip M. Griebel
Leonest L. Tillett	Norris D. Hickman
Leroy H. Harmon	James T. Mead
Gilbert W. Coughlan	Robert P. Ellard
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.	Philip E. Barnard
Henry A. Cook	Harold H. Rohr
Alfred M. Livingston	Kenneth G. Sherwood
John Chartuck	Elwood S. Hudson
John P. Ryan	Rudolph E. Anderson
Elmer C. Knudson	Harold Eveld
William E. White, Jr.	Clarence H. Checklin
Suell R. Grimm	Kenneth L. Drake
Roland R. Davis	Walter R. Terry
James W. Freeman	Herbert N. Litchfield
Charles E. Christman	Lloyd L. Franklin
Edward E. Lewis	Donald H. R. Fraser
Oliver F. Rossin	William K. Cooper
Louis M. Piermattei	Christian A. Weitzel
James W. Lockhart	Donald Cobaugh
Andrew Hauswirth	Walter R. Goldhammer
Russell M. Young	Gerald M. Davis
Ellis M. Moore	Fred M. Guild, Jr.
Kenneth E. Payson	Luther C. Knight
Thomas A. Smith	Harold W. Woolley
Homer E. McCullough	Ellis P. Ward
Martin J. Connolly, Jr.	John A. McCullough, Jr.
Edward J. Ard	Charles C. Colmer
Alfred F. Crose	Benjamin F. Weems
Harvey J. Hardy	Edward E. Walker
Michael R. Kassin	Norman J. Wirsching
Cyril D. Kring	Donald A. Nystrom
Gene D. Vecchione	LeRoy F. Lander
James A. Somers	Seymour Alexander
Harry V. Hardy	Charles U. Stastka
Carl M. Mortensen	Herbert L. Johnson
Leonard W. Arnold	Robert J. Hanson
Hobert E. Sadler	Edgar W. Thomas
Robert H. Kollmeyer	Stanley J. Salabor
Gordon B. Sworthout	David D. McCormick
Henry L. Cotton	Sterling Fulcher
Roy L. Singleton	Byron A. Barr
Andrew Kirkpatrick	Marion O. Hulbert
Alexander M. Grant	William I. Janicke
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.	John A. Dearden
William F. Winslow	

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2, in the United States Coast Guard:

George A. Knapp	Donald E. Phillips
Mark Fitton, Jr.	Maurice T. Hedgecock
William H. Fraser	James F. McLaughlin
Ervin L. Keel	Bob Nelson
Robert E. Mooring	Edward B. Eaton
Donald O. Nelson	Ralph E. LaMott
Talmadge F. Youmans	Frommhold K. Holtz
Eugene D. H. H. Willett	Harold R. Margrave
	Arthur L. Midgette
Daryl D. Paul	Francis W. Sullivan
Richard G. Thompson	Leo Frey
George Solometo	Gordon W. Ault
Edmond E. Hainstock	Charles R. Lee
Hugh B. Houston	Horace F. Hey
George E. Carriveau	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 4: 19: *My God shall supply all your needs according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus.*

Almighty God, grant that we may now be drawn together in unity of spirit and in one solemn and lofty aspiration to heed Thy voice of gentle stillness calling us to renew our faith and courage.

We know that without Thee our life ebbs out its little day in weakness and weariness, in futility and frustration.

Teach us the great secret of life learned by all whose hearts are filled with joy and peace that we must surrender our wills to Thine in complete obedience.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 6, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Karl L. Larson;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Alfred Hanzal;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Dr. Royal W. Williams;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of William F. Kempe;

H. R. 3210. An act to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels;

H. R. 3770. An act to rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 5161. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine A. Work;

H. R. 6069. An act for the relief of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey;

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6660. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the Tuscaloosa lock and dam on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam;

H. R. 7052. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for appointments of cadets from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7200. An act for the relief of the estate of Isa Hajime;

H. R. 7591. An act for the relief of Anton N. Nyerges;

H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Margie C. Stewart; and

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margot M. Draughon;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Ralph H. Weeks;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf;

H. R. 5163. An act for the relief of Forest H. Byroade;

H. J. Res. 417. Joint resolution for the relief of Mrs. Sabastiano Poletto, Hideo Konya, Edward H. Turri, and Mario Guiffre;

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 435. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 228. An act for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Maud Claer Wahl;

S. 1249. An act for the relief of Martha A. Calvert;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Hovhannes H. Haidostian;

S. 1657. An act for the relief of Lloyd C. King;

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Norma Josephine Hodges Dowd;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Maria Van Arendonk;

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Barbara Hollinger;

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Constantinos N. Alivantistos;

S. 2004. An act for the relief of George and Emma Clifford;

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Biro;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Marie Ethel Pavlovitch and her daughter, Dolly Hester Pavlovitch;

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Eva Lichtfuss;

S. 2132. An act for the relief of Leonard C. Fink;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Chong Sook Rhee;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of John J. Griffin;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edvin Jansson-Viik;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Josef Winter;

S. 2196. An act for the relief of Annadore E. D. Haubold and Cynthia Edna Haubold;

S. 2245. An act for the relief of Moy Tong Poy;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton;

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Luz Poblete and Robert Poblete Broaddus, Jr.;

S. 2274. An act for the relief of Mario Lazzarotto;

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Genevieve M. Scott Bell;

S. 2346. An act for the relief of Lucy Hedwig Schultz;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of Carlos Olmos Chang and his wife, Maria Luisa Chin de Chang; and

S. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria H. Aguas and Buena M. Castro.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 6306) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.'" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 10, 1958.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on February 6, 1958, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, February 7, 1958, the following message:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the above-entitled bill.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on February 7, 1958, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, February 6, 1958, he did on February 7, 1958, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 7, 1958.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT as a Representative-elect to the 85th Congress from the 8th Congressional District of Tennessee, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Jere Cooper, has been received from the secretary of state of Tennessee, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

Mr. EVERETT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SMALL-BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2920) to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 (b) (1) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, is amended (1) by deleting the words "where a drought is occurring" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "affected by a drought or excessive rainfall," and (2) by inserting after the word "drought" where it occurs elsewhere the words "or excessive rainfall."

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

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee has unanimously approved a bill, S. 2920, which will extend the disaster-loan program of the Small Business Administration to small businesses in areas affected by excessive rainfall. This bill is a logical amplification of the amendment to the Small Business Act which provided loan eligibility to small businesses in areas suffering from drought.

The district which I represent and nearly every other area of the country have at one time or another felt the brunt of both drought and excessive rainfall. Fields have been parched in the hot sun and crops have failed. In another year the heavens were too generous and those same fields were barren because crops could not be planted, cultivated, or harvested because of excessive rainfall or had been inundated by rainfall which sluggish streams could not carry away. It is my understanding that excessive rainfall contemplates all such situations of crop loss and failure.

The temporary impact of such natural disasters is often devastating to an area's commerce and trade. The small businesses serving communities which suffer such catastrophes are oftentimes unable to withstand the blow they are dealt. If accounts cannot be paid by the people of a community, many businesses have no other choice but to close their doors. Obviously, the people who have lost their homes in floods are usually unable to meet their financial obligations until they can restore some kind of stability to their lives and their communities.

This bill would provide the broadened credit standards, terms of repayment, and low interest rates to these small-business victims in disaster areas. It is generally viewed here as a noncontroversial measure since it would provide some means for the economic rehabilitation of areas struck by the catastrophe of floods. Such loans would insure, in many cases, that local commerce and trade affected by such devastation would be preserved where otherwise the existence of the small-business elements in its composition would be threatened by disasters, however temporary their nature.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of this bill in the House of Representatives, I want to express my appreciation to the House Banking and Currency Committee for their prompt action in bringing this emergency legislation to the floor. It will eliminate a major flaw in the Small Business Administration Act which makes it impossible for that agency to make loans to businesses which have suffered economic losses because of excessive rainfall.

Rainfall in my district last year averaged approximately twice the normal amount. The resulting crop loss has been estimated at $100 million. Mississippi cotton production for 1957 was the lowest in 33 years. Between September 1, 1957, and January 1, 1958, the normal cotton-harvesting season, farmers were able to work in the fields an average of only 12 days. Similar conditions prevail in many other States of the Union.

This bill will accomplish nothing toward eliminating the major hardships which resulted from the 1957 disaster. That economic condition can be eased only by broad-scale long-term credit to farmers to cover their 1957 losses.

The bill before us will, however, keep a number of small businesses from going into bankruptcy through no fault of their own. They will be able to carry delinquent accounts only through some type of loan such as can be handled by the Small Business Administration. I hope the House will act on this bill without controversy.

Now that the Congress is enacting this change in the law, I certainly hope that the Small Business Administration will feel an obligation to administer this new authority with the sense of urgency and need that is necessary if economic disaster is not to be felt throughout many parts of the country.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is most necessary to extend the Small Business Act to encompass the authority for making loans to business establishments in areas adversely affected by excessive rainfall.

At the present time disaster loans may be made through the Small Business Administration in areas adversely affected by drought. It is hoped that the SBA may see fit to liberalize their policies to the end that small businesses which now face bankruptcy and liquidation may be given a lease on life and permitted to continue to operate.

The best example of the situation in which small business finds itself in the rain-drenched areas of eastern Arkansas is a telephone call I received a few nights ago. This businessman was unable to meet his obligations because of the fact that he had on his books quite a number of open accounts of farmers who had made only a part crop in 1957 and were unable to pay him the past-due accounts. This man has the know-how; he has been in business for many years and has been a successful operator of a mercantile establishment. He is faced, however, with having to close his doors if relief is not obtained in the legislation which is now before the House. He wants a loan that would accord him some few years to pay off in annual installments. This businessman has consistently earned a profit and expanded his business up until the most disastrous year of 1957.

Other small business is affected in the same manner as the general merchant; that is, implement dealers, feed, seed, and fertilizer dealers, as well as fuel and oil dealers and various other firms which sell to the farmer.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration will transmit to the field offices new instructions and policies which will make available loans to business enterprises which are so adversely hit in the area which suffered from heavy rainfall, low yield, and crop losses in 1957.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 8, the vote on H. R. 2151, a bill to suspend import duties on certain coarse wool, recorded on pages 1689–1690 of the RECORD, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present when H. R. 2151 was approved, I would have voted "no."

PROTECTION AGAINST JURISDICTIONAL EXCESSES OF TRIAL COURTS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request, a bill to remove the present provision of law which permits Federal courts to issue writs only in aid of their respective jurisdictions. It would amend section 1651 (a)

of title 28 of the United States Code to read as follows:

(a) The Supreme Court and all courts established by act of Congress may issue all necessary or appropriate writs where agreeable to the usages and principles of law.

I have been engaged in intermittent research and study of this matter since it was first brought to my attention early in January of last year by a constituent, Mr. Hugh B. Collins, attorney at law of Medford, Oreg.

In a letter to me on the subject Mr. Collins said last July:

The appellate courts hold that title 28, United States Code Annotated, section 1651 (a), prevent the appellate courts from supervising the district courts unless the latter are invading the jurisdiction of the appellate courts.

It is conceded that if it were not for the statute in its present form, the appellate courts could issue the writ to restrain a jurisdictional excess by a district court even though the district court were not invading the jurisdiction of the appellate court.

The purpose of the proposed statutory change is to give the appellate courts the power to keep the district courts within their proper jurisdictional boundaries regardless of whether or not the district courts happen to step on the toes of the appellate court instead of just stepping on the toes of a citizen. In the States where prohibition is used, the appellate court is given the power to protect the litigant from jurisdictional excesses of the trial courts. I can see no reason why the appellate courts of the United States should not to the same extent be open to the citizens.

I believe this is a matter which deserves careful consideration by the Congress and I have introduced the proposed legislation to this end.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS AREA

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the unemployment situation in the Minneapolis area as affected by the difficulties in the field of agriculture, and requesting legislation to improve this situation.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY ALDERMEN YOUNGDAHL, MCCRADY, WOLINSKI, ANDERSON, HALLORAN, CHRISTENSEN, EARL JOHNSON, NELSON, STEWART, AND PRESIDENT MARTENS RELATING TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN THE MINNEAPOLIS AREA AS AFFECTED BY THE DIFFICULTIES IN THE FIELD OF AGRICULTURE

Whereas unemployment in railroad shops, farm equipment factories and other industries in Minneapolis is seriously affecting the welfare of its citizens and the economy of the area; and

Whereas to some extent, the unemployment is related to the difficulties being experienced in the field of agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we request the Representatives and Senators in the Congress from Minnesota to exert their best efforts to secure expeditious legislation designed to alleviate and improve the agricultural situation, thereby reflecting improvement in other economic areas.

Further, that the city clerk be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member of the House and Senate in the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed January 31, 1958.

GEO. W. MARTENS,
President of the Council.

Approved February 4, 1958.

P. KENNETH PETERSON,
Mayor.

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the RECORD show that on rollcall No. 8, on the coarse-wool bill, if I had been present, I would have voted "yea." I was unavoidably absent from the District of Columbia on that day.

TAX CUT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday a Washington columnist, Fletcher Knebel, humorously said in 34 words what I recently tried to say in several hundred words. I quote:

Ike says maybe he'll urge a tax cut if business doesn't get better. This is like giving a lawnmower to a guy who has just lost his house and lot in an earthquake.

If a tax cut is considered to relieve the whole economy, if things get bad enough, it should seriously be considered right now for the relief of the automotive industry. On behalf of thousands of the unemployed automobile workers in Michigan, and the thousands more indirectly affected, I urge that early and thorough consideration be given to my suggestion that the excise tax on automobiles be repealed. This would provide equitable tax relief throughout our entire economy, an economy that actually rolls on the wheels of our automotive industry.

The press has also carried news about bills recently introduced in the other body to increase unemployment benefits. This may be part of the answer, but, to me, emphasis should be placed on constructive efforts to put the unemployed to work. You cannot put a band-aid on cancer and call the patient cured. Let us do something constructive to stimulate business instead of having the Government buy off this human and economic misery with dollars from the Treasury.

LIMIT ON FISCAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the President has wisely emphasized that the obvious need for larger appropriations for national security imposes upon both the Executive and the Congress the duty to do everything possible to eliminate unnecessary expenditures in other fields. We cannot put a price tag on what is to be done for national security. That we must have, and we must pay whatever is necessary for that purpose. At the same time we must economize where economy can be effected.

To emphasize this point, I am introducing today a simple resolution to add the following paragraph, lettered (c) to section 138 of the rules of the House:

(c) It is the sense of the House that appropriations and other budget authorizations for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1958, shall be so limited as to assure total expenditures of not to exceed $68 billion; that such increases as are necessary for the national defense shall be offset by economies in other less essential areas; and that the Appropriations Committee in its reports shall provide data pertinent to attainment of these objectives.

On the basis of information I have received from people I consider expert in their fields, $68 billion is a very reasonable target at which to shoot. I am confident that when hearings are held, the evidence will more than justify a reduction to that amount.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEPARTMENT OF LABOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request granted on Wednesday last, I call up House Joint Resolution 533, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, and I ask for its immediate consideration; and I also ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

Unemployment Compensation for Veterans

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for veterans," $25 million.

Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees," $18,400,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes to explain to the House that this is emergency legislation. The funds for

paying unemployed veterans and Federal employees who have lost their positions will run out by the middle of this month. That is why we are taking this up now. The President in his budget message January 13 of this year, estimated an additional $8 million would be needed this year for unemployment compensation for veterans. The actual request sent to Congress on January 22 was for $25 million.

The same thing applies for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. The President estimated $14,500,000 on January 13 and then requested $18,400,000 9 days later. So the total of these requests was twice the amount suggested by the President in his budget in the second week of January.

This legislation is needed; we must pass it immediately if we are to keep our word with these veterans and Federal employees. These sums will have to be appropriated so they can be paid at the middle of the month.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a supplemental appropriation request will be along for additional funds for construction work under Public Law 815, the school construction program in federally impacted areas. Can the gentleman give me any idea when the supplemental appropriation bill will be before the House?

Mr. FOGARTY. Hearings have been held on that item, but I understand there is one subcommittee which has not finished its hearings. As soon as they are finished we will be ready to bring the bill before the House. I am informed that it should be before the House in about 2 weeks.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for $25 million for unemployment compensation for veterans, and $18,400,000 for the same item for Federal employees. Frankly I do not see any possible way of appropriating these funds.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House the bill introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], having to do with the public works program.

Mr. Speaker, unless immediate action is taken by the Federal Government this country faces a downhill toboggan ride, one that will make more than the former Secretary of the Treasury's hair curl.

I am introducing this legislation to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements. This bill is the same legislation that Senator GORE of Tennessee recently introduced in the Senate, and is now known as the Gore-Flood bill.

I have lived with this problem in my district for many years and to those of you who have just recently begun to experience this depressing economic situation in your districts, I extend my condolences.

There have developed two schools of thought on this increasing unemployment situation throughout the country, which has reached 4 million and may go as high as 5 million. One takes the position that the employment picture will improve in about 6 months, and there is no consequent need for affirmative action by the Federal Establishment. The other school is that the economic situation will not improve until the Federal Government steps in to halt the increasing unemployment figures.

May I point out that the rapid increase in the numbers of unemployed is seriously draining the funds available for unemployment insurance.

Consequently, the Committee on Appropriations of the House today reported out to the full House membership a special supplementary appropriations bill to provide funds for the possible eventuality that unemployment insurance funds may become exhausted.

I urge that the supplementary appropriations bill be favorably acted upon so that those who are unemployed will not have to face the further suffering of being without unemployment compensation. This would come under the heading of double jeopardy.

With reference to my district of Luzerne County, Pa., we need help at once, not 6 months or a year from now—but now; last night was late. There are presently some 20,000 men out of work in Luzerne County with no possibility of obtaining employment because there is simply no employment to be had. This has been our economic fate for years and it will not improve unless this body in its wisdom, along with a sympathetic ear from the administration, comes to our aid.

The legislation which I propose is not a leaf raking program, but, is a program which would enable municipalities, many of whom are bankrupt and insolvent at the present time, to undertake necessary and worthwhile public works which have been delayed because of the lack of funds over the past number of years.

In my district, many of the municipalities at one time were in fair financial shape, but the constant decrease in anthracite coal production has made extremely serious inroads on their respective tax incomes. Just recently, you may have read or heard, the giant Glen Alden Corp., the biggest producer of anthracite coal in the world, has drastically cut back its operations and this development threatens to almost decimate the coal production in my area. This is a catastrophic situation, as you well may imagine.

I read with more than passing interest the stories which recently appeared in the press concerning what was termed "bread lines and soup kitchens" that were set up in certain cities because of the unemployment in those localities.

I do not wish to bore you with a recital of the problems in my district alone, but the unvarnished truth is that in my district of Luzerne County we have had a surplus food program in operation for a long time, and according to the latest tabulations 1 person in every 12 qualifies for this surplus food program so that they can keep body and soul together. It is hard to believe that this county would tolerate such a condition, but there it is for anyone who is interested to see. Call them by any name you will, but the truth is these are the bread lines of 1958.

I could enumerate some of the most pressing needs which are generally lacking throughout the Nation, but these you know as well as I.

I point out that enactment of this legislation would enable municipalities to build new schools and improve the old ones; construct, repair and improve streets and sidewalks; improve public parks and public recreational facilities; build rehabilitation and health centers, hospitals, water and sewer facilities; airports; river and harbor improvements, and flood control, navigation and hydroelectric power facilities.

Under this proposed program, when the administrator approves an application for Federal assistance, funds would be allotted to the appropriate State or local agency having responsibility for the project in a ratio of 90–10—90 Federal and 10 State.

In conclusion, if this country is to remain economically strong it will be necessary right now to take action to combat the mushrooming unemployment rolls. We have been giving missiles, satellites, rockets and other equally impressive scientific developments a great deal of our time because of their vital roles in the defense of this country and the free world. Now, as important as all those things are, I strongly urge that we give equal time and consideration to another segment of our civilization, namely, people who are badly in need of employment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10589) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Adair	Engle	May
Addonizio	Evins	Merrow
Albert	Fallon	Michel
Alger	Farbstein	Miller, Nebr.
Anfuso	Fino	Moore
Arends	Forand	Morano
Auchincloss	Ford	Morgan
Ayres	Forrester	Morrison
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Multer
Barden	Fulton	Mumma
Barrett	Garmatz	Neal
Bass, N. H.	Gavin	Nicholson
Baumhart	George	Nimtz
Beamer	Glenn	Norblad
Becker	Gordon	O'Konski
Bentley	Granahan	O'Neill
Berry	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Betts	Griffin	Patterson
Boland	Gubser	Pfost
Bosch	Hagen	Philbin
Bow	Halleck	Pilcher
Boykin	Harden	Poage
Bray	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
Breeding	Harvey	Price
Broomfield	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Brown, Ohio	Healey	Radwan
Brownson	Hébert	Rhodes, Ariz.
Buckley	Hess	Riehlman
Budge	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Burdick	Hoffman	Robison, N. Y.
Byrne, Ill.	Holland	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	James	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Jarman	Sadlak
Cederberg	Jenkins	Santangelo
Chelf	Jennings	Saylor
Chenoweth	Johansen	Scherer
Chiperfield	Kee	Scott, N. C.
Christopher	Kilday	Scudder
Clark	Kluczynski	Seely-Brown
Corbett	Knox	Sheehan
Coudert	Knutson	Sieminski
Cramer	Krueger	Siler
Curtis, Mo.	Lafore	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah	Laird	Smith, Miss.
Dempsey	Landrum	Stauffer
Dennison	Lankford	Teller
Derounian	Latham	Tewes
Devereux	Lesinski	Thomson, Wyo.
Dies	McCulloch	Utt
Dingell	McDonough	Van Pelt
Dollinger	McGovern	Van Zandt
Donohue	McGregor	Wainwright
Dooley	Macdonald	Walter
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Magnuson	Wilson, Ind.
Edmondson	Mason	Withrow

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 255 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10589, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959 and the smallest. This bill provides funds for 16 Government agencies. The total budget request before the committee was for $15,064,870. Last year, the bill provided $16,010,370. The committee recommends in this bill $14,808,870, which is $1,201,500 below the 1958 bill, and $256,000 below the budget request. Among other agencies provided for in this bill is the Battle Monuments Commission. That Commission constructs and maintains American cemeteries overseas for both World War I and World War II men who were killed in action. One of the finest administrators in Government that I have ever known is the executive secretary of that Commission, Maj. Gen. Thomas North. I think he has done a wonderful job with the construction program. He started out 12 years ago to construct 14 World War II cemeteries. At that time he estimated that the total construction cost would be approximately $38 million. The job has been completed at a cost of approximately $34 million, or $4 million less than originally estimated.

The Commission is now in the process of making aerial photographs of the World War II cemeteries. Within the next 2 or 3 months those pictures will be available, through Members of Congress, to the next of kin of those men who lie buried in those World War II cemeteries. On the picture will be a little individual inset of the headstone of the veteran who lies buried there.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides funds for the maintenance and operation of the White House. You will find there are 72 employees at the White House. Several days ago some columnist had a story pointing up the fact that there are 72 employees at the White House. The inference you gathered from that story was that the White House employment was too high. As a matter of fact, the number of employees there is at the same level today that it has been for many years. After all, it takes a great many people to maintain and care for the White House.

The report shows that last year over 960,000 visitors passed through the White House.

I do not know of anything controversial in this bill, Mr. Chairman, unless it could possibly affect a new Commission of Government which, when organized, will be known as the Civil Rights Commission. There are no funds in this bill for that Commission. The reason for that was that the President allocated $200,000 out of his emergency fund sometime since the 1st of September of last year for the operation of that Commission. The clerk of our committee called the White House today and was told that as of this date the obligations for the Commission are approximately $5,000. The Commission has not been organized. Commissioners have been appointed but have not been confirmed by the Senate. No staff director has been appointed. No employees have been hired.

The White House notified the staff director of our committee within the hour that there are no employees, except three or four persons on detail from other departments. How on earth could this committee appropriate money for an agency that is not in existence?

There was a budget request for $750,000. We do not know what it is needed for; we do not know that they will ever get a staff director. My information is that that position has been offered to at least six men but that they have all refused to accept the employment.

If this House were to make appropriations without justification to agencies that are not in existence, then I say to you it is a sad day for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. As one whose name appears on the bill that set up this Commission, I am naturally interested, and I ask these questions, shall I say, in all kindliness. I think what the gentleman has indicated seems very cogent, and I think I would have done the same thing were I in his place with reference to this Civil Rights Commission appropriation.

May I, however, ask: In view of the justification that is presented to the gentleman's subcommittee as the gentleman has outlined it should be, the Bureau of the Budget justifying an appropriation of a proper amount, a Director is appointed and the members of the Commission shall have been confirmed, is it the gentleman's intention then to make the recommendations for the proper appropriations?

Mr. ANDREWS. I will answer the gentleman in the same way the gentleman answered me last year when I asked him a question. I wish the gentleman would quote again that old Chinese proverb that he called my attention to. It had to do with crossing a stream when we get to it. Does the gentleman remember the quotation?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I remember the quotation. It was not Chinese, it was a Russian proverb.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish the gentleman would quote it for me again.

Mr. CELLER. "You don't roll up your pants until you come to the stream."

Mr. ANDREWS. That is it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I think, nonetheless, it is necessary and appropriate that we get some intimation that the course which I have indicated would be followed, because Members who are interested in the setting up of this Commission and who are interested in seeing

the appropriation made would like to have some assurance somewhere from somebody. That very well could come from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or other members of the committee so that we will not be indulging in mere shadowboxing and that there will be forthcoming actual appropriations. Otherwise, I take it, a motion will be made by somebody this afternoon to appropriate the money. We will have then come to the stream and we will have to roll up our pants. So I hope the gentleman will take the time to reassure us.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not think I can do anything.

Mr. CELLER. We have reached the stream and I want to roll up my pants.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not think we have reached the stream. We do not have the Commission; no Commissioner has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CELLER. But the names of the Commissioners have been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. ANDREWS. But not confirmed.

Mr. CELLER. I simply asked whether or not in the gentleman's opinion we should not have some assurance. Otherwise we will be confronted with a fact and not a condition. We feel it might be ill advised to offer such an amendment at this time, but we would be constrained to have such an amendment offered if we do not get some assurance such as I have just suggested. Will the gentleman tell me that we can get what we expect in the way of appropriations in accordance with the wish of this body and the other body in pursuance of the bill that was passed?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from New York understands that this appropriation was not denied, it was merely deferred, and as soon as conditions permit, as soon as the administration, belatedly, gives the matter some attention, as soon as a chairman is provided and a secretary appointed and a staff mobilized and justifications are submitted, the item will receive every consideration.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In connection with the colloquy between the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New York, it should be added that it is my information from reliable sources in the White House that at the same time when this call was made to the staff member of the subcommittee it was stated to him that Dr. Hannah, Chairman of this Commission, would be available at any time to testify in substantiation of the request which had been made; and that a few days ago this same staff member called back and told the one who had sought to make this arrangement that it would not be necessary for Dr. Hannah to appear. Therefore, there appears to have been no opportunity given to the members of this Commission or to their Chairman to appear before this subcommittee in substantiation of their request.

Mr. YATES. Is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. I know nothing about that. I have not been consulted in the matter at all.

Mr. YATES. May I ask the gentleman whether or not to his knowledge the statement that was made by the gentleman from New York is correct?

Mr. FENTON. I do not know.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman does not know anything about that?

Mr. FENTON. No.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I understand that the call was made to the White House and they said there was nobody to testify to it, there was no staff director appointed.

Mr. FENTON. I know nothing about it. I was not called up. It is news to me here this morning.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand that a member of the White House staff called Mr. Michaels, the staff member of this subcommittee, and stated that Mr. Hannah would be available at any time they wanted him; that later on Mr. Michaels stated that the chairman had said it would not be necessary for Dr. Hannah to come up here. That was the end of the story until the bill was marked up.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. That call was not made by the White House staff, but the staff assistant of our subcommittee called the White House and asked them if they had someone who could testify as to the needs of the Commission. They said no, that no staff secretary had been appointed, but that Mr. Hannah would be available to outline the plans of the Commission at an appropriate time. No request was ever made of the committee for anyone to appear before it.

Mr. TABER. I know of no record of how the call was made beyond what I said.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Somebody—I do not know who it was—called our staff assistant here, Mr. Michaels, who relayed the message to me, that Dr. Hannah was in Michigan but would come down here and appear before the committee. Mr. Michaels told me we needed a staff member, and I agreed with him. Now, we do not go out looking for witnesses, and we do not want anybody before the committee who does not know the makeup of the Commission and what the needs are. That was 6 weeks ago.

Mr. TABER. That part of it occurred 6 weeks ago, but I thought that the whole picture should be put in the open. Frankly, in my opinion, the bill ought to be taken off the floor at the conclusion of general debate and the committee go ahead and hear the witnesses that can be produced on the subject so that they will have something to work on and the House will have the information as to what the need might be.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], the chairman of this subcommittee, has explained H. R. 10589. Generally speaking, the membership of the committee is in accord. This is the smallest amount of money asked for by any regular supply bill of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations and reflects the money necessary for the Executive Office of the President. I regret that hearings were going on in both the Subcommittee of the Interior and this particular subcommittee at the same time. Being a member of both subcommittees, naturally it was impossible for me to be present at all the hearings of either subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, out of a request for appropriations for general Government matters of $15,814,870 the subcommittee allowed $14,808,870 for fiscal 1959.

This is a reduction of $1,006,000 itemized as follows:

Office of Defense Mobilization, $206,000.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, $50,000.

Commission on Civil Rights, $750,000.

The latter—$750,000 for civil rights—was disapproved mainly because no one came from the Commission to justify that amount. The committee therefore thought it better to hold off on this item until there was some effort to justify same.

The Office of Defense Mobilization was cut back to the same amount of money that was given them for the current fiscal year, $2,214,000.

They had asked for $206,000 more than the current year, of which $135,000 was to cover continued regional representation for the ODM.

They had planned for 8 regional offices, each of which would support an executive officer and 1 secretary. They now have 10 regions staffed by an executive officer and a secretary which are supplied by other departments and agencies.

We were told that under this arrangement the other departments and agencies were becoming restive and they thought it wise to request funds—specifically—for the support of these regional committees in a single budget and not rely on the other agencies to supply personnel. However, the committee held to the amount given in the current fiscal year.

It was also brought out in the committee that in addition to the request for $2,420,000 for ODM that certain functions of the ODM have been delegated to other agencies to finance civil defense and mobilization functions of Federal agencies.

These agencies are listed on pages 52 and 53 of the hearings.

It was thought by the committee that hereafter those agencies should be represented at the hearings to justify their estimates for appropriations in this bill.

The committee went into the possible termination of certain programs of ODM such as stockpiling and rapid amortization. The rapid-amortization program is supposed to terminate December 1959 but there is a lot of work to be done in the field of postcertification action—either amending the certificates for an increase or a decrease in the amount of the certificate—as experience determines what the cost of construction will be.

As for stockpiling, we were told that as far as most items in the strategic and critical categories were concerned the objectives had been met.

However, there were still a few items—such as mica and beryl that would have to be continued until June 1962 although they have shifted from 5- to 3-year programs in most instances—thereby having their objectives reduced.

It is interesting to note that there will be an unobligated balance in the revolving fund of $59,499,000 as of June 30, 1959. There is language in this bill rescinding the unobligated balance in the revolving fund as of that date.

The budget estimates for the compensation of the President, the White House Office, special projects, Executive Mansion and grounds, Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, and the emergency fund for the President—national defense—were granted in full by the subcommittee.

As previously stated, the only cut made in the Executive Office of the President was the Office of Defense Mobilization in the amount of $206,000.

On the other hand, the Bureau of the Budget's estimate of $1,500,000 for special projects reflects an increase of $125,000 over fiscal 1958.

It also estimates an increase of $15,000 in appropriations for the Executive Mansion and grounds on the current year—$415,000 for fiscal 1959 as against $400,000 for 1958.

We also allowed the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization $57,500, the budget estimate, which is an increase of $7,500 over the $50,000 appropriated for fiscal 1958.

These increases for those 3 Executive Office items amount to $147,500 over fiscal year 1958.

As we understand it, the special projects fund is used by the President for staff assistance on special problems which arise from time to time but cannot be considered the responsibility of an existing agency. Examples of the type of assistance provided during the current year are projects on the coordination of the Nation's scientific effort, disarmament, and coordination of public-works planning.

The increase of $15,000 for the Executive Mansion and grounds reflects the cost of conversion of those employees occupying positions in the trades and crafts from an annual rate of pay to an hourly rate of pay consistent with rates prevailing in this area.

It is interesting to note that there is an estimated 964,544 visitors to the Executive Mansion in this fiscal year.

The increase of $7,500 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization is due to the fact that one of the full-time employees returned to the Committee after being away the first half of fiscal 1958.

I want to join with the chairman of this subcommittee and the other members of the committee in congratulating Maj. Gen. Thomas North and his staff for the fine work they have accomplished in our American cemeteries.

This program was started in 1948 at an estimated cost of $36,700,000, plus overhead.

Today, General North computes that the program will be completed for $32,319,000, which amount includes several other items not originally considered—such as repairing the monument at Brest, the memorials at Hawaii, the west coast and the east coast—plus the overhead.

There will be an estimated unobligated balance on June 30, 1958, of $3,373,512 for construction. Hence no new construction money is being asked for fiscal 1959.

The budget request for $1,250,000 for salaries and expenses was allowed by the subcommittee.

The Commission expects to complete the work assigned it by 1960, with the possible exception of the Hawaii and the east coast projects, which should take them into 1960.

As to the emergency fund for the President (national defense), the status of the present fiscal year's emergency fund as of January 6, 1958, is a balance of $725,000.

Out of the $1 million appropriated for fiscal year 1958, the following allocations were made:

Office of Defense Mobilization (July 11, 1957)	$25,000
General Services Administration (Sept. 28, 1957)	50,000
Commission on Civil Rights, Jan. 6, 1958	200,000
Total	275,000

The subcommittee disallowed the budget request of $750,000 for the Commission on Civil Rights because no one representing the Commission appeared before us to justify the request.

The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], asked the Bureau of the Budget representative, Mr. Merriam, who appeared before us, "Why could not the funds required for the Civil Rights Commission have been obtained through the usual channels of a supplemental appropriation bill?"

The explanation was that the civil-rights bill was enacted into law and signed by the President after the close of Congress and that there was no opportunity at the time either to request or to have the Congress act upon a request for appropriations.

There is a requirement in the law that a report be prepared and submitted to the Congress 2 years from the enactment of the law. That would be September 9, 1959.

It was therefore felt by the Commission that in order to meet the deadline which Congress required they would have to get their staff work underway immediately. It was on this basis that the request was made and granted by the President on January 6, 1958, for $200,000 from his emergency fund to get them started.

The $25,000 item for the Office of Defense Mobilization was for the completion of the project dealing with the study of military and nonmilitary defense, known as the Gaither report of the Gaither study.

The $50,000 to the General Services Administration was for the expense of representing the Government agencies in rate proceedings before Federal, State, and local regulatory bodies in connection with communication services required for the SAGE system.

With reference to the Subversive Activities Control Board, the committee recommends an appropriation of $375,000, the budget estimate, and the same amount for the current fiscal year. The status of the future of this Board is dependent upon the ultimate decision to be made in the Communist Party case. Hearings in this case were started in April 1951. In April 1953 the Board issued the first order. After that, it was sent to the circuit court, and finally it went to the Supreme Court. It was remanded to the circuit court by the Supreme Court because of three witnesses—Matusow, Johnson, and Crouch whose credibility had come under attack. The circuit court remanded it back to the Board to do one of two things, to either reopen the case and let the Communist Party of the United States impeach those three people or to expunge their testimony and then reevaluate the case and see if the Board could reach the same decision. The Board did expunge the testimony of the three witnesses in question, and sent their modified opinion back to the court of appeals. It remains in the court of appeals because of a subsequent decision of the Supreme Court in the Jencks case and a statute which relates to the production of Government documents. All the decisions are now stopped on account of the last remand, especially 2 or 3 other important cases. There are, I believe, seven additional cases, front cases, up in the circuit court—all awaiting the ultimate decision of the Communist Party case as to whether the Board will be upheld in its original findings and its constitutionality by the Supreme Court.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand there is to be $375,000 appropriated for this Subversive Control Board?

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What about the caseload of this Board? Do I understand that they anticipate only 6 to 10 new cases will be handled next year?

Mr. FENTON. For the current year and the next fiscal year, that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Is that not a rather large appropriation for a caseload of 6 to 10 cases?

Mr. FENTON. I suppose that the Board is doing a great deal of preliminary work on cases, but their decisions are tied up until this case of the Communists is finished.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me that $375,000 is a lot of money for the workload that they have.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would point out to the gentleman that these cases are very, very complicated and very lengthy. Hearings are held all over the country. The purpose of these hearings, as the gentleman knows, is to determine whether or not an organization is a Communist-front organization.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand the purpose of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Commission, of course, has no control over the volume of its work. Cases are referred to the Commission by the Attorney General.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, if I may.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the gentleman can find the details with reference to the question he asks on page 80 and page 85 in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, the Office of Defense Mobilization asked for 41 more employees; is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee approve more money for this personnel increase?

Mr. FENTON. No, they got the same amount of money and what they do with the money is up to them.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The committee did not authorize an increase in personnel. Now if I may ask the gentleman another question. The Science Advisory Committee, as I understand it, has been in the Office of Defense Mobilization; is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And has been moved out during the last year; is that right?

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. How does the appropriation for the Science Advisory Committee stack up with the appropriation of last year? The Office of Defense Mobilization performed housekeeping chores for the Science Advisory Committee and I am just wondering whether there was a reduction or an increase when they moved out on the part of the ODM or any increase in the Science Advisory Committee?

Mr. FENTON. Of course this had nothing to do with that, except the housekeeping part of it.

Mr. GROSS. Of course ODM had to furnish certain employees; did it not?

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman is referring to their Gaither report?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to the Science Advisory Committee.

Mr. FENTON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. They produced the Gaither report, of which we have heard practically nothing. Is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this week marks a special occasion. This week we celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator. During this week the members of the Republican Party will gather throughout the length and breadth of our Nation and boast about the gains that have been made in the field of civil rights because of their activities. They will declare themselves the great champions of civil rights and they will denounce the Democrats for having hindered the program. In their own party counsels such contentions will be well received, because there will be no opposition party to present the true facts and to set the record straight. But in the discussion on this bill, the opportunity is presented to put forward the situation as it actually exists and the record of the Republican Party is a sorry one indeed.

Last year, for the first time in 85 years, a civil-rights bill was enacted. An integral part of that bill was the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights which was to investigate violations of the civil rights of American citizens and to report on the same. Under the terms of the bill, the life of the Commission was to be 2 years. Inasmuch as the bill was signed into law on September 9, 1957, the date of expiration is September 9, 1959, plus a period of grace of 60 days thereafter during which time the Commission was to present its final report.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. GARY. You mean the Republicans will be making those speeches in the North. They will not make any of them in the South.

Mr. YATES. I am pleased to have the gentleman's correction and of course he is right. The Republicans make much of the fact that the Democratic Party opposes legislation in the field of civil rights. It is true that the Democrats from the South have consistently voted against civil-rights measures. It is equally true that the Republicans from the South have voted and vote against all civil-rights measures, and if the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle who continue to make such assertions will examine the voting records, they will learn that which I am sure they already know, namely, that Republican Members from Virginia, from Texas, from Florida—from all States where a Republican has broken through the longstanding southern tradition of electing Democrats—such Republicans invariably will vote in the same way as their Democratic colleagues from the same State. Members from the South do not vote on the basis of party—they vote on the basis of the mores and customs of their particular community.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which has jurisdiction of this bill has already been criticized because it has made no money available for the Commission on Civil Rights. The report shows that the committee deferred action on this appropriations item. It deferred action because the executive branch did not even present the slightest justification for the appropriation and this Appropriations Subcommittee believed that it had no alternative except to deny the budget request. Had I been a member of the subcommittee, I probably would have come to a different conclusion. In all probability, I would have voted to make money available or in the alternative, would have insisted that the executive branch take steps immediately to implement the civil-rights bill which the Congress passed last year.

That bill was enacted into law on September 9, 1957. Four months have already gone by and yet the Commission on Civil Rights has not been organized. This is a sorry mess. The Commission has not hired a single employee and I know of no reason why the Commissioners who have been appointed could not have taken the first steps to activate the Commission, even though they have not yet been confirmed by the Senate in accordance with the law. The White House has done nothing to push the matter.

In an effort to learn what was going on, I called the Commission this morning and learned that it has no employees of its own. There have been 2 employees allocated to it from other departments, 1 from the State Department and 1 from Treasury. Commissioners who have been nominated by the President will appear before the appropriate Senate committee on February 24.

I was referred to a Mr. Price, one of the assistants in the White House, who is supposed to be in charge of the Commission. Mr. Price told me there is no Director and that the Commission has no employees of its own. He said that he had spoken to Mr. Michael, who is the clerk for the Appropriations Subcommittee having jurisdiction of this bill, and Mr. Michael asked him to send someone to the committee to justify the appropriations request. Mr. Price told the committee clerk that he had no one with direct knowledge of the operation of the Commission, but that Acting Chairman Hannah could be called, if need be. The clerk replied that the committee would prefer someone who could give the organizational details about the committee. Mr. Hannah, made no appearance. As of this time, no testimony has been given to the committee as to what funds are needed and why. In the absence of any kind of a showing, would the committee be well advised to approve the President's request of $750,000? If it did so, it would be the first time to my knowledge that an Appropriations Committee has so acted.

The contention has been made that Mr. Hannah was not invited to testify and that he should have been invited. If Mr. Hannah is the strongest witness that the administration has who knows about the operation of this Commission, obviously he should have testified and the administration should have brought

him in. The fact is that there was a hearing on this appropriation, if one can call what transpired a hearing, and it appears on page 103 of the published hearings. If you examine that page you will see that Mr. Robert Merriam, Assistant to the Director of the Budget Bureau, attempted to justify the appropriation but it was most incomplete. A perusal of this testimony must lead to the conclusion that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the proposed operation of the Commission to warrant the committee approving the request.

In the supplemental report which was sent down to the Congress by the White House on January 2, the following appears, on page 8, under Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission on Civil Rights was established by Public Law 85–315, approved September 9, 1957.

Its final report to the President and to the Congress is due not later than September 9, 1959, and the Commission ceases to exist 60 days thereafter.

In view of the present time limitation it was necessary that the Commission begin its operation at the earliest possible date, and an allocation from the Emergency Fund of the President was made available to the Commission until an appropriation could be provided. This proposed appropriation is to cover expenses of the Commission for the fiscal year 1958 including repayment of the Emergency Fund of the President for the initial financing.

You will note that in this budget message, the President points out that time is of the essence with respect to the functioning of the Commission on Civil Rights; and yet, even today, the White House has not organized the Commission on Civil Rights. The White House is apparently not as much persuaded of the urgency of the situation as its message would indicate.

The President's budget contains a most general table of organization for the expenditure of $750,000 for the Commission on Civil Rights. There are not sufficient details presented upon which the Appropriations Committee can act. Those of us who favor civil-rights legislation and want to see the Civil Rights Commission operating promptly and effectively want to vote funds for the purpose, but we are being hamstrung by the inaction of the Executive. Even if we voted funds for the operation of the Commission, it is apparent that the Executive is in no position to utilize the funds. It has no director, it has no staff. There is not even a skeleton, let alone a commission. The White House is guilty of almost complete default in this matter.

And yet the While House will continue to pose as the great champion of civil rights. Even though gross inaction has marked the attitude of the White House toward the Civil Rights Commission, a flood of oratory will flow through the country this week presenting the Republicans as paladins of those deprived of their civil rights and castigating the Democrats for their opposition. A few weeks ago the Vice President of the United States declared to a Republican gathering that the Republican Party had been instrumental in bringing a civil-rights program to fruition. Words—nothing more. The facts show that the White House has been derelict in failing to press for continued implementation of civil rights in our Nation. Once again we have a repetition of the classic White House "fire and fall back" tactics.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that the administration is leaving its job to be performed by the Congress. If necessary, we will perform it, but certainly the people should know how inadequate and dilatory have been the White House efforts in this field.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I thoroughly am in accord with the gentleman, that the White House is dragging its feet on this matter, but I would like to gain some enlightenment on the following, and I refer to the bill, page 6, lines 15 to 23:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the 85th Congress, 2d sess., and 86th Congress, 1st sess., and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate, or House of Representatives, or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Now, it was considered by the Committee on Appropriations of this body, and it was apparently denied; at least no appropriaton was recommended.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman permit me to reply to that statement?

Mr. CELLER. Certainly.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman will recall the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, a few moments ago to the effect that it had not been denied. He said the appropriation had been deferred only, deferred until the executive branch presented a proper justification for the appropriation.

Mr. CELLER. I am asking for enlightenment. I know that on page 4 of the report there are words to the effect that the appropriation has been deferred. Now, what is meant by "deferred"? Is that a word of the art? Has it been interpreted in any way? Can the committee do anything to approve or disapprove? What can the committee do? I never heard of a deferral in law. What does it mean?

Mr. YATES. Let me point out this very important fact: The appropriation to which the gentleman refers is the emergency fund for the President. The emergency fund for the President is not the same as the appropriation for the Commission on Civil Rights. Thus, even in the event that the word "deferred" were interpreted to mean "denied," it would apply only to an appropriation for the emergency fund of the President.

It would not apply to an appropriation for the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. CELLER. Does not that appropriation refer to the general appellation "funds appropriated to the President"?

Mr. YATES. Unless I am in error—and I wish the chairman of the committee would correct me if I am wrong—this appropriation is not applicable to the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. ANDREWS. I did not get the question.

Mr. YATES. The question is whether or not an appropriation for the Commission on Civil Rights would be a separate appropriation than one which comes under the emergency fund for the President?

Mr. ANDREWS. It would be a separate appropriation.

Mr. YATES. It would be a separate appropriation, so that the proviso that appears in lines 15 to 23 would not be applicable to an appropriation for the Commission on Civil Rights?

Mr. GARY. That is correct. The language has not been changed since 1943. It was placed in the bill in 1943 and has been in there ever since. This is not new language.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I was a little startled when I saw that language in the bill and I checked the public laws for Government agency appropriation bills for the last 5 years. This proviso has always been in the bill. It is not a special proviso inserted in this bill for the specific purpose of preventing funds from being appropriated to the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. GARY. It was put in the law in 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that whatever action, little as has been taken by the White House, has been taken under the President's emergency fund?

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The President has allocated $200,000 for this purpose, of which only $5,000 has been spent to date. Most of this has been spent for the traveling expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights for their meetings. There has been no allocation of funds for the employment or any staff or staff director.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Assuming that there is no separate appropriation achieved here today for the Civil Rights Commission, this language would preclude for the moment at least, the President using further funds from his emergency fund?

Mr. YATES. I don't believe so. This is an appropriation bill for fiscal 1959. Therefore, I would assume that the President can continue to use these funds during fiscal 1958. It is important that the House provide funds for fiscal 1959. The fact that the committee has not done so is due to White House inaction. I regret very much that the White House has delayed and not presented the justification. We should be approving an appropriation for the Commission today.

Mr. GARY. If this language would bar the President from using those funds it would have barred the use of the $200,000 he has already used.

Mr. YATES. Presumably that item had not yet been considered by either the

House or Senate or by the Appropriations Committee of the House or Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, am curious about the use of the word "defer." I notice it is being used with increasing frequency in connection with countries which do not want to pay their debts to the United States.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I read the language on page 6, I find the statement: "during the 85th Congress, 2d session," which is the present session of this Congress?

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. McCARTHY. If such appropriation is denied, the President would then be precluded from using his emergency fund. It would seem to me this would apply to any emergency fund he might wish to use from this time. The only proper construction is since this request has been submitted to the Appropriations Committee, the failure of the House to specifically put in any money for this Commission would constitute the denial of a request for funds?

Mr. YATES. I would not think so, in view of the language in the committee report that action on the appropriation is being deferred. I do not construe this to be a denial. But it is most unfortunate that the executive branch provoked this confusion by failing to present a proper budget justification.

An adequate justification should be made promptly so that sufficient funds can be appropriated to permit the Commission to perform an effective job.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to engage in a political debate with the gentleman from Illinois about the civil rights bill or what members of what parties voted for it or what members voted against it. The record of that is very clear and speaks for itself as to how that bill was supported and opposed.

I do think it is desirable to get this debate in a little clearer perspective and to bring out one or two points regarding the failure to make any appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission. The names of the members of this commission, all of them outstanding men drawn geographically from all sections of the country, were sent up some time ago to the other body for action, and, as has been pointed out here, there will not even be a hearing on their confirmation until the 24th of February.

Now, in the first place, normally a new commission of this kind cannot do anything very constructive until it has been confirmed and the appointees know that they are going to be the members. I anticipate that there may be prolonged debate over whether these men will be selected or not. But, despite that general practice, this commission has had meetings; it is trying to organize; a number of people have been interviewed for the staff, and with the understanding that they were not fully organized, it was represented to this subcommittee that the chairman of the commission, Dr. Hannah, would be available at any time to testify as to the plans of the commission and as to the need for the funds amounting to $750,000 which had been requested. The answer was, according to the gentleman from Alabama, that it was necessary to have a staff member come up; that they did not care to hear the chairman of the commission but wanted to hear a staff member.

I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this body, to the fact that this appropriation bill covers many commissions. It covers the Bureau of the Budget, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Subversive Activities Control Board, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and many others, and I apprehend that the RECORD will indicate that in all of those cases members of those bodies were the principal witnesses. True, they may have been attended by the staff, but the thing that the Committee on Appropriations is interested in and should be interested in is that the responsible people in charge of the particular activity shall testify and make themselves heard as to the need for the funds. And, on that basis the chairman of this commission held himself available to be heard, whereupon a few days ago a call came in that it would not be necessary for him to come up to be heard. It does not seem to me too much for him to have assumed that there would be no question about this appropriation, or he would have been called as a witness.

Let no member of the Committee on Appropriations, let no one of them avoid the responsibility for the failure to provide the funds by saying that a staff member had to be called. That is contrary to the normal practice in such matters.

It has a hollow ring. Now, I agree that hearings should be held. I think, therefore, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made the only sensible suggestion for a solution here, that at the end of general debate the committee rise and that hearings be immediately held on this request. I am authorized to say, Mr. Chairman, that a member of the Commission with a staff adviser will appear at any time before this subcommittee to outline as best he can, as an unconfirmed public servant, just how this commission plans to function, what they plan to do with the funds, what their plans are for staff, for quarters and any other details regarding which this committee would like information. They have already been allocated some 30-odd offices and they are ready to be heard at any time the committee desires to hear them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am a member of this subcommittee but unfortunately was down with a severe cold and laryngitis and at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda at the time. I found myself in that situation in which no Member of Congress should ever find himself—I could not talk. I spent about 10 days absolutely unable to speak. I am glad that the attention I received out there restored my voice. They always do a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I did not participate in the meetings of this subcommittee when this matter was up. I found when I came back from the hospital that the bill had been marked up the day preceding. The full committee met on the bill the other day. With reference to the colloquy had a few moments ago between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], as to the general provisions of the bill, an amendment was offered in the full Committee on Appropriations by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] to restore the $750,000. That amendment was defeated in the committee because there were perhaps no more than half of the membership of the full Committee on Appropriations in attendance. Some members voted for it.

Mr. Chairman, I have this comment to make. I want to say, frankly, I think somebody has been derelict in his duty, on the executive or administrative side, in failing to see that justifications and explanations were sent to the committee. I do not know who it is. I do not know whether it was just a slipup or an intentional oversight or whether it was just carelessness. But someone should have been there from the executive side. It is somewhat difficult from the appropriations angle for any committee to recommend an appropriation of money, a request for which has not been justified and no case made.

Mr. Chairman, let us look a little further here. In this particular matter, a commission has been appointed. The Commission can function without regard to the fact that they have not yet been confirmed by the other body. They can function up until the point where someone has been refused confirmation and that individual whose confirmation has been refused may no longer act. But the Commission can function.

They are attempting to hire a staff director, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] said, it was offered to several persons and turned down. They are still trying to get a director. This is still no reason to deny funds—perhaps the reason the Commission cannot get a director is the fact no man will take the job until he knows the Commission has the money to pay him.

Mr. Chairman, I think since we passed the law a year ago the responsibility rests with the Congress of the United States to provide the money so they may go ahead with the work of this Commission. Without trying to place the blame, without trying to say that the White House slipped up or that the White House did not see to it that supporting evidence was submitted to the committee, without regard to how it happened, we would be short-circuiting that law which we passed last year if we

did not give them the money now with which to function.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here which I am prepared to offer. I would much rather see this House keep its record clear and if the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] were carried out, that immediately upon the close of general debate the committee would rise and, since it is up to the minority to make a motion to recommit, to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to hold hearings forthwith on this matter, we could bring it back within a week or 10 days after the hearings and have a sensible solution of this problem.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is the situation in which the committee finds itself: The language of the appropriation that was passed last year provided:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the 85th Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

What does that mean? That language, with the statement that the money shall not be available on a project that has been rejected by the Committee on Appropriations of either body, mean that the $200,000 which has been allocated cannot be provided.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is the gentleman's opinion, I take it, that the $200,000 which has been appropriated may not be used?

Mr. TABER. That has been allotted.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That has been allotted; and that the impediment created by this language goes so far as to go through the 86th Congress?

Mr. TABER. The language that is here before the House at the moment goes so far as to include the 86th Congress, first session. On the other hand, let me say to the gentleman that right after the words "Eighty-fifth Congress" in the new bill the words "second session, and Eighty-sixth Congress, first session," are inserted in the bill that is presented before the House. Those words were not in the current fiscal year's operations. The gentleman understands that situation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. So that this does definitely make impossible further operation without an appropriation if this language is accepted?

Mr. TABER. That is right. Under those circumstances I should like to see the committee do what I suggested a while back.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the answer the gentleman gave the gentleman from New Jersey, is the gentleman of the opinion that the President could not allocate funds during this fiscal year from his emergency fund for carrying out the purposes of the Commission on Civil Rights because of the language that is in the bill for the fiscal year 1959?

Mr. TABER. Because of the operation of the Committee on Appropriations in rejecting this item last Friday.

Mr. YATES. The Committee on Appropriations rejected the item insofar as it appertained to the appropriations bill for the next fiscal year. Therefore, it would not be applicable to the funds for this fiscal year, would it?

Mr. TABER. Certainly it would, because the allocation was made out of the funds for this fiscal year and that law was in effect, and it already has been accomplished by the rejection of the language relating to this situation in the motion that was made last Friday.

Mr. YATES. May I point out to the gentleman that this bill will not become a law before some months to come. Therefore, until it becomes a law, certainly the President may use his funds for this year.

Mr. TABER. He may use them, but not for an item that has been rejected by the Committee on Appropriations. I think that is clearly correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHELLEY. In view of the fact that the full committee rejected the motion, that has already been accomplished; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That has already been accomplished, and that is the law that is enforced at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The use of the word "defer" is merely a play on words; is it not? Essentially what happened was a denial.

Mr. TABER. The thing that happened that was the denial, was the rejection of the motion to put the thing into the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Precisely.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation which was created or rather that is what created the situation. The language in the report about the deferment would have no effect whatever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. In connection with the use of the so-called emergency funds of the President, would the language as presently set out here prohibit the President from using any of the funds contained therein for the purpose of financing the meeting, to be held on February 25 by Eric Johnston and some 600 stooges, to organize and sell the American public on foreign aid?

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about any estimate for the purpose of spending that money that has been presented to the Congress. I do not know of any action by the Committee on Appropriations or the Congress that would fit into the gathering that the gentleman suggests.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman that we have the Dworshak amendment to the Mutual Security Act which prohibits the use of funds appropriated for that purpose, for the propagandizing or publicizing the foreign aid programs. Does the gentleman think, if the President used money for that purpose, that he would be flying in the face of the clear intent of the Congress or does he not think so?

Mr. TABER. I would want to see the language involved. But that is another item that is not under consideration by the House at this time.

Mr. GROSS. No funds are specified here, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman states that the Committee on Appropriations having denied the motion for funds for the Commission on Civil Rights last Friday that that acts as a barrier to further action by the President this year because of the provision of this language. I will cite to the gentleman what the language says. It says:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project—

And so forth.

Mr. TABER. I read the language a little while ago that is in effect at the present time with reference to this $1 million appropriation.

Mr. YATES. But I suggest to the gentleman that the motion which was made was a motion to allocate funds for the next fiscal year and not the funds that the gentleman was speaking about.

Mr. TABER. That was an appropriation request which was submitted to the Congress for the particular purpose for which these funds have been allocated and, therefore, it applies.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount of the President's funds for this purpose is $200,000.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Of that they have spent about $5,000; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Is the gentleman from New York of the opinion that the balance remaining in the amount roughly of $195,000 is not to be touched any further for this purpose?

Mr. TABER. That would be my understanding.

Mr. RABAUT. Does it not refer to this appropriation, which is an appropriation into the future?

Mr. TABER. It refers to any function or project for which function or project the budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted, pursuant to law, during the 85th Congress, and such appropriation denied after consideration by the Senate or the House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either House.

Mr. RABAUT. But what about the language in the proposition before us last Friday, that refers to this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. That is when that happened on Friday. That

action results in the end of the authority to use funds from that particular source for the operation of this Commission.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that the Commission could use the remaining $195,000 of the $200,000 that the President has already allocated to the Commission. That money is now in the hands of the Commission.

Mr. TABER. Well, I doubt that.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The money was also for immediate use. The amount involved in this bill is for the fiscal year 1959. That amount has not yet been denied or rejected, but the House committee has deferred action according to the report of the committee until they could get additional justification.

Mr. TABER. The fact is that the committee rejected the request for the appropriation. That is the thing we have got to consider. That is what we are up against.

Mr. GARY. The report of the committee does not say so.

Mr. TABER. I know what the report of the committee says, but the action of the committee was simply a rejection of the motion that was offered by the gentleman from Chicago.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The action of the committee is expressed in the report. We use the report to convince every section of the Government. We say, "Put this in the report." In the report we say, "Not acted upon but deferred."

Mr. TABER. But it was acted upon. It was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. But what we want to be certain of here is this: I think it would be very, very necessary for the Congress to be informed about the balance of this $200,000 from the President's fund; whether or not that is denied from now on, or whether that is still usable for the purposes of this Commission.

Mr. TABER. The only thing I can say is that the gentleman read the language that was in the bill last year, because that is what governs.

Mr. RABAUT. Downstairs the committee was in executive session.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Here is the report of their executive action. It reads, on page 4:

> The committee has deferred action on the estimate of $750,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission.

Mr. TABER. But the record of the committee will show that that motion to insert the item in the bill was rejected. That is what would govern.

Mr. RABAUT. It was the executive action of the committee at that time. The special committee presented it, but that is what the committee had before it.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I did not vote for the bill which carries the authority for this Commission, but I have this feeling, that we have got to provide for the operation of that Commission and provide funds for it. I am in hopes that that Commission will come with some recommendations that may smooth out some of the difficulties that the Congress and the country are facing in that situation. I would like to see the thing put in shape so that we could face the country and say, "We have done what we could to straighten out that situation." For that reason I feel that what we ought to do is to go back, after you get through with the general debate on this bill—go back into committee and have a hearing on this item right away and bring back a report on it, if they make out a case for it. I do not like to see this matter acted upon here and adopted or rejected without any hearing whatsoever; I think it is a great mistake and a very bad practice for the Appropriations Committee to get into a situation where it allows the House to come to a decision on a thing of this kind without any hearings whatsoever and without any justification as to what the money is going to be used for. For that reason and in the interest of orderly procedure I hope the Committee of the Whole will rise and that a hearing on this will be had immediately.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. I would just like to ask one question: This motion that was defeated in the Committee on Appropriations on Friday was not a motion pertaining to that section on page 6, funds appropriated to the President; it was a motion by the gentleman from Illinois to set up a separate section entitled "Civil Rights Commission" and appropriate to that Commission $750,000. Was it not, sir?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. If that be true, sir, how can that in any way affect page 6, a separate section entitled "Funds Appropriated to the President for Emergencies and National Defense."

Mr. TABER. Because it says in the language of the bill——

Mr. POWELL. I am familiar with that language.

Mr. TABER. That no part of the appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the 85th Congress. I am leaving out a little—"And such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. The motion offered by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] was not to that section at all.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate that.

Mr. POWELL. It was to set up a separate section.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate that, but I was just stating what the situation was with reference to the allocation of $200,000 that has been attempted to be made.

Mr. POWELL. Does the gentleman take the position that if any motion were denied in any part of this bill for any new section, it would pertain only to page 6 funds appropriated to the President?

Mr. TABER. It would, insofar as the allocation of money out of the emergency fund is concerned.

Mr. POWELL. I do not follow the gentleman's reasoning.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry.

Mr. POWELL. I take the position that the gentleman from Illinois introduced an amendment to set up a separate section, a Civil Rights Commission, I think it was on page 8, and that was defeated. That does not apply to the President's emergency fund, because it was not an amendment to the President's emergency fund.

Mr. TABER. That is true; it was no amendment to the emergency fund, but it was an operation upon a budget estimate that had been submitted to the 85th Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is the purpose of the language on page 6, lines 15 through 23, not intended to prohibit the use of the emergency fund for any section of the bill in order that if the committee in its judgment denies one of these subsequent items this money can be used to overcome the denial by the committee?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but it also refers to any estimate that is turned down during the 85th Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I understand that, but the effect of this is not only to prohibit the use of the moneys appropriated in this section for civil-rights purposes but also it would go to the matter covered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE]. It covered both of them?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it would.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In line with the gentleman's suggestion, does he feel that there is any assurance that in the meantime the Commission can function while we are waiting for the committee to meet and the committee to act, or is it more or less out of existence on account of lack of funds at the present time?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that is the situation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. They have $195,000 to do business up until the 1st of July.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I asked the gentleman from New York and I think he stated that in his opinion that is not so, that the $195,000 will be stopped as of now due to the committee action.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I very seldom differ with the gentleman from New York, I have a tremendous respect for him, but, in my opinion, the gentleman from New York is assuming that the minutes of the full committee are a matter of public record and take precedence over the committee report. The committee report is the evidence that is given out and the committee report distinctly uses the word "deferred." The full committee in voting upon this amendment either had to vote it up or down, so it was rejected, as I assume, by the full committee. The report uses a word that cannot be misinterpreted and that word is "deferred." It is on that that I base my claim and I am in opposition to the thoughts expressed by the gentleman, my very distinguished colleague, from New York.

Mr. TABER. The committees of this House are required to keep records. That record is the thing that would govern in this particular case. I believe that record will show just what I indicated, that is that the motion was offered and was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. What do we take into consideration when we want to find out what was the intent of the action of the committee and what instructions are given, in everything referred to in this body? The first word that would come from the gentleman would be "bring me the report." The report uses the word "deferred."

Mr. TABER. I would go back of the report to the action of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The report which the gentleman from Michigan refers to does not express the final action of the Appropriations Committee. If the action of the Appropriations Committee which was taken last Friday were reported in a committee report at this time, it would show that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was defeated; hence the report in its finality would show exactly what had transpired. But the report which the gentleman reads from was written before the action of the committee taken on last Friday. That committee action was taken and it is necessary to have committee approval on this item. So the gentleman from New York is absolutely right in the position he takes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I am sorry I cannot agree with my friend from New York as to his interpretation of the action of the committee. It seems to me that the report of the committee as to what went on in the committee is the only official account of what took place. But even assuming that the gentleman is right, may I call attention to the fact the language under discussion in the bill says:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project.

Now, the allocation of $200,000 has already been made, so it does not have to be reallocated. That has been made; it is out of the way. And, I cannot see by any stretch of the imagination how that language could possibly prevent the use of the $200,000 that has already been allocated to this project.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this discussion with a great deal of interest. I happen to be the ranking minority member on this subcommittee. I think this report reads just as my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] says it does, that in the opinion of the subcommittee this $750,000 item was simply deferred until we could hear from the Commission itself. Now, there has been a lot of talk here today, and I think the Members are stretching the issue pretty far. As far as the action of the full committee was concerned on last Friday, it was simply on a voice vote, and very few voices that I heard responded to the question. Personally I am of the opinion that we should reconsider this request for $750,000. It is certainly the intent that the law at least be applied to this Commission, and if we are going to take into consideration the laws we passed setting up the Commission and try to defeat the will of the Congress, well, then, of course, that is up to this body.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that this very discussion as to the legal effect of what has taken place and the difference of opinion which exists here between the distinguished Members of this Committee points up the essential sensibleness of the proposition made by the gentleman from New York that at the conclusion of general debate we rise and send this matter back to the committee to iron this out and make clear just what they do propose to do. If they see fit to deny any appropriation for this Commission, then we can fight it out on the floor, but certainly we should know and therefore should be in agreement before the bill is here as to exactly what the Committee on Appropriations intended to do. I hope that the Members will agree that we should, at the close of general debate, send this back.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I think what is going on is an illustration of what makes the law business intriguing; a lot of different interpretations by different lawyers as to what the language means. I have my own opinion, and I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. As of now or as of last Friday morning, the President of the United States is estopped from using any further funds for this Commission. I do not think that is a situation that any of us want to see exist. I know if I offer the amendment when the bill is being read and debated, that it will be defeated, and it just simply solidifies that situation more. I think in view of the differences of interpretation that certainly the ordinary way to handle this would be to have it go back to the committee. Let us have a hearing right away. The proceedings before the Senate next week certainly will be available.

I would like to ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] going to make that motion?

Mr. TABER. It is my intention to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, continuing the thought which I was expressing when the Committee rose informally a moment ago, I understand now that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will offer a motion, immediately upon the conclusion of general debate, that the Committee rise. Will the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, since that will put the bill back into the committee, call a meeting of our committee within the next several days so that we can resolve this matter and bring it back to the House in an orderly way? I would like to see if we can get action on that. I put the question.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] one more question. I sat on this committee. I thought that the Commission was going to have its turn and be treated properly. We brought up the subject of the President's Emergency Fund Allotment, of $200,000, and learned that only $5,000 of that amount had been used, although the Commission had been in existence for about 6 months.

Incidentally, there is a bill before the committee to return that money to the President's fund. No one has been before us to justify returning it. But the point that I want to make with the gentleman from New York is this. The debate on this report of the committee is now taking place in the House. There was no debate in the full committee on the language of the bill. This report was approved by the full committee and this report carries the word deferred. That word deferred was approved by the full committee last Friday. That is the point that I am making. This report is the record of the action of the committee. The report was approved by the committee and I say that the money is in there at this time. In am referring to the balance in the President's Fund, which is $5,000 less than $200,000. All they have used for the period thus far is $5,000. The balance of the money, $195,000, is in there still available for use.

The other item, the $750,000, will come to us in a supplemental request as soon as the Commission acts, as soon as they get their feet off the ground and decide what they want. They are dragging their feet. They have dragged their feet and the House will fall into a trap if they do anything other than stand by the action of this committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman asked me a question. The language of the report does not cover the action of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that the budget request for the Civil Rights Commission will be granted. I shall not vote for it and I consider it a waste of money. Nevertheless, I know that a majority of those in the House now feel bound to support almost anything that comes to us under the guise of civil rights. The evil which lurks underneath that broad term will some day be more fully exposed. But, until then, it will not be possible to consider civil rights legislation on its true merits.

I know personally but two members of the new Commission. They are former Gov. John Battle, of Virginia, and former Gov. Doyle Carlton, of Florida. These are men of highest caliber and of sterling character. They will give freely of their talents in an effort to make the *Commission's* work fair and honorable. They will not be party to a Board which operates on any other basis. Therefore, I do not know how long the atmosphere will be such that they will find it possible to continue to serve on the Commission. These men are in the minority and all of us know that in some quarters this Board is expected to conduct a witchhunt; that some of its sponsors had nothing else in mind; and that it will be mercilessly hounded by the radical elements of the press if it does less.

In other words I question that the Civil Rights Commission, in view of the prejudicial situation under which it was created, can justify its existence. I question that it can properly and profitably spend the amount of money requested for it by the Bureau of the Budget. I can see no earthly reason for the amount which is asked by the administration. Unfortunately, the facts are the Congress probably would vote twice as much or 10 times as much in the name of civil rights with as little expectation of a realistic return for the money to be spent.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force informs me that Brig. Gen. Charles D. Jones has been officially declared to be presumed dead. General Jones has been serving as assistant in charge of legislative liaison for the House and Senate of the United States Congress. News of the loss of this able officer, who has served so well the needs of Congress in providing liaison and legislative help to the Members of Congress, comes to us with a real shock and deep sadness.

Tragedy has indeed struck close to the Halls of Congress. Brig. Gen. Charles D. Jones went down in the Chesapeake Bay presumably in his B–57 jet bomber while returning to Washington for legislative liaison duties.

From his birthplace, Jackson, Miss., Charles D. Jones went to the University of Notre Dame and graduated in 1932. His love of flying led him into the Air Corps in 1934 as a flying cadet, and in 1935, as a second lieutenant, he began a career which was to take him to many parts of the world, to try and to prove his strength, his courage and his devotion to his ideals.

In the early stages of our invasion of North Africa, General Jones went ashore with the Army troops to establish liaison between Gen. John K. Cannon's tactical air force and Gen. George S. Patton's ground forces. While flying a B–17 bomber in a raid over Tunis, he was wounded and hospitalized for a long period of time. Back in combat again, this time on a B–25 mission over Rome, Italy, General Jones was shot down and made a prisoner of war. His liberation came more than a year later, in May 1945.

It so happened that the first duty assignment Gen. Charles D. Jones had was at Barksdale Air Force Base near Shreveport, La. This is my home. It was while serving at this base that he met, fell in love with and married Dorthea Erickson, a native of my home of Shreveport, La. Together they moved from this first assignment to positions of great responsibility for General Jones. Just prior to coming to Washington he served as Chief of Staff, Allied Air Forces in Northern Europe.

I pay tribute now to a gallant airman. He will long be remembered by the people of Mississippi and Louisiana, the Air Force and the country he so nobly served. To his little wife and two children in this dark hour of their lives we of the Congress who knew and loved General Jones extend our sincere and abiding sympathy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, for the RECORD, permit me to submit the alleged noncontroversial and easily understood amendment introduced by me before the Appropriations Committee last Friday morning. Please refer to page 8. After line 7, this is the wording I propose as a new section:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946——

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield, has the gentleman put the amendment in the right place in his announcement now? In what line did he have the amendment?

Mr. BOYLE. I had a new section, and I asked to have it incorporated just before section 210. That is actually where I had it inserted.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman's amendment offered the other day was on page 14, just before section 210.

Mr. BOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman did not say that a few minutes ago. That is why I asked him about it. I thought the gentleman had mentioned the wrong section.

Mr. BOYLE. I thought I was reporting the language haec verba I employed at the time and place in question. I may have said that I inserted it at that point last Friday but today propose to insert it after line 7 on page 8, because it appears to be a better arrangement. In the hustle and hurry of last Friday, when I had not even had an opportunity to inspect the bill or read the report or even to look into the hearings, in a split second it was difficult to determine where would be the best place to insert that amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. You are going to put it now on page 8, after line 7?

Mr. BOYLE. If I have the opportunity of again introducing the amendment that I introduced before the full committee, I propose to put it after line 7 on page 8. If I may conclude the amendment, it reads further, as follows:

As authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 558), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals: $750,000.

I would prefar to transmit the question of whether the language on page 6, after line 15, after $100,000 and starting with the word "Provided" actually is legislation within an appropriation bill; or constitutes a mere limitation on the right of spending the funds appropriated to the President; or, urged by the gentleman from New York, whether my introduction of the amendment to the committee restoring the budget request of $750,000 which was voted down, constituted a rejection.

This was in fact a denial and came within the language on page 6 which precluded further consideration during the 85th Congress, 2d session, and the 86th Congress, 1st session.

Further, for the purpose of debate, I would respectfully request that controversies regarding the significance of the word "defer" be set aside for the present. To evaluate properly the question of whether the word "deferred" in the light of the action by the committee is synonymous with "reject" does not need to be resolved at this time.

Let us take all of these intangibles out of the deliberations today and let us talk about the Congress that thinks of itself as being the most deliberative and the most representative and responsible branch of Government on earth. We find ourselves after long, long, years—the first time in 82 years—putting on the statute books and enacting into law a civil-rights bill. Almost in

the first section of that civil-rights bill there is set out a provision creating a Civil Rights Commission. Now, how in the name of heaven can you justify legislating a bill into existence and almost in the same breath denying any money to implement or to call into existence the Commission that obviously represents efforts in one of the most tender and one of the most difficult and one of the most emotional areas in any bill that has ever come before the Congress.

Permit me, without taking any undue pride, to make the observation that as I sat there last Friday morning and urged my amendment, I was pretty much in the minority. So little interest was displayed in support of the amendment that I did not ask for a rollcall. Due to the fact that the Commission established under the act has a life of only 2 years and 60 days after enactment of the law, which was September 9, 1957, we should do everything we can to implement this law and give and make available the necessary money to fulfill the Congressional intent.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Did the full committee vote and approve the committee report which appears to be in question?

Mr. BOYLE. I would rather let the secretary read the record of the proceedings, as it speaks for itself. Mr. Clerk, what does the record of the full committee show?

Mr. GARY. The committee was in executive session, and its records are not open to the public.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am talking about the full committee.

Mr. GARY. The records of the full committee and the action of the full committee were in executive session and are not open to the public. The committee has set up the report of what has transpired, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] cannot say that that was not the reason the committee took the action that it did.

Mr. BOYLE. I carefully said, "Let us transmit either one of these three suppositions that might have anything to do with it, since I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk that I am prepared to introduce in the event that our deliberations reach that stage today.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BOYLE. Gladly.

Mr. YOUNGER. To clear this up—I am talking about the full committee. Did it approve the report that is before the Committee at that time?

Mr. GARY. They did.

Mr. YOUNGER. According to the minority ranking member, there was no action taken on the committee report itself.

Mr. GARY. It is the report of the Appropriations Committee, and it states what the committee did. That is the only official report of the committee.

Mr. YOUNGER. But there is no record that that report was approved by the committee?

Mr. GARY. It does not have to be. It was reported to this floor as the report of the committee.

Mr. YOUNGER. So that anybody can bring in a report without the approval of the committee? Is that the way you operate?

Mr. GARY. The committee itself brought the report in.

Mr. YOUNGER. They did not, because the committee never approved it.

Mr. GARY. The committee took a vote in committee, and the bill and the report was approved by the committee.

Mr. YOUNGER. No. The report was not in the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the tactics of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] of trying to bring some order out of this confusion by a move that the Committee rise at the proper time.

As we now look at the situation, we now have a Civil Rights Commission, not confirmed, without a staff, and with no funds. That is a deplorable situation for our country.

I have talked to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He says that the minute the White House sends over a request for funds and the Commission is confirmed, then it will be mandatory for hearings to be held, and the appropriation to be presented to this body. Am I correct?

Mr. CANNON. Approximately; I will be glad to explain the usual procedure in a moment.

Mr. POWELL. I believe that we have confusion, the denial or deferment of rights, and the question of whether or not the President has $200,000 allocated to the Civil Rights Commission or not; with a Commission not formed; with a staff that has not been appointed, and I believe the only thing to do is to rise and adjourn and wait until we have something tangible to really present here. The next move, as I see it, is for the White House to send to the committee a representative to testify on how much money they need and how it should be spent.

I will support the motion to rise.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. If the motion to which the gentleman refers is offered by the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, that would be a motion at the conclusion of general debate that the Committee of the Whole do now rise. We would go back in the House and the bill would be left resting on the Clerk's desk where it could stay ad infinitum until it is taken up again on the calendar or rescheduled; and nothing is done unless at the same time the chairman of the full committee or the chairman of the subcommittee calls such a meeting. Is that not so?

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. In view of the fact that we have had no response to the question I addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, my very good friend the gentleman from Alabama, with whom I enjoy serving on the subcommittee—and I think that is a very vital factor in this connection, may I suggest to the gentleman from New York that it might be very appropriate since he has the floor that he address the question again to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to address the question to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, first: If the Committee does rise, and if there is a message from the White House that Dr. Hannah, Chairman of the Commission, is available for testimony, will you, as chairman of the full committee, say that there will be hearings on an appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, may I say that when such a request is received from the executive department, the regular routine invariably followed is to refer the request to the Committee on Appropriations. It is then, in turn, referred to the subcommittee.

In the event that an estimate was received from the executive department it would, of course, come to the Committee on Appropriations, since it could go nowhere else; and when it came to me I would, as I have always done, refer it to the proper subcommittee for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I then, Mr. Chairman, ask this question of the chairman of the subcommittee to whom the chairman of the full committee says the request would be referred? Would the chairman of the subcommittee call his subcommittee together immediately and act upon the request for appropriation and bring it back to the floor of the House?

Mr. ANDREWS. That would depend on the majority vote of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But you would call the committee together so it might vote?

Mr. ANDREWS. I would.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me unfortunate that we ever got into a position in the House where we had to have this kind of debate. It cannot be clear to anyone, I think, exactly what the law is. We have distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the aisle differing as to the exact effect of the action the committee has already taken. I think it may be summed up by saying that in the opinion of sound people the Civil Rights Commission as of today cannot act. It is in effect helpless if the President agrees with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It, therefore,

seems very clear to me that we must demand that the executive branch of the Government with all speed do something to rectify the situation in the immediate future. This is a sorry, yes, a shameful, record which we have had brought before us. Five months after the law became effective the Civil Rights Commission is not organized, has no Director and not even the chairman could take the time to be sure his Commission would have the necessary funds to do the vital job assigned to it. Where is the leadership of the Republican Party? Where has the President been? One must wonder Is there a deal to destroy the effectiveness of the Commission? I hope not, but the record is just plain bad.

I personally am very sorry even to see the makeup of the Commission itself with the 3 of its 6 members avowedly opposed to desegregation. But that is beside the point at this particular time. I want to simply say that if the motion of the gentleman from Michigan is carried, I sincerely hope that the matter will be brought back to the House at the earliest possible opportunity, that this country may not be put in the position of having a Civil Rights Commission unable to act in this important election year. It would be taken all around the world, as we know, as a lack of interest in what is probably one of the decisive factors in our battle against communism today. So, upon the word of the gentleman who heads the subcommittee, I personally hope and believe we will get the earliest possible action and the full $750,000 given to the Commission so that it may go ahead.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York who has led us in our fight for civil rights.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, let it be noted that the members of the Civil Rights Commission were appointed on November 7, 1957, with the exception of Doyle E. Carlton, who was appointed on December 23, 1957. Let it also be remembered that the life of the Commission extends for 2 years plus 60 days. Since the final report must be submitted to the President and Congress not later than 2 years from the enactment of the act and 60 days thereafter to permit them to wind up its affairs, time is running out. I can safely say I am sure from the facts elucidated today that the administration has been stalling. I cannot find any other word to characterize it. All of these months have gone by and this Commission has not been functioning. That does not mean that we should not carry out our duties in this matter. Our duty is to appropriate where there has been an authorization. There has been an authorization in the civil-rights bill and I think we would be derelict if we did not appropriate here certain sums. We have the assurance given to us that those appropriations will be made. We have the assurance of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that I think we can rely on. We have the assurance of responsible members of that great committee that we can rely upon. It is for that reason I am willing to vote for a motion that the Committee rise so that the Appropriations Committee can hear from the Bureau of the Budget. I hope that this debate will act as a sort of a prod to spur the Bureau of the Budget and the administration to do what is necessary in the premises.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the action of the Appropriations Committee has stirred up this opposition. If the action taken by the committee had been on any other subject, you would have heard very little.

By this amendment you are asking this House to approve the expenditure of a sizable amount of money without any justification by the Commission. But be that as it may, it is "water over the dam"—so to speak—for Congress has already spoken and written into law the very things that it set up a Commission to find out what should be done in the first place. In other words, this very Congress passed a measure taking away the right of trial by jury and seeking to penalize the South. And may I prophesy that this may some day come back to haunt those who voted for it. You cannot through malice, hate, and prejudice penalize one great section of this Nation without doing violence to all other sections.

For the first time in nearly a century you were able to get legislation passed covering so-called civil rights. In the same legislation, you set up a Commission—a Commission for what?—listen, a Commission to investigate and find out what kind of legislation they should recommend to the Congress.

Now, since you already have the legislation, what is the Commission to do? You simply have the "cart before the horse." In my opinion there is only one thing that they can do and that would be to recommend the repeal of the legislation already enacted. However, I know that the proponents of this legislation do not think this will be done.

As you will recall, this legislation originally provided that the Commission be given a free hand to appoint thousands upon thousands of investigators, snoopers, and harassers—the sky was the limit—to poke their noses into citizens' business and homes; however, the motive was so obvious that we were enabled to cut this down to only a small number.

Let the Commission come before the Appropriations Committee and justify their needs; other agencies, departments, and commissions do this; why should this one be treated differently.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the situation here today is caused, I think it is perfectly obvious now, by the fact that the White House has not taken enough interest in civil rights since the legislation passed, and in the money needed to take action. The Commissioners were given interim appointments and under the law can act, and should have acted before this time. Notwithstanding this, we run into a situation where the House Appropriations Committee has decided that because no case was made by the White House, it should not have acted. I disagree with the action of the Appropriations subcommittee. I would much prefer, from my own point of view, to stay here today, notwithstanding the deficiencies which the Appropriations Committee finds, and appropriate this money. It is obvious, however, that this cannot be done, that there is some confusion, and we can only hope that the committee will hold hearings. But it cannot possibly hold hearings until the administration comes up with witnesses. We are going to leave this matter in a state of suspension, as it has been since the law was enacted. I think it is too bad but I do not know what else can be done about it.

As a result of this debate, the situation has become clearer. Alert action by the Democrats in the Committee of the Whole House has prevented this legislation from passing without funds for the Civil Rights Commission. In so doing, we have saved the White House from its own folly. But, more important, we have made possible subsequent action by the Appropriations Committee which will enable the civil-rights law to be implemented.

The matter is now to be placed where it belongs—on the President's doorstep. We Democrats will do everything possible to see that funds are appropriated for the Civil Rights Commission. Before we can do this, however, the White House must request funds and have someone go before the Appropriations Committee to ask for them. Now we shall see whether or not we have revived General Eisenhower's interest in civil rights. If we have, he will ask for the moneys and a Democratic Congress will appropriate the funds required.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 85, noes 67.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10589) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed

without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

BLOOD, BREATH, AND URINE TESTS AS EVIDENCE OF INTOXICATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1330)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That (a) if as a result of the operation of a vehicle, any person is tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for (1) operating such vehicle while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor in violation of section 10 (b) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, approved March 3, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 609), (2) negligent homicide in violation of section 802 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 606), or (3) manslaughter committed in the operation of such vehicle in violation of section 802 of such Act approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, title 22, sec. 2405), and in the course of such trial there is received in evidence, based upon a chemical test, competent proof to the effect that at the time of such operation—

"(1) defendant's blood contained five one-hundredths of 1 per centum or less, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in two thousand cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ per centum of carbon dioxide), or that defendant's urine contained eight one-hundredths of 1 per centum or less, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall be deemed prima facie proof that defendant at such time was not under the influence of any intoxicating liquor;

"(2) defendant's blood contained more than five one-hundredths of 1 per centum, but less than fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per centum, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in two thousand cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ per centum of carbon dioxide), or that defendant's urine contained more than eight one-hundredths of 1 per centum, but less than twenty one-hundredths of 1 per centum, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute relevant evidence, but shall not constitute prima facie proof that defendant was or was not at such time under the influence of any intoxicating liquor; and

"(3) defendant's blood contained fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per centum or more, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in two thousand cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ per centum of carbon dioxide), or that defendant's urine contained twenty one-hundredths of 1 per centum or more, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute prima facie proof that defendant at such time was under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

"(b) Upon the request of the person who was tested, the results of such test shall be made available to him.

"(c) Only a physician acting at the request of a police officer can withdraw blood for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content therein. This limitation shall not apply to the taking of a urine specimen or the breath test.

"(d) The person tested shall be permitted to have a physician of his own choosing administer a chemical test in addition to the one administered at the direction of the police officer.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require any person to submit to the withdrawal of blood, the taking of a urine specimen from him, or to a breath test."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and agree to the same.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
JOHN DOWDY,
SID SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
ALAN BIBLE,
J. K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline except for minor clerical changes.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of the first section of the Senate bill provides that if competent proof, based on a chemical test, is received in evidence in a court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia that the defendant's urine contained eight one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would be deemed prima facie proof the defendant was not at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The House amendment provides that if the chemical test shows the defendant's urine contained five one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would be deemed prima facie proof that the defendant was not at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The conference substitute adopts the percentage provided in the Senate bill.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of the first section of the Senate bill provides that where such a chemical test shows the defendant's urine contained more than eight one-hundredths of 1 percent but less than twenty one-hundredths of 1 per cent by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would constitute relevant evidence, but not prima facie proof, that the defendant was or was not at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The House amendment provides that where such a test shows the defendant's urine contained more than five one-hundredths of 1 percent but less than fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would constitute relevant evidence but not prima facie proof that the defendant was or was not at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The conference substitute adopts the percentages provided in the Senate bill.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of the first section of the Senate bill provides that where such a chemical test shows the defendant's urine contained twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would constitute prima facie evidence that the defendant was at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The House amendment provides that where such a test shows the defendant's urine contained fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, at the time of the alleged violation of law, such proof would constitute prima facie proof that the defendant was at that time under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The conference substitute adopts the percentage provided in the Senate bill.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
JOHN DOWDY,
SID SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, S. 969, as it passed the Senate, provided for the use in evidence of the results of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating a vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquors.

The bill, S. 969, was referred to the House District Committee, and at the time the committee considered the bill on August 19, 1957, the House District Committee struck all after the enacting clause and inserted the provisions of a bill, which had been before the committee, H. R. 2206, which provided that the evidence of tests in the blood or urine be permitted in evidence and in addition included also a breath test. The House bill further provided that the evidence be permissible not only while operating a vehicle under the influence of intoxicating liquors but in the case of negligent homicide or manslaughter.

The House also wrote an amendment to the bill that would guarantee that no person would be forced to submit to such test against his will.

In the Senate and House bills there were differences in the formula as laid down in these tests. At the time the conferees considered the bills in conference a medical expert was brought before the conferees and after hearing from

this expert the conferees agreed unanimously that the formula as provided in the Senate bill should be adopted. The Senate agreed to accept the amendments as provided in the House bill which would provide that such evidence be admissible when a person was operating a vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquors, negligent homicide and manslaughter.

The conferees further agreed that section 2, which was written into the bill, which would guarantee that no person would be required to submit to such test against his will should be accepted.

The conferees agreed unanimously to these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACTS KNOWN AS THE LIFE INSURANCE ACT AND THE FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1040) to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act (sec. 35–404, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Superintendent to issue a certificate of authority to a company when it shall have complied with the requirements of the laws of the District so as to be entitled to do business therein. The Superintendent may, however, satisfy himself by such investigation as he may deem proper or necessary that such company is duly qualified under the laws of the District to transact business therein, and may refuse to issue or renew any such certificate to a company if the issuance or renewal of such certificate would adversely affect the public interest. In each case the certificate shall be issued under the seal of the Superintendent, authorizing and empowering the company to transact the kind or kinds of business specified in the certificate, and each such certificate shall be made to expire on the 30th day of April next succeeding the date of its issuance. No company shall transact any business of insurance in or from the District until it shall have received a certificate of authority as authorized by this section and no company shall transact any business of insurance not specified in such certificate of authority."

SEC. 2. That section 6 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act (sec. 35–405, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Superintendent shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any company which has failed or refused to comply with any provision or requirement of this act, or which—

"(a) is impaired in capital or surplus;

"(b) is insolvent;

"(c) is in such a condition that its further transaction of business in the District would be hazardous to its policyholders or creditors or to the public;

"(d) has refused or neglected to pay a valid final judgment against such company within 30 days after such judgment shall have become final either by expiration without appeal within the time when such appeal might have been perfected, or by final affirmance on appeal;

"(e) has violated any law of the District or has in the District violated its charter or exceeded its corporate powers;

"(f) has refused to submit its books, papers, accounts, records, or affairs to the reasonable inspection or examination of the Superintendent, his deputies, or duly appointed examiners;

"(g) has an officer who has refused upon reasonable demand to be examined under oath touching its affairs;

"(h) fails to file with the Superintendent a copy of an amendment to its charter or articles of association within 30 days after the effective date of such amendment;

"(i) has had its corporate existence dissolved or its certificate of authority revoked in the State in which it was organized;

"(j) has had all its risks reinsured in their entirety in another company, without prior approval of the Superintendent; or

"(k) has made, issued, circulated, or caused to be issued or circulated any estimate, illustration, circular, or statement of any sort misrepresenting either its status or the terms of any policy issued or to be issued by it, or the benefits or advantages promised thereby, or the dividends or shares of the surplus to be received thereon, or has used any name or title of any policy or class of policies misrepresenting the true nature thereof.

"The Superintendent shall not revoke or suspend the certificate of authority of any company until he has given the company not less than 30 days' notice of the proposed revocation or suspension and of the grounds alleged therefor, and has afforded the company an opportunity for a full hearing: *Provided,* That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required: *Provided further,* That in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company for causes enumerated in this section, after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that the public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the Office of the Superintendent to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia. At any hearing provided by this section, the Superintendent shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses. Anyone testifying falsely after having been administered such an oath shall be subject to the penalties of perjury."

SEC. 3. That section 27 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act (sec. 35–426, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. The Superintendent of Insurance may suspend or revoke the license of any life insurance general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker when and if, after investigation, it appears to the Superintendent that any license issued to such person was obtained by fraud or misrepresentation; or that the general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker has violated any insurance law of the District; or has made any misleading representations or incomplete or fraudulent comparison of any policies or companies or concerning any companies to any person for the purpose or with the intention of inducing such person to lapse, forfeit, surrender, or exchange his insurance then in force; or has made any misleading estimate of the dividends or share of surplus to be received on a policy; or has failed or refused to pay or to deliver to the company or to its principal any money or other property in the hands of said general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker belonging to such company or principal when requested so to do; or has violated any lawful ruling of the insurance department; or has been convicted of a felony; or has otherwise shown himself untrustworthy or incompetent to act as a life insurance general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker. Before the Superintendent of Insurance shall revoke or suspend the license of any such person he shall give to such person an opportunity to be fully heard, and to introduce evidence in his behalf. Within 30 days after the revocation or suspension of license or the refusal of the Superintendent to grant a license, the general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker, or applicant aggrieved may appeal from the ruling of the Superintendent of Insurance to the court of competent jurisdiction designated in section 28. Appeals may be taken from the judgment of said court as prescribed in section 28. At any hearing provided by this section, the Superintendent shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses. Anyone testifying falsely after having been administered such an oath shall be subject to the penalties of perjury.

"No individual whose license as a general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker is revoked shall be entitled to any license under this act for a period of 1 year after revocation.

"Any person who violates any provision of this section upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding $100 for each and every violation: *Provided,* That in lieu of revoking or suspending the license of any such general agent, agent, solicitor, or broker for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such person to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that the public interest would be best served by the continuation of the license of such person. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by such person through the office of the Superintendent to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. That section 3 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1306, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Superintendent shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any company which has failed or refused to comply with any provision or requirement of this act, or which—

"(a) is impaired in capital or surplus;

"(b) is insolvent;

"(c) is in such a condition that its further transaction of business in the District would be hazardous to its policyholders or creditors, or to the public;

"(d) has refused or negelcted to pay a valid final judgment against such company within 30 days after such judgment shall have become final either by expiration without appeal within the time when such appeal might have been perfected, or by final affirmance on appeal;

"(e) has violated any law of the District or has in the District violated its charter or exceeded its corporate powers;

"(f) has refused to submit its books, papers, accounts, records, or affairs to the reasonable inspection or examination of the Superintendent, his deputies, or duly appointed examiners;

"(g) has an officer who has refused upon reasonable demand to be examined under oath touching its affairs;

"(h) fails to file with the Superintendent a copy of an amendment to its charter or

articles of association within 30 days after the effective date of such amendment;

"(i) has had its corporate existence dissolved or its certificate of authority revoked in the State in which it was organized;

"(j) has had all its risks reinsured in their entirety in another company, without prior approval of the Superintendent; or

"(k) has made, issued, circulated, or caused to be issued or circulated any estimate, illustration, circular, or statement of any sort misrepresenting either its status or the terms of any policy issued or to be issued by it, or the benefits or advantages promised thereby, or the dividends or shares of the surplus to be received thereon, or has used any name or title of any policy or class of policies misrepresenting the true nature thereof.

"The Superintendent shall not revoke or suspend the certificate of authority of any company until he has given the company not less than 30 days' notice of the proposed revocation or suspension and of the grounds alleged therefor, and has afforded the company an opportunity for a full hearing: *Provided*, That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required: *Provided further*, That in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the Superintendent to the Collector of Taxes, District of Columbia. At any hearing provided by this section, the Superintendent shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses. Anyone testifying falsely after having been administered such an oath shall be subject to the penalties of perjury."

SEC. 5. That section 30 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1334, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 30. No company authorized to do business in the District shall, by its representatives or otherwise, make, write, issue, or deliver any contract of insurance, surety, or indemnity, except title and ocean marine insurance, on any person, property, business activity, or insurable interest within the District except through regularly constituted policy-writing agents or authorized salaried employees licensed in the District as provided in this act.

"No such contract covering persons, property, business activities, or insurable interests in the District, except contracts of title and ocean marine insurance, shall be written, issued, or delivered by any authorized company or by any of its representatives unless such contract is duly countersigned in writing by a person who is licensed as provided in this act to countersign such contracts, and no salaried officer, manager, or other salaried employee of any authorized company, unless he be licensed as provided in this act, shall write, issue, or countersign any such contract.

"No company, agent, or salaried company employee shall make any agreement as to a policy other than that which is plainly expressed in the policy issued.

"No company, agent, salaried company employee, or broker shall pay or offer to pay or allow as an inducement to any person to insure any rebate of premium or any special favor or advantage whatever in the dividends to accrue thereon, or any inducement whatever not specified in the policy.

"Every company authorized by this act to do business in the District shall file annually with the Superintendent on or before the 15th day of April, and at such other times as they may be appointed, a list of agents and salaried employees of said company who are authorized to solicit, write, effect, issue, or deliver policies for such company in the District, except that the names of soliciting agents may be filed either by the company or by the policy-writing agent.

"Any policy-writing agent or salaried company employee authorized by any company to solicit, negotiate, bind, write, or issue policies or applications therefor shall, in any controversy between the insured or his representative and the said company, be held to be the agent of the company which issued or affected the policy solicited or so applied for, anything in the application or policy to the contrary notwithstanding.

"Any payment made by or on behalf of the insured to any broker for policies issued to such broker for delivery to the insured or issued directly to the insured on the order of such broker, shall, in controversies between the insured and the company, be deemed to have been paid to the company.

"No soliciting agent shall have any authority to countersign any policy."

SEC. 6. That section 32 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1336, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 32. Any person hereafter desiring to engage in business in the District as a policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee, as defined by this act shall, before engaging in such business, secure from the Superintendent a license authorizing him to engage in such business. The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require. Before the Superintendent shall issue or renew a license to any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, or salaried company employee, he shall require the company or policy-writing agent desiring the appointment of such person to certify—

"(a) that the person to be appointed, if not a salaried company employee, is a resident of this District, or that his principal office for the conduct of such business is in or will be maintained in the District;

"(b) that he is personally known to the person making the certification;

"(c) that he has had experience or instructions necessary to the proper conduct of the kind or kinds of business to which the license is to extend;

"(d) that he has a good business reputation, is trustworthy, and is worthy of a license.

"Resident and nonresident brokers shall, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a license, file with the Superintendent a corporate surety bond in an amount not less than $1,000 for the benefit of any person who may suffer loss resulting from fraud or dishonesty on the part of said resident or nonresident broker. Before the Superintendent shall issue a license to any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, salaried company employee, or resident broker, who has not previously been licensed under this act, he shall personally, or through his deputy or any person regularly employed in the department, within a reasonable time, and in a designated place within the District, subject each such person to a personal written examination relating to such person's knowledge of the kind or kinds of business to which the license may extend and his competency to act as such policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee. The Superintendent may in his discretion limit the scope of such examination to such particular kind or kinds of business in which the person to be licensed is to be principally engaged. The Superintendent shall issue or renew such license as may be applied for when he is satisfied that the person to be licensed is (a) competent and trustworthy and intends to act in good faith in the capacity involved by the license applied for, and that not more than 25 percent of his commission income from business to which the license applies will result from policies the premiums on which are paid or are to be paid in the manner set forth in paragraph (f) of section 36 and (b) that he has a good business reputation and has had experience, training, or education, or is otherwise qualified in the line or lines of business in which the license would entitle him to engage, and, except in the case of a nonresident broker or salaried company employee, is a resident of the District, or maintains his principal office for the conduct of such business in the District; and (c) is reasonably familiar with the insurance laws of the District, and with the provisions, terms, and conditions of the policies he is proposing to solicit, negotiate, or effect, and is worthy of a license. In the case of a nonresident applying for a broker's license, the Superintendent may waive the examination requirement and accept in lieu thereof evidence that the applicant holds a license as broker or agent in the State where his principal business is conducted. The Superintendent may also waive the examination requirement in the case of any person who has been licensed in the District prior to the effective date of this act. The examination requirement shall be waived in the case of any applicant for a license under this section who holds a license under section 26 of the Life Insurance Act (D. C. Code., sec. 35–425), if the company desiring the appointment of such applicant certifies in writing to the Superintendent that such applicant will solicit only accident and health insurance on its behalf. Licenses may be issued in the names of individuals, or in the names of firms, partnerships, or corporations, including banks, trust companies, real-estate offices, and building and loan associations: *Provided*, That on such licenses, in addition to the name of the applicant, there shall be listed the name of every member or officer of such firm, partnership, or corporation who solicits insurance or who countersigns policies: *Provided further*, That such named persons as well as the licensee shall be subject to all requirements of this act, and that the Superintendent shall have authority at any time to require the applicant fully to disclose the identity of all stockholders, partners, officers, and employees, and he may in his discretion refuse to issue or renew a license in the name of any firm, partnership, or corporation if he is not satisfied that any officer, employee, stockholder, or partner thereof who may materially influence the applicant's conduct, meet the standards of this section applicable to persons applying as individuals. No person shall be licensed as agent, broker, or salaried company employee when it appears to the Superintendent that said license is sought primarily for the purpose of obtaining commissions on policies on which he on his own account pays or is to pay the premiums, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any person who receives or is to receive any benefit, direct or indirect, from the commissions obtained, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any partnership, association, or corporation of which he is a member."

SEC. 7. That section 35 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1339, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Upon application for renewal of an expiring license and the payment of the applicable fee prescribed in section 41, the

Superintendent shall issue the license applied for when he is satisfied that the applicant therefor meets the conditions set forth in sections 32 and 36. Before the Superintendent shall refuse to renew any such license he shall give to the applicant an opportunity to be fully heard and to introduce evidence in his behalf. If the Superintendent shall refuse to renew any such license he shall give the applicant written notice thereof and he shall not, for a period of 10 days from the date of that notice, take any action to stop the applicant from continuing in business, within which period the applicant may apply to any court as provided in section 45 hereof, for leave, in the discretion of the court, to continue in business until an appeal from such refusal is decided."

SEC. 8. That section 36 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1340, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 36. The Superintendent may revoke or suspend the license of any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee when and if, after investigation, it appears to the Superintendent that any license issued to such person was obtained by fraud or misrepresentation, or that such person has otherwise shown himself untrustworthy or incompetent to act in any of the foregoing capacities, or that such person has—

"(a) violated any of the provisions of the insurance laws of the District; or

"(b) has failed within a reasonable time to remit to any company all moneys which he has collected, and to which the company is entitled; or

"(c) has been guilty of rebating or has misrepresented the provisions of the policies which he is selling, or the policies of other companies; or

"(d) has countersigned policies in blank; or that

"(e) more than 25 percent of his commission income from business to which the license applies results from policies the premiums on which are paid or are to be paid in the manner set forth in paragraph (f) of this section; or that

"(f) said license is being used primarily for the purpose of obtaining commissions on policies on which he, on his own account, pays or is to pay the premiums, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any person who receives or is to receive any benefit, direct or indirect, from the commissions obtained, or on which the premiums are paid or are to be paid by any partnership, association, or corporation of which he is a member.

"Before the Superintendent shall revoke or suspend the license of any such person he shall give to such person an opportunity to be fully heard, and to introduce evidence in his behalf: *Provided*, That in lieu of revoking or suspending the license of any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such person to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of such person. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by such person through the office of the Superintendent to the Collector of Taxes, District of Columbia. At any hearing provided by this section, the Superintendent shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses. Anyone testifying falsely after having been administered such an oath shall be subject to the penalties of perjury."

SEC. 9. That section 38 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1342, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 38. The provisions of this act relating to the licensing of policy-writing agents, soliciting agents, salaried company employees, and brokers shall not apply to the sale of personal accident insurance in the ticket offices of railroad companies or other common carriers, or in the offices of travel bureaus, nor to the business of ocean marine insurance, nor to insurance covering the property of railroad companies and other common carriers engaged in interstate commerce."

SEC. 10. That section 39 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act (sec. 35–1343, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 39. Except as provided in section 40, no person shall act as agent in the District for any company which is not authorized to do business in the District, nor shall any person directly or indirectly negotiate for or solicit applications for policies of, or for membership in, any company which is not authorized to do business in the District. The term 'company' as used in this section shall include any association, society, company, corporation, joint-stock company, individual, partnership, trustee, or receiver engaged in the business of assuming risks of insurance, surety, or indemnity, and any Lloyd's organization, assessment, or cooperative fire company, or any reciprocal or interinsurance exchange, and any company, association, or society, whether organized for profit or not, conducting a business, including any of the principles or features of insurance, surety, or indemnity. Any person who violates any provision of this section upon conviction shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 for each offense, or be imprisoned for not more than 12 months, or both, and any such person shall be personally liable to any resident of the District having claim against any such unauthorized company under any policy which said person has solicited or negotiated, or has aided in soliciting or negotiating: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who negotiates with an unauthorized company for policies covering his own property or interests, nor shall the provisions of this section apply to the officers, agents, or representatives of any company which is in process of organization under the laws of the District, and which is authorized temporarily to solicit or secure memberships or applications for policies for the purpose of completing such organization. Prosecutions for violations of this section shall be upon information filed in the municipal court for the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants."

SEC. 11. Where any provision of this act or any amendment made by this act refers to an office or agency abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824), such provision or amendment shall be deemed to refer to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or to the office, officer, or agency which the Commissioners have heretofore designated or may hereafter designate to perform the functions of the office or agency so abolished.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is, first, to correct a situation arising from a recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals in the case known as Atlantic Insurance Agency, Inc., a Corporation, et al. against Albert F. Jordan, Superintendent of Insurance; and secondly, to bring related sections of law applicable to the business of life insurance into conformity with corresponding sections applicable to the business of fire and casualty insurance.

In the opinion of the majority of the court in the above-mentioned case, it was stated that—

However desirable it may be for the Superintendent to be empowered to act at all times in the public interest in the insurance field, neither the Superintendent nor the courts may supply powers which the Congress has never conferred.

The court also said:

The Superintendent really has asked us to read the statute as though it authorizes him to deny renewal to a corporation which in every respect has originally been found by him to be qualified under and to have complied with the statutes, if it should later develop that an ownership interest in the corporation shall have been acquired by a person deemed by the Superintendent to be untrustworthy. Perhaps Congress should have said that much; the plain fact is that it did not do so. The Superintendent must be held to his statutory authority.

As a result of the court of appeals decision, the renewal of certain licenses cannot be denied because of the untrustworthiness of the applicant or because of violation of any law by the applicant other than an insurance law.

For example, if, when such a person applies for the renewal of his license, it is found that he has committed larceny, forgery, fraud, or any other similar offense, his license must, nevertheless, be renewed so long as there is no conclusive finding that he has violated an insurance law.

Other sections of the bill deal with related problems pertaining to the issuance and revocation of insurance licenses. The primary purpose of the bill, therefore, is to permit the Department of Insurance of the District of Columbia to continue to protect the public by issuing or revoking licenses in accordance with standards previously established by Congress.

The provisions which are added to the insurance acts by the amendments contained in the bill are comparable to provisions usually found in State laws. The bill is designed to protect the public interest involved in the insurance business.

The individual sections of the bill provide as follows:

Sections 1, 2, and 3 merely bring the provisions of the Life Insurance Act relating to the issuance and revocation of agents and companies' licenses into conformity with corresponding sections of the Fire and Casualty Act. In addition, an existing prohibition of false advertising is given greater emphasis, and there is also included a provision for the swearing of witnesses and the testimony given by such witnesses to be subject to the penalties of perjury.

Section 4 makes applicable to fire and casualty companies the prohibition against false advertising now applicable to life-insurance companies under the Life Insurance Act of 1934, and also provides for the swearing of witnesses at hearings and the testimony given by such witnesses to be subject to the penalties of perjury.

Section 5 takes out of a presently existing section of the Fire and Casualty Act references to life insurance in order to make the section consistent with the ap-

plication section of that act, which provides that it shall not affect the business of life insurance.

Section 6 corrects the defect in the law found by the court in the case referred to above by making it plain that the section applies to renewal as well as to original licenses. This section adds to present law and would give the Superintendent the authority to not only ask the names of the members of the firm, partnership, or corporation who solicit insurance or who countersign policies, but would as well authorize him to require the applicant, at any time, to disclose the identity of all stockholders, partners, officers and employees, and he may, in his discretion, refuse to issue or renew a license in the name of such firm, partnership or corporation if he is not satisfied that such named officers, stockholders, partners and employees, who may influence the company's conduct, meet the standards of this section applicable to persons applying as individuals.

Section 7, for the purpose of clarification and emphasis, states again that applicants for renewal licenses shall be subject to conditions of the law relating to trustworthiness and competency and, in the event the Superintendent refuses to renew the applicant's license, the applicant has a right to a hearing and an appeal. Also the applicant may appeal to the courts for leave to continue in the insurance business pending litigation.

Section 8 eliminates the present necessity for conclusive findings and provides for the swearing of witnesses.

Sections 9 and 10 eliminate references to life insurance and fraternal benefit societies in order to make those sections consistent with the application section of the Fire and Casualty Act, from which it will be seen that that act was not intended to apply to life insurance or to fraternal benefit societies.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and its enactment will not involve any additional cost to the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. It is my opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of every member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, too, that the enactment of this bill is in the public interest. Under the law as it is now interpreted, it is possible for a person to get renewal of his license to operate, even if he is guilty of larceny, forgery, fraud, or any other similar offense—so long as there is no conclusive finding that he has violated an insurance law.

This is corrective legislation that should be enacted promptly to protect the public, and it has the wholehearted support of the insurance fraternity.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is exactly correct. This bill is supported by the entire insurance industry of the District of Columbia and by the District Commissioners. It was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 9271) to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, incorporated by the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution," approved June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), is authorized to use the real estate described as lots 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, and 816, in square numbered 2507, situated in the city of Washington, D. C., as the national headquarters of such society.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to occupy the residence at 2412 Massachusetts Avenue NW. as a national headquarters of the society.

The Society of the Sons of the American Revolution was incorporated under an act of Congress on June 9, 1906. Under existing law the area in which the association wishes to buy the residence is zoned residential. Because of the fact that the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution wishes to occupy the house in this location it will be necessary for the Congress to enact this legislation to permit a variance in the zoning laws.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in a letter addressed to the chairman of this committee, stated, "The Commissioners, having previously opposed special zoning treatment by legislation, cannot recommend favorable action on H. R. 9271. However, since the Commissioners believe the contemplated use of the property as authorized by the bill will have no adverse effect on neighboring property, they do not offer objection to passage of the bill."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] may include the following statements in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF WADE H. COOPER BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT COMMITTEE JANUARY 29, 1958, ON S. 2798, H. R. 9271, AND H. R. 9359, RE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

I am 100 percent opposed to the passage of any of these bills for the reasons following:

(a) Because the property is too remote and too distant to be of any service to the Sons of the American Revolution except as a workshop and might be its death knell; and its purchase means a dissipation and waste of around $150,000, as other buildings could be and can be purchased for $75,000 or less, more suitable as to location and as to structure and ready for immediate occupancy.

(b) Because the record shows that the members of our organization know nothing of the real facts which have been withheld and never revealed to them; and that this attempt to purchase the property involved has been fixed almost from the beginning, to pay the owner $165,000 plus $25,000 for rearrangement or two or three times what we should pay for the property involved. When I urged and made the motion for the sale of our old home for $305,000 cash I expected to save $200,000, which can be done if permitted, as there are buildings all around 2412 Massachusetts Avenue for sale are one-third to one-half the price which we are to pay (over my protest), viz, 2408 Massachusetts Avenue (next door to 2412) at $60,000, 1525 Rhode Island Avenue (Scott Circle, one block from our old home) at $75,000, 2100 S Street NW., a gorgeous building with an elevator for $58,000 (less than a third of 2412 Massachusetts) and 2346 Massachusetts Avenue, also a gorgeous building with an elevator, for $100,000 or less.

(c) Because the Adjustment Zoning Board, a creature of the Congress, has already refused a Permit of Occupancy for 2412 Massachusetts Avenue and the matter is now res judicata. Therefore, the Congress is without any lawful authority to intervene and its action would be ultra vires and void as an appeal to the courts is a proper remedy if there be any complaint. The Congress cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time.

(d) Because our membership is now at a standstill and some of us want to start a forward movement by offering modest club privileges. It is a natural law that anything that ceases to grow must die. This property is too remote for a club, and we could not possibly get a permit for a club.

(e) Because I firmly doubt that any man, financially able, would pay $75,000 for 2412 Massachusetts Avenue because of its interior structure. I do not believe that the owner of the house would deny that his own wife refused to live in the house and is not living in it now. For several years I resided at 1722 Massachusetts Avenue and I know generally the property values all along that avenue.

(f) Because a meeting or a half meeting of the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution has been called for February 8. I earnestly urge the rejection of all of these bills for the foregoing reasons, or that no action be taken until this so-called meeting of February 8.

FACTS

I think that every fact which I have stated is correct, but I will gladly correct any mistake.

LAW

Our Supreme Court, in my opinion, has been shattering constitutional cases and legal precedents, perhaps, by the abuse and misuse of rule 61, but there is nothing the Congress can do about this except to make rules and regulations as to the future. With perfect courtesy, I would like to point out that the same situation seems to exist here.

The Zoning Board is a creature of Congress, and the Congress cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time, as stated above.

UNIVERSITY CLUB,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1958.

Gen. GEORGE E. TARBOX, Jr.,
President, Denver, Colo.

DEAR GENERAL TARBOX: Your letter to me of January 7 is of doubtful wisdom as it automatically prevents the National S. A. R. Congress from reconsidering the building matter prior to the action of the Congress on the pending bills. Delegates will not respond to such an indefinite call. May I suggest that you immediately address a letter to each delegate stating that the matter of the building will be considered in the afternoon of February 8, 1958 (naming the place), regardless of the disposition of the pending bills.

"Good intentions," "failure to investigate" (as here), or "breach of fiduciary duty" by officers or directors, resulting in the impairment of assets, renders offending officers and directors liable to make full restitution. See Corpus Juris Secundum, page 117, volume 19 (and other pages), an eminent authority. This may mean that I am forced to the unpleasant necessity of taking legal action in order to protect myself as I personally cannot allow any such condition to confront me. I must do my best to prevent a waste of $150,000. You and all other officers, trustees, directors, and delegates have the same responsibility under the law that I have. There are buildings all around the Hurley House, and elsewhere, that can be had for one-half and one-third the Hurley House, more suitable as to location and as to structure for our purpose.

Yours truly,

WADE H. COOPER,
Past President, D. C. State Society.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 9304) to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) On and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of approval of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 there shall be deducted and withheld from each member's basic salary an amount equal to 6½ percent of such basic salary. Such deductions and withholdings shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia, and shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of the date of approval of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, approved August 21, 1957 (Public Law 85–157; 71 Stat. 391), provides that deductions from salaries of policemen and firemen be increased from 5 to 6½ percent on and after October 1, 1956.

The purpose of the bill is to change the effective date for the increased rate of deduction to the first day of the pay period which began on or after the approval of the act rather than make this date retroactive to October 1, 1956.

At the time the law was enacted amending the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1957 (Public Law 85–46; 71 Stat. 46), it was provided that deductions at the increased rate should begin on the first day of the second month following the enactment of such act, and the effective date of such act for all other purposes was October 1, 1956. It was the opinion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that it would be inequitable to require policemen and firemen to pay the increase in deductions from salary retroactively since teachers were not required to pay the increase retroactively.

The Commissioners strongly recommended the passage of this legislation and agreed to withhold deductions from salaries of police, firemen, and so forth, until the Congress had acted on this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 15, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 7300) to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (sec. 25–116, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 15."; by inserting "(b)" immediately before the second paragraph; and by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"(c) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in any case where an application is made for the issuance or transfer of a retailer's license for a place of business conducted in a residential-use district as defined in the zoning regulations and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission if the zoning of such place of business was changed from a less restricted use to such residential use during a period when a license of the same class for which application is made was in effect at such place of business: *Provided,* That a license of the same class at such place of business is in effect on the date the application for the new license, or transfer, is filed.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply in any case where an application is made for the issuance or transfer of a wholesaler's or manufacturer's license for a place of business conducted in a residential- or first commercial-use district as defined in the zoning regulations and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission if the zoning of such place of business was changed from a less restricted use to such residential- or first-commercial-use during a period when a license of the same class for which application is made was in effect at such place of business: *Provided,* That a license of the same class at such place of business is in effect on the date the application for the new license, or transfer, is filed.

"(e) In any case where an application is made pursuant to this section for the issuance or transfer of a retailer's license for a place of business conducted in a residential-use district, or for the issuance or transfer of a wholesaler's or manufacturer's license for a place of business conducted in a residential- or first-commercial-use district, as such districts are defined in the zoning regulations and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission, and the applicant for the issuance or transfer of any of the said licenses is the holder of a similar license for any of the said places of business in effect on the date the application for the new license, or transfer, is filed, nothing contained in this section shall be construed as entitling such licensee to any preferential treatment or be construed as making inapplicable any provision in any other section of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 9, strike "filed, nothing" and insert in lieu thereof "filed. Nothing."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, section 15 of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act as presently written prohibits the issuance of retailers' licenses, except of classes B or E, for any business conducted in a residential-use district as defined in the zoning regulations and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission as well as wholesalers' licenses in residential and manufacturers' licenses in residential- or first-commercial-use districts. Since by section 13 of the act "every annual license shall date from the 1st day of February in each year and expire on the 31st day of January next after its issuance," the act presently prohibits the reissuance of a license and for all practical purposes the transfer of a license for the same place of business where the zoning of the premises in which the business operates is changed in the case of a retailer or wholesaler to residential and in the case of a manufacturer to a commercial- or residential-use during the life of the license.

At the present time the number of places to which a license may be transferred is exceedingly limited, with the result in many cases a business possessing an ancoholic beverage control license will be destroyed by the change of zoning, a result which was not believed contemplated by either the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act or the Zoning Act.

The purpose of the bill is to overcome the effect of section 15 of the act in those cases where the zoning of a property where a license is in effect is changed to a more restricted zoning classification

than the former zoning classification and thus permit the continued operation of a licensed business.

This proposed legislation has the approval of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

There was objection.

LET'S MAINTAIN OUR WATERFOWL BREEDING GROUNDS, NOT DRAIN THEM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference H. R. 10641, a bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Soil Bank Act so as to end Federal cost sharing and technical assistance in farm drainage harmful to wildlife, and to create corresponding incentives for maintaining wet lands in the conservation reserve program. A companion bill, H. R. 10642, has been introduced by that distinguished conservationist, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Our national policy should be to encourage the highest and best use of the Nation's land and water resources. Instead, the Federal Government has been paying out millions of taxpayers' dollars to encourage farmers to drain wet lands, particularly in Minnesota and the Dakotas. Such drainage brings into existence new surplus crops of corn, wheat, and other grains. Additional millions of tax dollars are then spent for Government purchases of surplus corn and wheat, and for the soil-bank program to take corn and wheat land out of production. Further illustrating the inconsistencies, conservation reserve payments are now being made in some instances to restore marshlands previously drained with ACP assistance. The drainage program, by hastening runoff from the land, often causes harmful erosion and depletes our water reservoirs. It has already destroyed almost one-third of the Nation's finest breeding grounds for migratory waterfowl.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been urged time and again to put a stop to the wasteful and destructive phases of this program. He has refused to do so. H. R. 10641 is designed to meet this situation before the last waterfowl breeding ground has been blotted from the continental United States.

The basic authority for the Department of Agriculture's payments to farmers for draining wet lands is contained in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, Public Law 461, 74th Congress. Under this act, the Secretary of Agriculture has designated drainage as an eligible conservation practice, thereby permitting the Federal Government to pay farmers 50 percent of the cost of drainage work on their land, and the entire cost of technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service.

Federal cost-sharing for farm drainage was initiated in the North Central, Western, and Southern States in 1942. Spurred on by World War II, by 1944 Federal payments were being made in 37 States. The program received an additional impetus during the Korean conflict.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND POTHOLES DRAINED

This drainage of potholes, water-holding depressions varying in size from small potholes to shallow lakes covering hundreds of acres, has been most marked and destructive in the so-called prairie pothole region of the Middle West. This consists of 39 counties of eastern North Dakota, 44 counties of eastern South Dakota, and 57 counties of western Minnesota. Of the 1,350,000 potholes in the area at the start of the subsidized drainage program, more than 350,000 have been drained through Federal subsidies. In addition, an unknown number have been drained by farmers acting without the benefit of Federal subsidy.

The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, is chairman, held a hearing on August 15, 1957, on the question of farm drainage. The testimony of Daniel H. Janzen, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior, sums up the danger to our shrinking wildlife resources presented by Secretary Benson's activities:

1. The end of unlimited water resources for industry and agriculture is in sight. Our shortage of wet lands valuable for waterfowl habitat is nationwide. Our expanded population has far more time to spend in recreational activities and is constantly increasing its demands on our shinking waterfowl resources. Additional losses in waterfowl habitat will seriously jeopardize our waterfowl resource base. We must preserve and develop the remaining waterfowl habitat in the United States.

AN INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

2. The protection of migratory waterfowl and its habitat is more than a domestic responsibility. It is an international obligation of the Federal Government under treaties concluded with Great Britain and Mexico and a number of laws enacted by the Congress to implement those treaties. We believe that wholesale destruction of vital waterfowl production habitat by agencies of the Federal Government—or as a result of their programs—is clearly inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under these international conventions.

3. We want to emphasize here that we are not opposed to all drainage of wet lands. Neither are we opposed to Federal subsidy and technical assistance for all drainage. We are, however, greatly concerned about the continuance of Federal technical assistance for drainage of wet lands which are vital to the maintenance of our waterfowl resources.

4. The three-State area of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota has produced an average of 4 to 5 million ducks annually during the past 7 years. Nearly three-fourth of the ducks produced in the United States are hatched here. Waterfowl banded in the 3-State pothole region and northeastern Montana during the nesting season have been shot in 42 States, Canada, and Latin America.

Breeding ground studies conducted by the Service in cooperation with State fish and game departments and Canadian wildlife agencies show conclusively that the prairie pothole region, including the 3-State area and adjacent Canada, is the preferred breeding habitat on the North American Continent. In 1956, these potholes furnished production habitat for 67 percent of the continental breeding population.

It is sometimes suggested that drainage of prairie potholes may not necessarily be a serious factor in duck production because breeding birds can find nesting sites farther north in Canada. Breeding ground censuses during past years show conclusively that such a northward shift of breeding birds does occur when water is not abundant in the prairie region, but this shift causes a significant reduction in duck production. When there is an abundance of water farther south the birds will shift back to the preferred breeding habitat of the prairie pothole region to breed and nest.

The prairie potholes thus represent the most productive natural duck-breeding habitat on the continent and any reduction in this habitat by drainage must necessarily result in a lower production potential for our waterfowl.

5. Destructive soil erosion due to cloudbursts and floods in Minnesota in August, 1957, could have been prevented on two bases; first, if there had been less drainage more of the water would have been stored temporarily in these depressions, but because of the drainage it rushed off rapidly; second, had there been more assistance by th Department of Agriculture to stabilize the soil on the hillsides, there would have been less damage done to the farms. One of the reasons that there was not more assistance to farmers was because funds were not available. It has been my feeling for many years that if the engineering-technical assistance and the funds made available for this drainage were made available to farmers to stabilize soil on the hillsides, that problem would have been more nearly solved.

SAVING MILLIONS

6. For at least 8 years the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has negotiated with agricultural agencies to find a cooperative solution to the curtailment of drainage damaging to waterfowl. After all, this is a problem that can be solved only by the interests that are presently responsible for that drainage.

7. In keeping with current economy policies in Government, substantial savings of somewhat more than a million dollars annually could be achieved by abolishing subsidies for drainage in the three pothole States.

8. The position of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on this problem is that the Federal Government should not offer subsidies for drainage in the prairie pothole region of the Dakotas and Minnesota, because of the national interest in the 4 million acres of waterfowl wet lands there. We do not, of course, object to a farmer draining his land on his own initiative at his own expense. This is his right as a private property owner.

9. The handwriting is on the wall for the waterfowl resource of this Nation unless destruction of its breeding habitat is halted. Prompt action is called for to maintain this resource, and the recreation it supports, as we know them today.

Another witness was H. R. Morgan, of Bismarck, N. Dak., former North Dakota game and fish commissioner. Mr. Morgan, who is also chairman of the soil-bank committee of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, testified on behalf of the North Dakota Wildlife Federation. He said:

DRAINAGE INCONSISTENT WITH SOIL BANK

I should like to point out the inconsistency of spending public funds to encourage drainage of noncroplands which are to be placed in future crop production at a time when surpluses of certain crops are a problem.

On the one hand, we have the modern Soil Bank Act, designed to meet the surplus problem which is the result of too much production of certain commodities.

On the other hand, we have public funds being expended to convert more land into crop production. I believe this to be inefficient administration.

Still another witness was Thomas A. Schrader, director, Department of Game Fish and Parks, State of South Dakota, who testified:

DESTROYS UPLAND, TOO

Mr. REUSS. Based upon your years of experience in this prairie pothole area, both in the Fish and Wildlife Service and as director of the South Dakota Game Commission, do you have an opinion as to whether the federally subsidized drainage program has had an effect on wildlife production?

Mr. SCHRADER. It has had a tremendous adverse effect on wildlife, not only on waterfowl, which is primarily the interest of the Fish and Wildlife Service, but biologists in the South Dakota Game and Fish Department are of the opinion that this drainage does more harm to the upland game, primarily pheasant, than it does to the waterfowl. We have lost tremendous acreages of very valuable upland game habitat in addition to the waterfowl production that has been lost.

Mr. REUSS. Do you have an opinion, based on your actual observation, as to whether the effect of the federally subsidized farm drainage program in the pothole area has been primarily one of bringing new land into production as opposed to some other purpose?

Mr. SCHRADER. Well, all of it brings new land into production. In fact, it got its start during the war. This program was first accelerated by the effort during the war to put new land into production. It was listed as one of the early places which would increase production badly needed during the war. I have never been able to find a place, from my experience, where drainage would not increase production. Now there may be places where that is the case. But in the pothole country I have never seen a drainage project that did not have as its ultimate end result an increase in production. It is primarily for the production of corn and flax, which we have too much of already.

Mr. REUSS. When you say that you have never seen a pothole drainage project which has had any other result than increasing the area devoted to producing crops, how many potholes, or former potholes, have you looked at in the last 12 years?

Mr. SCHRADER. I suppose that I have seen 10,000 of them personally. I have been employed in this work to the extent that I have seen thousands and thousands of drained potholes. I have taken a good many of the photographs that we have in our files in the office.

DRAINAGE VASTLY EXCEEDS ACQUISITION

A comparison between federally assisted wet lands drainage programs and federally acquired waterfowl habitat in the three prairie pothole States for the period 1951–55 shows devastatingly how much faster we are moving to destroy duck habitat than to acquire it:

	ACP drainage		FWS acquisition	
	Funds spent [1]	Duck habitat removed (acres) [2]	Funds spent [3]	Duck habitat acquired (acres) [3]
1951	$871,380	40,700	$6,731	647
1952	1,089,851	63,700	50	57
1953	1,077,639	61,100	13,025	785
1954	1,117,976	40,300	1,179	282
1955	1,482,877	50,900	46,628	1,691
Total	5,639,723	256,700	67,613	3,462

[1] Source: Annual summaries of ACPS.
[2] Source: FWS estimates based on 25 percent of total ACP drainage in the 140 counties where duck production is important. These estimates represent 19.3 percent of all reported drainage for the 3 States.
[3] Annual reports of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

As the above table shows, the agriculture conservation program was spending 83 times as much to destroy waterfowl habitat as the Fish and Wildlife Service was spending to acquire it. In terms of acres, ACP was removing 74 times as many acres of wetlands as FWS acquired.

Faced with this indictment of the farm drainage program in the prairie pothole States, the Department of Agriculture spokesman at the August 15, 1957, hearing sought to justify the Department's activities by insisting that the program was good conservation. When pressed how a program that was wasteful of water, destructive of wildlife habitat, and inconsistent with soil-bank objectives could be called conservation, Deputy Administrator Gladwyn E. Young of the Soil Conservation Service testified that by draining their marshy areas farmers can shift crop production to lowlands that are less subject to soil erosion than their uplands. It seems to me a more sensible approach would be for the Soil Conservation Service and the agriculture conservation program service to attempt to save the uplands from erosion by vigorously promoting practices such as terracing, contouring, and strip cropping, rather than let the uplands go to pot and then attempt to recoup needed land by draining wetlands. This is not the first time that true conservation has been trespassed against in the name of conservation.

CONSERVATIONISTS PROTEST

True conservationists have protested for many years the Department of Agriculture's farm drainage activities in the prairie pothole States. From time to time, the Department of Agriculture has thrown a crumb to its critics by adding a word here or a phrase there to its farm drainage regulations. In 1952 language was added requiring due consideration to the maintenance of wildlife resources. Starting in 1955 language was added prohibiting drainage assistance for the primary purpose of bringing new land into crop production. Apparently the Department of Agriculture made no serious effort to enforce even these loose limitations. An inspector for the Fish and Wildlife Service conducted a survey of ACP drainage activities in North Dakota in 1955 and 1956. Of the acreage drained during these 2 years in North Dakota, he reported, 48.1 percent—13.4 percent of the total number of potholes drained—was in direct violation of the Department of Agriculture's regulations. This high percentage of violations of even the Department's loose rules appears to be the result of leaving the drainage program to such a large extent in the hands of county agricultural stabilization conservation committees.

On August 9, 1957, the Agriculture Conservation Program Service issued still a new regulation on drainage subsidies, as follows:

1101.976. Practice C-9: Constructing permanent open drainage systems to dispose of excess water. Federal cost-sharing may be authorized for clearing the necessary minimum width right-of-way. Federal cost-sharing may be authorized for the spreading of spoil banks where this is necessary for the effective utilization of the drainage system. No Federal cost-sharing will be allowed for ditches, the primary purpose of which is to bring new land into agricultural production. This practice is not applicable to land other than that devoted to the production of cultivated crops or crops normally seeded to hay or pasture during at least 2 of the 5 years preceding that in which the practice is applied; provided, however, that upon a showing by a farmer applicant for this practice that the land on which the practice is to be applied was in cultivated crops, tame hay, or seeded pasture 2 years out of 10 years preceding the application applied for, he may be allowed cost-shares as to such land. The installation of this practice on eligible land shall not be ineligible for cost-shares because its use results in incidental drainage on ineligible land. No Federal cost-shares are allowable for cleaning a ditch, installing crossing structures, or for other structures primarily for the convenience of the farm operator. In the installation of drainage systems, due consideration shall be given to the maintenance of wildlife habitat.

FEDERAL GOBBLEDYGOOK

This regulation was aptly characterized in the September 1, 1957, issue of Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, as—

A classic example of Federal gobbledygook. The loopholes are plenty big enough to drive a bulldozer or a dragline through at any point. * * * The phrase "primary purpose" in the third sentence above permits local committees in charge of ACP payments to say that bringing new land into production is merely incidental to another purpose, say the drying-up of wet fringes of a pothole that have been farmed in years of subnormal rainfall. The effect of the long, involved fourth sentence is 2 in 10 years; the 2 in 5 proposal is meaningless. If despite the foregoing loopholes it still bothers the conscience of a county committee to approve the drainage of a pothole, the fifth sentence clearly opens the way for ditches passing incidentally through permanent potholes to reach adjacent eligible land.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior on August 27, 1957, had the following

discouraging comment to make on the new ACP regulation:

The 1958 ACPS program regulations for drainage assistance under practices C–9 and C–10 have been carefully studied. In our review of these regulations particular attention was given to the new language they contain which purportedly was included to clarify the policies and objectives of the Department of Agriculture in administering the program. Our conclusion is that the 1958 regulations provide more encouragement through Federal assistance for drainage of farm wetlands than comparable regulations of the past several years.

Under practice C–9, the wording of the first two sentences authorizing cost-sharing for clearing rights-of-way and for the spreading of spoil banks is the same as in 1957. The third sentence which states that Federal cost-sharing will not be allowed for ditches, the primary purpose of which is to bring new land into production, likewise is the same as last year. Experience has shown that the term "primary purpose" is widely used as a justification for assisting drainage which does bring substantial acreages of new land into production.

The fourth sentence apparently is a new attempt to define land eligible for drainage assistance. Although the first portion of this sentence states that the practice is not applicable to land other than that devoted to the production of cultivated crops, seeded hay or pasture during 2 of the preceding 5 years, a following proviso nullifies this restriction by stating that cost-sharing will be allowed for lands shown to be in production of such crops 2 out of the preceeding 10 years. Thus, under this portion of the regulation, lands which are considered as unfit for cultivation, tame hay, or seeded pasture 80 percent of the time are now eligible for drainage cost-sharing. Drainage of such lands obviously destroys much waterfowl habitat and increases the acreage of land under cultivation.

The fifth sentence authorizes cost-sharing for drainage of eligible lands which cannot be drained without also draining ineligible lands. This is a new provision in the regulations, although the practice of allowing such cost-sharing is not new. In past years, ineligible wetlands have been drained with Federal funds and technical assistance when they were located between an eligible area and the terminal point of the ditch necessary to drain this eligible area. Situations of this type comprised some of the more flagrant deviations from the stated policy of the agricultural agencies assisting drainage. Inclusion of this new language apparently is intended to provide outright policy authorization, at the national level, for such cases, which in the past have been justified on the basis of local interpretation. In effect, this provision in the 1958 regulations will make all potholes susceptible to legal drainage.

The last two sentences in the regulations for practice C–9 contain no new provisions over those included in the 1957 docket.

The regulations for practice C–10 in the 1958 docket include provisions identical with those in practice C–9. Our comments on these provisions apply to the regulations for both practices.

On the whole, the 1958 regulations for ACPS practices C–9 and C–10 do not reflect cooperative or sympathetic consideration of the views of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on the impact of drainage on waterfowl habitat. We also wish to point out that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife was not provided an opportunity to review these regulations prior to their acceptance by the Secretary of Agriculture.

FRUSTRATED BY SECRETARY BENSON

The frustration of any conservationist who has tried to stem Secretary Benson's farm-drainage program is well described in an article by Harold Titus, Big Man From a Little Town, in the February 1958 issue of Field and Stream. Mr. Titus tells of the trip to Washington of Dr. J. H. Shaeffer, of Parker, S. Dak., president of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation:

Another encounter that the doctor characterizes as his greatest hour of frustration was staged in Washington, when he appeared with others before Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson to protest the drainage program. After a long talk about the situation with South Dakota's Senator CASE, Shaeffer got an appointment with high brass of SCS and ACP, "certainly figured that was a break," confesses Jim. "I was sure that if I could sit down with key officials I could make them understand how we feel, and why. But when I got there, here were these two high-ups and each had two assistants at his elbow. Every time I made a statement or asked a question they turned on an avalanche of statistics and citations that just smothered me." If they couldn't stop me dead with the data they had with them, they sent out for another big batch. I knew from living on the land that the water was disappearing because of the drainage program administered by those men. My own tax dollars were being shelled out to hurry water off the land, in direct contradiction to one of the original concepts of conservation as proclaimed by the Soil Conservation Service. More of my tax dollars were being used to pay farmers for raising more surpluses on those drained acres. I knew that the water table in my State was dropping and that, if history supplies any precedent, another drought would come and the Great Plains would need every natural wet spot to survive it.

"But I couldn't get to first base," he says. "I was just a little fellow from a little town and trying to mix with the big time."

THE GRANGE'S POSITION

H. R. 10641 is designed to end Federal aid for farm drainage where wildlife interests are adversely affected, and at the same time see to it that farmers in the area affected become eligible to receive incentive payments for maintaining their wetlands roughly equivalent to what they would have received for draining them. The bill is, therefore, an attempt to deal fairly with farmers in the prairie pothole area, and to see that they are not put at a financial disadvantage with farmers in other areas who may receive help for drainage. This is in substantial accordance with the comments of Mr. Gordon K. Zimmerman, research, director, the National Grange, in his letter of August 16, 1957, to the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. Mr. Zimmerman's letter states:

Under the circumstances, the Grange believes:

1. That the prairie potholes have a unique value as breeding grounds for waterfowl production;

2. That the chief beneficiaries of pothole maintenance are sportsmen living in sections of the country at some distance from the potholes;

3. That farmers owning the potholes cannot in justice and fairness be deprived, for the benefit of sportsmen, of income opportunities and Government program assistance available to other farmers; and

4. That a program should be devised and put into operation whereby sportsmen and hunters benefiting from pothole maintenance will compensate pothole owners for such maintenance. This might be accomplished, for example, by an increase in the duck-stamp fee or some other license fee arrangement for hunters."

TEXT OF BILL

The text of H. R. 10641 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C., sec. 590g) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) No assistance shall be furnished for draining wetlands, either through grants or by technical assistance, unless advance notice of the proposed assistance has been given the Secretary of the Interior; and such assistance shall be furnished only upon concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior upon a finding that wildlife preservation will not be materially harmed by the proposed drainage. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly develop rules and regulations for the expeditious administration of this subsection."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 107 (a) (1) of the Soil Bank Act (7 U. S. C. sec. 1831 (a)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "or to maintain for the contract period a specifically designated acreage of wetlands on the farm."

(b) Section 107 (a) (7) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and to wildlife management of wetlands acreages."

(c) Section 107 (b) (2) of such act is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence thereof the following new sentences: "In establishing such rates in the case of contracts for the maintenance of wetlands, the Secretary shall also take into consideration the value of such wetlands for wildlife and water conservation purposes and the incentive necessary to prevent their drainage. The aggregate of the annual payments made to producers in any State in a year for maintaining wetlands shall not exceed the sum of the amounts paid producers in that State under this subtitle for maintaining wetlands and the amounts granted or expended in such State under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for draining wetlands, in that 1 of the 3 preceding years in which such sums was the largest."

(d) Section 107 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) In determining the lands in any acreage to be covered by contractors for the maintenance of wetlands, the Secretary shall give priority to lands for which drainage aid under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act has been requested.

"(f) The Secretary, in agreement with the Secretary of the Interior, may delegate to the Secretary of the Interior such of his duties hereunder relating to the maintenance of wetlands and to wildlife management thereof as he deems can best be carried out by such a delegation."

DETAILED ANALYSIS

There follows a detailed analysis of H. R. 10641.

Section 1: This cuts off assistance for farm drainage under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 where the Secretary of the Interior finds that wildlife preservation will be materially harmed by the proposed drainage. It should be noted that this provision merely cuts off Federal assistance and, of course, does not prevent a farmer from going ahead on his own. By providing that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall develop regulations for carrying out the Secretary of

Interior's wildlife protective power, the section makes possible speedy administration. For example, the Secretaries might well decide to concentrate on proposed drainages in Minnesota and the Dakotas, where the problem of wildlife preservation is acute, and to refrain from interfering with the drainage program elsewhere.

Section 2: (a) This subsection amends the Soil Bank Act of 1956 by specifically including in the conservation-reserve program the maintenance of wetlands. According to the Secretary of Agriculture, maintenance of wetlands is not included in the act as it now stands.

(b) This subsection allows the Secretary of Agriculture to require not only that wetlands be maintained but that wildlife-management practices be performed, if the applicant is to receive conservation-reserve annual payments.

(c) This subsection does two things. First, it directs the Secretary of Agriculture to "take into consideration the value of such wetlands for wildlife and water-conservation purposes and the incentive necessary to prevent their drainage" in establishing conservation reserve payments. Second, it sets a ceiling on what may be paid to farmers in any one year. This ceiling seems necessary because otherwise there would be nothing to stop farmers from all over the country applying for conservation-reserve payments for whatever wetlands they happen to have on their farm. The ceiling set up by this subsection is the sum of the highest amounts paid in that State in the 3 prior years under a combination of the existing farm-drainage program and the proposed wetlands-maintenance program of the conservation reserve. For example, in order to determine the ceiling under this subsection for Minnesota for conservation-reserve wetlands-maintenance payments for the year 1956, reference should be made to Federal drainage expenditures for Minnesota for 1955, 1954, and 1953, which come to $333,000, $182,000, and $302,000, respectively (since the conservation-reserve program was not in existence, no expenditures for maintaining wetlands were made in these years). Since the highest amount is $333,000, the limit to be spent in Minnesota for 1956 would have been $333,000.

(d) This subsection does two things. First, it gives priority for obtaining conservation-reserve payments for wetlands maintenance to farmers who have applied for Federal aid in draining their wetlands, and have been turned down. The purpose, obviously, is to avoid hardship toward and discrimination against farmers in the Minnesota-Dakotas area.

Second, it permits delegation of functions having to do with wetlands maintenance and management from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of Interior. This provision is included because the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior is already vested with many wetlands-management functions, mostly on the Federal wildlife refuges. It may well be thought economical and efficient to have this portion of the soil bank farmed out to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10641 will compensate farmers for doing what is best for their land, not for doing what is worst for their land. I hope that it becomes law.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTHDAY OF HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN, FORMER MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on this, another anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln on February 12, I again find particular pleasure and inspiration by reading as much as possible of the more recent available facts about him, as well as reviewing some of my own personal files and library of him. Abraham Lincoln, as you know, was a Member of the United States House of Representatives during the 30th Congress, from March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849.

And, in passing, I recall that annually on the occurrence of this significant birthday of a great American statesman and great American President, I did begin in 1949 taking occasion to make some remarks similar to those I now make.

When Mrs. Doyle and I again visited Lincoln's birthplace at Hodgenville, Ky., and again viewed the original Lincoln cabin there in the national park at Hodgenville, which was during our following of the Lincoln Trail from Washington, D. C., where he was assassinated at Ford's Theater, to his magnificent tomb at Springfield, Ill., we included in that trail trip by auto en route to our home in southern California, at least a short stop and visit to each and every of the spots and place where history records for public information where Abraham Lincoln himself lived, or worked, or practiced law, or forded a stream, and also included those places of public pronouncement where the father and mother of Abraham Lincoln stopped for a bit, or crossed a river, or built a cabin en route from Kentucky to Indiana and Illinois. This was a very enriching experience to my wife and me and I recommend that those of you who possibly can do so and have a similar thrilling experience.

I remember that at the place of record at Hodgenville we saw an original document in the handwriting of Bersheba Lincoln, widow of Thomas Lincoln—who was the father of Abraham Lincoln—which said:

Sir, you will please give a license for Wm. Brumfield to marry Anne Lincoln, my daughter. Given under my hand this 3d of February 1801.

And again we saw on the cornerstone of the original Lincoln birthplace cabin the following:

This is on the original farm site of 200 acres owned by Thomas Lincoln, father of Abraham, for which he paid $230 and a few other costs.

It has been my pleasure to participate and cooperate in the very worthy and educational functions, as a member of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, in their presentation of and promulgation of the life and death of President Lincoln.

I have another recommendation which is that every member of this great legislative body who has not already done so go to the Lincoln Museum located in the Ford's Theater building where our former colleague was shot by the assassin John Wilkes Booth on the night of April 14, 1865, and by all means take all the members of your own family with you. Amongst other historic exhibits you will there be able to see and to read and to appreciate some of the original quotations by Abraham Lincoln which are exhibited on certain panels. Some of the favorites of mine I reread whenever I can are as follows:

I was born and have ever remained in the most humble walks of life. I have no wealthy or popular relations or friends to recommend me. (Lincoln's first public address, New Salem, Ill., March 9, 1932.)

I am not an accomplished lawyer; I find quite as much material for a lecture in those points wherein I have failed, as in those wherein I have been moderately successful. (Notes for a law lecture, July 1, 1950 (?). The Life and Writings of Abraham Lincoln, Philip Van Doren Stern.)

As I would not be a slave, I would not be a master—this expresses my idea of democracy. (Written about August 1858; Lincoln: His Life in Photographs, Stefan Lorant.)

I am glad I made the late race. * * * I believe I have made some marks which will tell for the cause of civil liberty long after I am gone. (Letter to A. G. Henry, November 19, 1858.)

You can vote for me if your neighbors will let you. (Letter to Nathaniel Grigsby, September 20, 1860.)

If you know of any other men who think they are bigger than I am, let me know. I want to put them all in my Cabinet. (Said to a friend in Springfield; The Life and Writings of Abraham Lincoln, Philip Van Doren Stern.)

I would rather have Democrats I know than Republicans I don't know. (Said to Judge Joseph Gillespie; Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years, Carl Sandburg.)

My * * * object * * * is to save the Union, and not either to save or to destroy slavery. (Letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862.)

Upon this act, * * * I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God. (Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863.)

This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom. (Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863.)

Let us strive on to finish the work we are in. (Second inauguration, March 4, 1865.)

To bind up the Nation's wounds. (Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865.)

If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference. (Conversation at the White House, reported by Frank B. Carpenter; source: Familiar Quotations, Christopher Morley, ed., Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1948, p. 458.)

In my personal records and files in the life of Abraham Lincoln, a Member of Congress from Illinois, one of the most interesting itemized records I have of any Member of Congress is that of "Hon. Abraham Lincoln, 30th Congress, 2d session, for December 1848 through March 1849."

When I spoke of his life on February 12, 1951, to this august body on the anniversary of his 142d birthday, I called attention to the fact that while here in Washington he generally lived at Mrs. Spriggs' boarding house here on the Hill where at the present time the Library

of Congress is situated, and that he was appointed to the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and also the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department. It appears the principal issues of those days were the War with Mexico, the extension of slavery, the Wilmot proviso, western migration, discovery of gold in California and our relations with the Indians.

The recognized authority on the life and doings of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg, says of him as follows:

To understand the humor of this merry, serious, sad man, one must remember his sympathy and understanding for men and his deep faith in God. He moved without the slightest jar from telling a funny story to a decision on some serious problem of Government or to a declaration of his faith in the providence of Almighty God.

And historian Sandburg also writes that Lincoln was paid a visit by members of the Baltimore Presbyterian Synod, and that, when they voiced their confidence in him as President, Lincoln made to them an avowal of religious faith, as follows:

I have often wished that I was a more devout man than I am. Nevertheless amid the greatest difficulties of my administration, when I could see no other resort, I would place my whole reliance in God, knowing that all would go well, and then He would decide for the right.

In these brief remarks by me on this anniversary of he who is affectionately called "citizen of the ages," I wish to again very earnestly urge each of you, my distinguished colleagues—regardless of political party registration or philosophy to become very much more acquainted with and to apply the philosophy of this great martyr to the best there was and still is in the life of our beloved Nation.

And, while the text of the famous Gettysburg Address of November 19, 1863, is no doubt at least as well known as the text of any speech in American history, I close my remarks by again including it for your refreshment and inspiration. He having been a Member of this great legislative forum, and having been the 16th President of the United States, set a pattern of habitually practicing justice, fairness, wholesomeness, patriotism, and dedication to his public duties and responsibilities which should always be a beacon light to our own daily paths and practices and attitudes.

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent, a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of it, as a final resting place for those who died here, that the Nation might live. This we may, in all propriety, do. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have hallowed it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here; while it can never forget what they did here.

It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that, from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain; that the Nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON STEPHENS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 146th anniversary of the birth of a great American and one of Georgia's immortals—Alexander Hamilton Stephens. Puny, sickly, and and orphan at 14 Alexander Stephens rose from a poor plowboy to the vice presidency of the Confederate States and Governor of my State. Affectionately known as Little Ellick, Mr. Stephens made up in towering intellect and an unquenchable spirit what nature had denied him in physique and health. Ill health and infirmity followed him all the days of his life.

Little Ellick's father was a small-scale farmer in what was then Wilkes County, Ga. Alexander Stephens received little in the way of formal schooling before the age of 15. Yet he graduated at the head of his class at the University of Georgia in 1832. He was admitted to the bar 2 years later. Mr. Stephens was elected to his first term in Congress in 1843. He retired because of ill health 16 years later as the clouds of war lowered over this country.

Alexander Stephens revered the Constitution. He opposed the Mexican War on strictly constitutional grounds. He opposed nullification and secession for the same reason. When Georgia voted 208 to 89 to follow South Carolina in secession. Alexander Stephens was 1 of the 89. Indeed, many northern leaders including Mr. Lincoln had firmly believed that Mr. Stephens would be able by sheer oratory and influence to prevent Georgia from joining the broad movement of secession. He bowed to the will of the majority and thereafter supported the cause of the South with a zeal and devotion matched by few others. He became vice president of the Confederate States of America in February 1861 when the fatal die had been cast.

After the end of the war Alexander Stephens served in the 43d, 44th, 45th, and 46th Congresses as Representative from my State. He became Governor of Georgia in 1882 but died the following year in the 72d year of his life. He was revered throughout the South and highly respected by many northern leaders who knew him personally.

In a speech he made in Augusta, Ga., which brought a great audience to its feet, Little Ellick urged his listeners to stand by the Constitution in any and every event. A counsel which I may say is even more cogent and necessary today.

AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a growing situation which I view with alarm and this has to do with a rapidly deteriorating professional aircraft maintenance and overhaul industry in face of the greatest workloads since World War II.

This situation is due largely to the constantly increasing Government workshops which have grown to the point of employing over 140,000 technicians while private enterprise is laying off thousands of highly skilled personnel which can accomplish this work at considerably less cost than the Government workshops.

It has been and still is our first duty in Congress to provide the new weaponry that our military needs to defend our Nation. But while our main attention has been on these complicated problems I am afraid the military has run off with the ball in another direction—that is, setting up a large business in our Nation in competition with private enterprise. Such a policy is contrary to the intent of Congress and certainly the often pronounced policy of the administration of getting Government out of business.

Unfortunately, when appropriation requests come before us for this important phase of our military activities I find the figures are widely scattered and buried within operations to the extent that it has been difficult to ferret out what is actually going on.

My information indicates that of the $1.5 billion which we approve for the Navy and Air Force for aircraft maintenance, overhaul, and modification, only approximately 3 percent goes out to competitive bid which is the only measuring stick we have of knowing if the cost is right. Over 36 percent or $565 million is retained by the military to operate their own shops while industry which has not one Government dollar of the total $100 million investment in plant facilities is now operating at only 50-percent capacity.

The whole subject of maintenance is now taking a $7 billion bite out of our military budget and as we stockpile more hardware it will be even greater. This brings me to the point of urging Congress to investigate this situation, set up or suggest a policy to be followed, and require corrective action. This subject is important to our economy as well as reducing costs to the taxpayer, and maintaining proper procurement policies within our Defense Establishment.

Just last week Congress approved a multi-million-dollar supplemental appropriation to provide dispersal facilities

for SAC. It is proper that SAC be dispersed but before we plow millions more into new facilities, I urge this House to take a look and find out why we cannot turn into SAC bases our present huge investment in the extensive workshop airports which are ready made for dispersal now. This would free those present technicians which SAC says it must have because they are unable to get more than 12 percent of their fleet in the air at one time without these technicians. This industrial type of aircraft maintenance running into many hundreds of millions of dollars could then be turned over to private enterprise at a great saving in cost and badly needed first-line defense technicians. The way it is now the amount of competitive business offered industry will hardly fill 5 plants of the 20 companies which our country encouraged and used in our Korean emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress and the Office of the Secretary of Defense give specific attention to this problem. Thank you.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE PROPOSED FOR FEDERAL WORKERS—A NEW APPROACH

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which will repeal the discriminatory provision in the Social Security Act which now denies coverage to about 2 million members of the civil service retirement system and certain other retirement systems of the Federal Government or its instrumentalities. I should like to make it perfectly clear that this bill will not affect, in any manner, the benefit rights that Federal employees now have under their existing retirement systems. And it should also be made perfectly clear that each employee presently within the purview of my bill will have the right to decide whether or not he wishes the additional protection of the social security system.

We have prided ourselves in this country on the growth of our social security system. When the act was first passed, only 6 out of every 10 workers were covered. Now 9 out of 10 workers are covered, and, if my bill is enacted, we could truly say that we have a universal system.

Today over 15 million Americans enjoy substantial security for themselves and for their families because they have the protection of both social security and a private pension plan. Likewise, over a million and a half working men and women are covered under social security and also under a State or local retirement system. And over 2½ million servicemen are accruing credits toward benefits under their respective military retirement systems and under social security.

The general exclusions from coverage of Federal employees that my bill would repeal have been amended in a piecemeal fashion over the years. In a sense, so many exceptions have been made that the exceptions are now the rule. One of the provisions my bill would repeal is a coverage exclusion in section 210 (A) (5) which, as far as anybody has been able to find out, really does not apply to anybody.

Here is the confusing story of the patchwork way in which social security affects employees of Federal, State, and local governments today. It begins in 1950 because, prior to that time, no Federal, State, or local employees received social-security credit on the basis of their government service. The 1950 amendments, however, brought in approximately 100,000 Federal employees who were not included in a Federal retirement system, and also covered employees of such Federal instrumentalities as the Federal credit union, the Federal Reserve banks, national banks, national farm-loan associations, and other instrumentalities, even though they might have a retirement system of their own. Similarly, coverage was authorized in 1950 for State and local employees who were not under retirement systems, but this latter exclusion of retirement-system members was removed in 1954 so that almost all State and local employees are now potentially eligible for social-security protection. The 1954 amendments also rary employees in the field service of the Federal Government, including temporary employees in the field service of the post office and temporary census takers of the Bureau of the Census. Finally, in 1956, coverage was extended to members of the Armed Forces, members of the retirement system of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other State and local employees under retirement systems who had previously been excluded by various technicalities of the law.

The bill I have introduced today will provide coverage, on an elective basis, to all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities not previously under the social-security system. This means that members of the civil-service retirement system, including Members of the Congress and employees of the legislative branch, will have the opportunity to obtain the additional protection provided by social security. Coverage will also be available for members of the Foreign Service retirement system, of the retirement system for the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia, as well as for the members of various retirement systems of the Federal judiciary and those of such Federal instrumentalities as the Federal home-loan banks and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Moreover, the bill will repeal certain other exclusions from coverage relating to certain temporary employees and even the President and Vice President. In reality my bill means that all Federal employees will be getting social-security credits if they earn $50 or more within a 3-month calendar quarter of the year.

The method of adding social-security protection on top without change in the status of the benefit structure of an employee's existing retirement system is not at all unique. It is a little known fact that the great majority of the State and local retirement systems which have voted to come under social security have done so in just this manner. Congress also adopted precisely this approach when it extended coverage to members of the Armed Forces under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act of 1956.

Moreover, my bill would use the so-called two-division approach, which Congress instituted when it authorized coverage for certain State and local employees, including those of my own State of New York, in the 1956 amendments. According to this plan members of retirement systems would be separated into two divisions: One division to be composed of members who desire social-security coverage and the other of members who do not want it. Like the two division State and local legislation, my bill also provides that individuals who are employed by the Federal Government after the date of enactment will be put in the division which is under social security. This is a precautionary measure to avoid adverse selection of risks and preserve the financial integrity of the social security trust fund.

I believe that the enactment of my bill is necessary for a number of reasons. First of all, as I have said previously, this legislation will terminate the discriminatory exclusions from social security—which do not apply to workers in private industry or to employees of State and local government—and give all Federal workers the opportunity for social-security coverage even though they are under another retirement system.

Secondly, it will eliminate the great inequities which arise when employees go into Federal service from private industry or any other covered employment. Take the case of a young secretary who has been employed 8 years in an insurance company and then enters Government service as a career employee. She stands to lose all of the money she has paid into the social-security fund, without hope of benefit or refund, because she does not have the 10 years normally required for fully insured status under social security. And even if she had worked for the required 10 years, the amount of the benefit she will receive when she retires will suffer corrosion because she is not covered by social security in her Government job. Or to give a case of even more blatant inequity, consider the young father of three children who enters Government service but dies before he has the requisite 5 years of coverage under the civil-service system, and is also unfortunate enough to have lost his insured status under social security. His family is indeed in desperate straits because he died while he was in this coverage vacuum.

Finally, my bill will be of particular value to the short-term Federal worker who, for one reason or another, leaves Government service. If he has less than 5 years in Government he will have no benefit entitlement at all and, even if he has this minimum entitlement, his payment will be extremely low inasmuch

as Civil Service benefits are heavily weighted on the basis of length of service.

These are just a few examples of the compelling need for the kind of legislation I am proposing. I recognize that, in the past, there have been objections on the part of Federal workers to proposals which would integrate Federal retirement systems with social security, because they were convinced that they would lose some of their existing benefit rights. My plan meets this objection with a new approach. It makes no change whatsoever in either existing system, except to make it possible for those people who wish the additional protection of social security, to take full advantage of both.

A CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS WAYS AND MEANS OF COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOLTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today offering a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should call an immediate conference of the leaders of industry, labor and Government with a view toward setting up a long-range program leading to full employment in the United States.

Since 1954 I have been urging the President to call a nationwide conference to discuss ways and means of combating the problem of unemployment. In response to a letter I wrote to the President on October 9, 1957, with particular reference at that time to the layoffs in the aircraft industry on Long Island, I received a reply from Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, to whom my letter had been referred, which was in my opinion just a slough off. Mr. Mitchell stated in his reply to me of October 30, 1957, that a "survey of conditions in all major labor market areas indicated that defense curtailment had not affected the overall manpower situation significantly in most areas". The letter avoided the question of what to do about defense lay-offs, and about the unemployment situation in general, and demonstrated a lack of vision and imagination in coping with the problem.

A reply from the White House to my most recent letter of January 13, 1958, reflects that my suggestion is being examined.

In the meantime we read in the papers today that Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks expects unemployment to go as high as 5 million this month, the highest figure since 1941. This figure did not take into consideration at all those who may be working 1 or 2 days a week, so that the actual figure looks fairly close to 10 percent of the entire working force. In my own home county of Queens in New York unemployment has increased 38 percent since last year, and in Nassau and Suffolk Counties it has increased 53 percent.

Incidents of history are repeating themselves. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. And, while we may not be able to pinpoint the blame for the 1929 depression on President Hoover, we certainly can find fault with the fact that he sat back and took no constructive action, even when the breadlines became longer and longer. This administration is showing its usual dynamic inertia with respect to anything that affects so closely the lives and livelihood of the people. However, we cannot afford to wait until we are in a full scale depression. A healthy expanding economy in this country is important to the stability and prosperity of the entire free world. Now is the time to act, before it is too late.

We must not listen to the prophets of prosperity, in spite of Secretary Weeks' calm statement that he expects everything to work out by June. I wish I knew where he got his crystal ball, because I see no evidence available that the business slump will be terminated in a few months. This in spite of a tremendous amount of money being spent for defense. If there are any secret weapons we can fashion or utilize to combat the specter of unemployment we must use them now. With bold and imaginative leadership we can meet this challenge, keep pace with developments, and keep our economy on firm footing.

I respectfully urge the Members of the House and the Senate to concur in my resolution suggesting the calling of such a conference.

IMPLEMENT CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to join today with the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS and his distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle in introducing in the House Mr. DOUGLAS' civil-rights bill of 1958.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides no new rights. It suggests no changes in the statute passed in the last session nor does it confirm the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court which need no confirmation by this body. The bill does one thing—it provides explicit conditions and machinery for implementation of the decisions of the Supreme Court. It does this by providing a system of Federal grants and technical or professional assistance to school districts and local units which are working out plans for desegregation of their public schools. In those communities which are unable to implement the Supreme Court decisions themselves or undesirous of doing so, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to assist the community by suggesting such a plan, holding hearings, and in every way furthering the purposes of the decision of the Court with deliberate speed and at the same time accomplishing these purposes with every opportunity for community cooperation and support. Title III of the 1957 act is restored in this bill as a final measure to guarantee equal protection of the law.

Mr. Speaker, even as cosponsor of this bill and believing as I do that the need for its passage cannot be denied, I nonetheless do not believe that it should have been necessary for this body to do the job that this bill does. Essentially, the provisions of the bill are administrative provisions which could and should have been set in operation long before this by the executive branch. Since the Civil Rights Act was passed in the last session and a Civil Rights Commission was established, Little Rock focused the attention of the world on us. A handful of children, who asked nothing but that which the highest Court of the land had proclaimed as their right, triggered a town, a State and part of a nation into hysteria by taking what was their right. Little Rock could happen again. No steps have been taken to prevent its happening again.

Attorney General Rogers' call for a cooling-off period in the area of civil rights and the delay in the appointment of a staff director of the Civil Rights Commission are omens of inactivity which we cannot afford; nor did the President's recent messages indicate any plan of action to end denial of constitutional rights. This is the time for action. We have waited long enough for positive action from the administration. It has not come and there is no evidence that it will in the near future. If Congress must take this function over, then I urge my colleagues to act with speed and with assurance by passage of this bill.

COLUMNS OF THE YEAR 1957

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on July 16, 1957, it was my sad duty to inform the House of the death of the Honorable James M. Cox, a former distinguished Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Ohio and one who had distinguished himself in many other ways in the fields of politics, business, and human services.

Fitting tributes were paid that day, Mr. Speaker, to the memory of this great man by yourself, myself, and many other Members of Congress who had had the privilege of knowing him personally and serving with him.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I learned that Mr. John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., for himself and for his late father paid glowing tribute in memory of the work and life of James M. Cox. His tribute appeared in his column, the Editor's Notebook, in the Miami Herald of July 21, 1957.

The Honorable Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of Dixie Business—The Voice of Southern Progress, a magazine he started in November 1929, and which is published in Decatur, Ga., selected this column written by John S. Knight in honor of the memory of the Governor as the Dixie Business Column of the Year 1957. In view of this recognition of Mr. Knight's column by the editor of Dixie Business and in view of the very fitting tributes it pays to the memory of a great American, the Honorable James M. Cox, and also so that this splendid column may be preserved as a historic document, I include it with these remarks in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date.

THE GOVERNOR ROSE FAR ABOVE TYPICAL SUCCESS

(By John S. Knight)

The telephone rang insistently, as only telephones can, demanding to be answered. Half awake, I lifted the receiver and glanced at the clock. It was 1:30 in the morning.

"This is the Associated Press. Governor Cox has died. May we have a quote?"

My comment was brief, and I fear, totally inadequate.

For James Middleton Cox, though not a familiar name to the modern generation, was one of the truly great men of the first half of this century.

HIS CAREER BEGAN ON A NEWSPAPER

The Governor, as he was best known to his friends and associates, began his career on a newspaper in Middletown, Ohio.

Then came several years in Washington as secretary to a Congressman. Upon returning to Ohio, Cox bought the languishing Evening News of Dayton for $26,000. The purchase was financed through personal loans and stock subscriptions.

As Walter Locke, Cox' distinguished and faithful editor, has said: "It was journalism on a shoestring, a common sort in those days when newspapers were born and died with easy facility."

THREE TIMES OHIOANS CHOSE HIM AS GOVERNOR

After 10 years of lusty newspapering, Cox turned again to politics. He served two terms in Congress and was first elected Governor of Ohio in 1912.

The progressive young governor brought into being a modern State government. His reforms were bitterly resisted by the vested interests and they managed to defeat him for reelection.

But as the people had time to evaluate and appreciate his accomplishments, the governor was returned to the statehouse in 1916 and again in 1918 to become the first three-time chief executive in Ohio's history, and probably its greatest.

DEFEAT IS DIFFERENT FROM SURRENDER

In 1920 Governor Cox was nominated for the Presidency at San Francisco, with Franklin D. Roosevelt as his running mate.

His campaign against a fellow Ohio newspaper publisher, Senator Warren G. Harding, boldly and vigorously advocated membership in the League of Nations.

It was doomed to defeat. The Republicans had straddled the League issue in their platform but Harding later declared: "The League is dead."

The Nation, disillusioned about "saving the world for democracy" and resentful against Woodrow Wilson, voted overwhelmingly for Harding and isolation.

But even in defeat, Cox never waivered in his convictions. He said: "I am as proud as when the fight started. I would not retrace a step nor yield a single jot in principle. * * * There is a distinct difference between defeat and surrender."

Without a trace of bitterness or disappointment, the Governor turned back to newspapers, his first love. In the years that followed, he acquired other newspapers in Ohio and Florida. At 70 years of age, when most men have retired, Cox bought the Atlanta Journal and later took over the venerable Atlanta Constitution.

He lived to see them prosper and extend their influence.

OHIO'S GOOD GOVERNMENT RESTS ON HIS REFORMS

The career of this Ohio farm boy, in business, in journalism and politics, has been called a typical success story. The description is wanting. It was far more than that.

Many other men have tasted the rewards of material success. Few, however, could match the Governor's accomplishments in so many fields.

Cox was a newspaperman who knew every facet of his profession, a master of details. Still, he never permitted the day-to-day problems to obscure his broader vision of leadership and public service.

He had a rare zest for politics, but he was no ordinary politician.

Cox was a true progressive when the breed was scarce. In a State long dominated by the most reactionary interests, Governor Cox provided the forward-looking leadership that has been the basis for good government in Ohio for nearly half a century.

Modernization of the State's fiscal policy, passage of the first workmen's compensation law, welfare, and prison reform, higher safety standards in the mines, and the outlawing of child labor are numbered among his major accomplishments.

Today, such measures are taken for granted.

In Cox' time, they were denounced as visionary and radical.

WHERE OTHERS FALTERED, HE HAD COURAGE

Governor Cox had courage where others faltered. When his advisers told him in 1920 that his advocacy of the League of Nations would cost him the election, the Governor replied: "This is the supreme test. * * * We must say in language that the world can understand whether we shall participate in the advancement of a cause which has in it the hope of peace and world reconstruction, or whether we propose to follow the old paths which always led to fields of blood.

"I am in favor of going in."

SWORN POLITICAL FOES LIKED ONE ANOTHER

In the bitter and acrimonious League of Nations fight, my father, the late Charles Landon Knight, and Governor Cox were on opposite sides.

In fact, they were sworn political enemies. "C. L.," who wrote with a pen dipped in vitriol, sarcastically referred to the Governor as "jimcox," always with a lowercase J. Nevertheless, they remained good personal friends despite their differences.

The measure of Cox' political courage was shown during the First World War. My father had been under severe attack as being pro-German because he opposed our entrance into the war. Still, Cox appointed his long-time political foe to take charge of food conservation because he knew the job would be well done.

Honoring my father's memory in Ohio State's Journalism Hall of Fame, the governor wrote: "C. L. Knight was recognized for his power of expression and his independence of thought and action. He never wrote an editorial to please either an individual or class.

"As a Member of the American Congress, he was as unsparing, when occasion demanded, in criticism of his own party as of the opposition.

"His promptings came not only from patriotism, but from a sense of the dignity and duty of the press."

FRIENDSHIP SPANNED FOUR DECADES

Many, many years later, in urging me to do a book, the Governor said: "You have an opportunity to put into enduring print many things about your father that should be given to the public."

But in 1946, when the Governor's own autobiography, Journey Through My Years, was published, he gave me better counsel. Under date of November 19 of that year, he wrote: "Take my advice, old fellow, don't ever write a book."

Our friendship, which began with a visit to the governor's office in 1917, when inexperience compelled me to decline his offer of a military commission, endured until the night the AP told me the Governor had died.

HE HOLDS A SPECIAL PLACE OF HONOR

In paying tribute to a gallant old warrior, I like to remember James Middleton Cox as a formidable competitor, unafraid of a fight but never resorting to petty sniping; a politician who worked for the public good; a statesman who refused to compromise his principles and a wise counselor who, next to my father, holds a special place of honor on my hero list.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, the President has forwarded to the Congress his special message urging the renewal of the present Trade Agreements Act for a 5-year period, and would give the President the right to raid annually the present thin screen of protection from excessive foreign imports.

What the President is asking here is that the Congress give him dictatorial powers to use every industry in the Nation as a pawn in the game of international politics. He has by recent Executive order—for which I can find no law or justification—set up a Policy Committee that will, through the State and Commerce Departments, own the show and play our hand at the poker game in Geneva, Switzerland, with the economic future of America as the stakes.

His message was to be expected, but it must be a shock to my colleagues in the House to see him drag into his arguments the new so-called war emergency. Congress has in recent days given him all the funds he requested for this defense buildup. Now, he wants to place in jeopardy the very basis of our economy—American industry.

The President, Mr. Speaker, would revise the slogan, "more trade and less aid." I repeat what I have said on numerous occasions from the well of this House, that we have failed to buy friendship abroad by direct grants from the Treasury. Does President Eisenhower think we can win back our pestige abroad by selling short our economy and in doing so placing in jeopardy the jobs of American workmen and the profits of American industry?

The President makes a point of the American jobs created as a result of our export business. The State and Commerce Departments are now busily engaged in a crash program at the taxpayers' expense to determine just how many jobs are involved in our export business. It is strange indeed that he

fails to mention, and the Commerce and State Departments likewise fail to report to the American people, the number of jobs that have been lost over the past several years due to imports of foreign-made goods on wage levels and working conditions far below that of the American standards.

The President also fails to give the American people any idea of how many more American workmen would be displaced should the Congress grant him authority to further reduce tariffs a total of 25 percent over the next 5 years.

We talk about stockpiling critical materials. We of the Congress act hastily in granting additional funds to put our defense efforts at the peak. What America needs to do most of all today is stockpile jobs for American workmen. Our economy is geared to purchasing power. Now we have more than 4 million unemployed. I submit that our economy is basically weak and in no condition to meet the drain of financing the free world unless every American is fully employed at high wage levels.

What is happening to our textile economy is best illustrated in a letter I have just received from one of the employees of the Abbott Worsted Mills, of Wilton, N. H.

The letter follows:

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A rapidly approaching loss of work by 19—? and a sincere interest in my chosen career field has prompted me to write this letter. It is my hope that after reading it you will be prompted to action concerning our plight and will in some way acknowledge this letter for the 600 employees of the Abbott Worsted Mills, Wilton, N. H. I am neither a mill owner or stockholder but am merely one who is intensely interested in the future of our great industry. Our great newspapers and news magazines being my only source of information, I have become increasingly alarmed in the following facts published in the last 2 years:

1. Our Government maintains cotton and wool prices to United States mills above the world levels.

2. American taxpayers spent a billion dollars in the past year on cotton alone to subsidize foreign manufacturers.

3. The International Cooperation Administration, part of the United States State Department, has purchased $44 million worth of textiles from Japan and only $5 million from the United States mills in fiscal 1957.

4. Since the end of the war, our Government has furnished over $130 million worth of textile machinery to foreign manufacturers with which to compete with us.

5. Since 1947, approximately 281 mills, employing over 100,000 workers, have been permanently closed. One hundred and twenty-five of these mills, employing 75,000 workers, were located right here in New England.

6. Tariff rates were cut in 1934, 1945, and again in 1955.

7. Japan now has almost twice as many woolen and worsted looms as the United States.

8. In the last 10 years total imports of low-wage foreign fabrics have increased by 650 percent. Japan alone has increased by 800 percent.

9. Average textile employee earnings are $55 a week for 40 hours.

10. Thirty-five percent of all Japan exports are in the textile field.

The age of high living standards and keen competition have made it impossible for a mill in the United States to compete with any foreign textile mill paying wages of less than 15 cents an hour in eastern countries and below 40 cents an hour in Western Europe. I do not deem it unreasonable to ask the following questions:

(a) Will tariffs remain the same or be lowered to an even more ridiculous low in 1958?

(b) Has the textile industry any position in the line of our industrial giants such as automobiles, steel, and petroleum products?

(c) Did 407,828 of our men give their lives in World War II so that the countries they fought against could, with the help of our Government, put their parents and friends out of work 10 years later?

(d) With 15 million people indirectly and directly associated with the textile industry in this United States, is it necessary to place this great industry on the expendable list in order to further our economic standing in the unsettled world?

(e) Can I as a textile worker look forward to remaining at $50 to $60 a week as wages in other industries go higher and higher with the cost of living? Or—

(f) Can I as a textile worker look forward to relocating my family, learning a new trade, starting at minimum wages again, in 5 years? This will most certainly happen should our present textile situation continue.

(g) Has the United States, should another war start, the production capability left within its boundaries to clothe our military services and our populace? It is possible that we would not be able to import our needs in wartime. In World War II all our mills were operating at full capability to meet our needs.

(h) How will you vote on the tariff issue? If you are voting for lower tariffs, why?

It is my sincere hope that in 1958 our Government, with the support of your vote, will in some way equalize through tariffs the strong competition our United States textiles are receiving from imported fabrics. If imports are absolutely necessary to maintain the world peace, I only ask the United States textile workers be given the opportunity to utilize their talent and years of experience on the United States cloth market. Talent, desire, and years of experience cannot begin to off-set the existing wage gap between our great Nation and other nations of the world. This will be accomplished only by equalizing through tariffs.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS GROS LOUIS,
Abbott Worsted Mills, Wilton, N. H.

Five years ago Japanese imports of cotton cloth was 15 million square yards annually. One year after the Japanese Trade Agreement Act was approved in 1955 their imports of this type of textile had risen to 270 million yards annually. The 40 million yards "cut back" which the Japanese reluctantly agreed to make was a clever effort to stop the clamoring of Congressmen from districts where textiles are produced so that the administration could force down their throats a 3-year renewal of the Trade Agreements Act in 1955.

They are still trying to use this same propaganda with another of the Nation's major industries. This interesting bulletin was clipped from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of last Saturday:

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, in an unusual weekend statement, indicated today the Government will consider taking new steps in the immediate future to curb oil imports.

The great Sinclair needs to be briefed on this matter. He seems to have forgotten, if he ever knew, that the President some 2 years ago named a Commission to work out a voluntary agreement with the large oil importing companies. After months of delay, the Commission announced that these large companies, that are American capital invested in Venezuela, had agreed to reduce these shipments of crude oil by 3,000 barrels daily. When you learn that daily shipments of crude oil are in excess of a half million barrels, you get an idea of what is meant by the expression, "oil tanker diplomacy."

The foxy Secretary fails to tell the coal industry that this new move will affect shipments of residual oil that have taken a large share of the American soft-coal markets. The old agreement included only crude oil shipments. Daily shipments of residual oil were not included. They now exceed 750,000 barrels daily.

The long-haired internationalists who are behind this move to put across a 5-year extension of our Trade Agreements Act are having plenty of trouble. While they are engaged in selling the American public that our export business is flourishing and creating many new jobs for American workmen, it suddenly happens that our export trade is on a steep decline. Exports for the last quarter of 1957 were off $1.8 billion from the level for the first quarter of 1957.

I have said repeatedly over the past several years, from the well of this House, that you cannot justify reciprocal trade relations in instances where we give tariff concessions to another nation unless that nation pays its workers wages that allow them to exist and have added purchasing power to buy American exports.

Secretary Weeks, in a letter addressed to me some days ago, attempts to justify a renewal of our trade agreements in order to combat the new common market set up by six Western European nations. When this idea was being developed last year, Mr. Dulles and the State Department gave it their blessing. Here is one more instance where this bluenosed aristocrat from up Boston way needs a briefing on the facts of life as they apply to our trade policies.

The remainder of the Secretary's letter was devoted to a justification of the misleading and false propaganda contained in a State Department booklet, "Together We are Strong," which you will recall, I denounced in a speech some days ago.

The great Secretary has evidently fallen for the State Department bait. He, too, wants to shed crocodile tears over the American public's being deprived of the pleasure of reading their favorite morning paper if the Trade Agreements Act is not extended. He evidently has not learned that newsprint is on the free list and is not affected by the agreements.

The time is now the Congress must—

First. Keep our Nation out of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Second. Continue to refuse recognition to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade.

Third. Restore the control and regulation of commerce to the Congress.

Fourth. Stop further cuts in import duties and lay down regulations for the

United States Tariff Commission so that domestic industries can survive the onrush of foreign imports.

A BILL TO PROMOTE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, publicity in connection with recent hearings of a special subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has brought to national notice the issue of honoraria and expense reimbursement of Government officials, and the matter of standards of ethics of Members of Congress as well as high ranking officials of the executive branch of the Government is under wide discussion.

The time is ripe for the legislative branch to review the entire subject of a code of conduct for public service and especially is it appropriate that we establish rules and requirements to strengthen the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by setting up codes of official conduct for the executive and legislative branches of Government.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would require all Members of Congress and Government officials paid $10,000 a year or more to make full disclosure of outside sources of income, investments, and business dealings by themselves or in their behalf. Members, under this code, would be banned from accepting fees for speeches from any individuals or organizations sponsoring legislation or registered under the Federal Lobbying Act. Nor could Government officials receive honoraria where their travel and subsistence was at Federal expense.

This bill follows previous proposals to eliminate influence peddling, favors and unethical and dishonest conduct from both branches of Government.

Under my bill, each Member of Congress, each employee of the Federal Government, and each member of the Armed Forces paid $10,000 a year or more, and also members of the national committees of political parties would be required to file annual financial reports of income and assets with the Comptroller General of the United States with criminal penalties for evasion of false information, and available for public scrutiny.

The restrictions on Congressmen and legislative employees in the bill cover direct or indirect personal arrangements for profit based on official position. Gifts, favors, services, or compensations from individuals or organizations interested in legislation are prohibited. Also, the bill amplifies the procedure covering conflicts of interest in voting on measures when under consideration in the House or Senate. The measure covers and restrains employment offers, divulging confidential information, accepting entertainment and direct or indirect attempts to influence decisions, including gifts or gratuities.

If Congress will pass this bill or some similar legislation to set up a basis of good ethics, public confidence in our system of Government will be strengthened. I believe it is an appropriate time for the passage of such a measure to prescribe a high standard of conduct for Federal officials and legislators. In the latter case, the rules have been conspicuous by their absence.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the gentleman on what seems to me to be a very high principle which he seeks to put into effect by legislation. I should like to ask the gentleman this question, however. Does his bill propose to set up any commission, agency, or bureau of any sort?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his very kind remarks. I would say to him that my bill does not make any provision for a Commission on Ethics. I realize the gentleman must have in mind that proposals have been made in the past for a commission, but it is my opinion that we already have too many commissions and that it would be unnecessary if we enacted my bill into law and if information as to the finances of officials was available for public inspection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. In which opinion the gentleman from California heartily concurs.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

It seems to me that these hearings in Congressional committees constantly bring out the fact that we should have the same standards of ethics governing the actions of those in the legislative branch as govern those in the executive branch. I hope the proposal which the gentleman is making today will have an early hearing before the committee of which I am a member. I assure him that I shall urge that hearings be held to give attention to this very important subject.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman from New York. As I said before, this bill does not provide for any commission, as I think we already have too many commissions. But I agree with the gentleman that we should have as high standards for ourselves as we set up for the executive branch of the Government. As it is now it seems to me that we do not have as high standards.

My bill has two titles. One provides for a code of ethics for the executive branch and amplifies the present situation there. But it also provides for a code of ethics for the legislative branch which I feel is greatly needed.

A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON OUTER SPACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it has been my feeling that the problems of outer space—including military, scientific, and jurisdictional matters—should come under the aegis of a joint Congressional committee. The magnificent and efficient service rendered by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy provides ample precedent for this approach.

Therefore, on the first day of this session I introduced a bill providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Outer Space. Unfortunately, no action has been taken on that proposal.

Last week, the other body chose to go ahead on its own and set up a special committee to consider policy problems involved in our approach to outer space. Meanwhile, the House remains dormant.

Already, serious questions have arisen due to the failure of this body to take action. Various bills have been introduced concerning the multitude of unresolved questions deriving from man's venture into space. No single committee is now constituted to deal comprehensively and in a coordinated fashion with these measures. In many instances, a single bill cuts across the lines of interest of a number of our standing committees.

The result already is that a number of committees may want to duplicate hearings on a single issue or series of issues. We may witness the unappetizing sight of committee chairmen fighting for the first crack at a bill. And department and agency heads could well spend all their working hours trudging up to the Hill to appear before the plethora of committees considering outer-space problems.

We must frame a coordinated House approach to these issues by establishing a standing House Committee on Outer Space. It is undesirable to make this a temporary committee, in my view. After all, the problems of outer space are going to last a lot longer than this session or the next. And they are going to be of increasing importance as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I am presently drafting an amendment to the rules of the House to establish a House Outer Space Committee. By setting up this committee we can bring order out of the chaos which is bound to grow until we take action.

Such a group can work effectively with the Senate group and with the Government agencies and departments concerned to shape America's role in the space age. I still feel that the best way to proceed is by a joint committee. But in view of the other body's action, we must act with dispatch now and provide our own committee. To tarry longer is to invite confusion and manufacture jurisdictional problems.

I hope the speedy action demanded by the times will be forthcoming soon.

SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS WOULD NOT COMPETE WITH EXISTING PRIVATE BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include additional material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1958, I introduced H. R. 10345 to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes.

It is pleasing that there has appeared a widespread, favorable reaction to the proposals contained in H. R. 10345 for the creation of a Small Business Capital Bank System. Identical bills have been introduced in the House by our colleagues. Also, the majority leader of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced an identical companion bill in the Senate—S. 3191. Other Members of the House and the Senate have expressed interest in also joining and associating themselves with the proposals to create a Small Business Capital Bank System. Therefore, I urge all of our colleagues to study these proposals and consider joining in this worthy cause for small business.

The proposals we are making to establish a Small Business Capital Bank System were drafted only after we had consulted with experts who had studied the problems of small business financing for a long period of time. Indeed, we received the testimony from a number of them in an extensive hearing before the House Small Business Committee. We have tried to take advantage of the factual information they gave us and the advice they stated in their views about what ought to be done to solve the problems of small-business financing.

As I have stated previously, the proposals we are making for the establishment of a Small Business Capital Bank System will not impose new burdens on the Federal Government or add to its budgetary problems. Our proposals will require—

First. No appropriations.

Second. No increases in taxes.

Third. No borrowing of funds by the Federal Government and, therefore, will in nowise add to the debt of the Federal Government.

The bills we have introduced would create a new privately owned system of small business capital banks. Therefore, the very segment of our economy which would benefit through the creation and operation of such a bank system would be required to invest in it, own it, and eventually direct its affairs—subject, of course, to Federal Government supervision and regulation.

Another important aspect of our proposals is that they would not provide a new system to compete with existing private banks. The Small Business Capital Bank System we propose would provide equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources.

Recently, Mr. William F. Kelly, president of the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., of Philadelphia, and chairman of the credit policy commission of the American Bankers Association, testified before the House Small Business Committee on the problems of small business financing. He testified at length regarding small business lack of adequate capital to support short-term credit and added:

> The proper and adequate financing of small business will continue to be a major concern of the Nation's banks.

He emphasized that:

> The banks, as this committee knows, are not set up, they are not capitalized, they are not organized for the purpose of providing equity capital, and they are certainly not organized for the purpose of providing long-term loans.

The spokesman for the American Bankers Association, Mr. Kelly, also testified about the plans which were being suggested to the House Small Business Committee for solving the problems of small business financing. It had been suggested that a system of small-business capital banks be established somewhat along the lines of the Federal land banks. Regarding those suggestions, Mr. Kelly stated:

> Certainly as far as our approach to this problem is concerned, I think that there are a great many suggestions which have been made to this committee with respect to how the Government may introduce their assistance in raising capital for small business. I think it is perfectly apparent that the commercial banking system should not necessarily be made a part of that.
>
> I think our approach to that problem in the past, the policy of the association has been to insist that whatever the Government does in that direction, that it adhere to two principles. First, that it actually lend its support only to a new field of credit or a new field of finance and, second, that at the time it is set up that a realistic and a practical process be developed so that eventually that field can find its way into private hands and out of Government hands. I think that has been the testimony that has been submitted here in the past and before other committees.

An examination of the bill I have introduced to create a system of small-business capital banks, H. R. 10345, will demonstrate that what we are proposing squarely and completely meets the suggestions and the standards of the principles outlined by Mr. Kelly, the spokesman for the American Bankers Association, for a system of small-business financing.

Despite the care utilized in the drafting of a bill that would accomplish all of these things and in the manner we have pointed out, a misunderstanding has developed in the minds of some regarding this proposed legislation. For example, I have just received a letter from the assistant director, economics and statistics division, of the Continental Oil Co., Houston, Tex., in which it was stated that in his opinion the proposed system of Small Business Capital Banks would compete with private banking and other financial institutions. Of course, that would not be the case. As has been pointed out, the spokesman for the American Bankers Association, Mr. Kelly, emphasized that the banks are not set up and are not organized for the purpose of providing equity capital and they certainly are not organized for the purpose of providing long-term loans and he has, as a representative of the American Bankers Association, stated his objection to any plan that would provide for the commercial banking system to participate in such activities. Therefore, I have replied to the Continental Oil Co., explaining why it is that the small-business capital banks would not compete with existing private banks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point a copy of my letter to Dr. Robert G. James, assistant director, economics and statistics division, Continental Oil Co., regarding that matter. It is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1958.

Dr. ROBERT G. JAMES,
Assistant Director, Economics and Statistics Division, Continental Oil Co., Houston, Tex.

DEAR DR. JAMES: I acknowledge and thank you for your letter of January 20, 1958, in which you refer to proposals for forming certain capital banks to provide financing for small business.

It is noted that you object to the establishment of a Small Business Capital Bank System along the lines of the Federal land bank system and the Home Loan Bank System. It appears that you base your objection on the thought that a Small Business Capital Bank System would compete in the same markets that private banking institutions are able to adequately service.

The House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been and is continuing an intensive study into the problems of small business financing. Much time and money has been spent by many organizations and agencies in and out of the Government over a period of several years in studying these problems. The problems have been stated in various ways by many who have testified about them and a number of proposals have been made for alleviating the problems.

On one point, almost all of the witnesses and those who have studied this problem are in agreement. It is that small business is without adequate opportunity for securing needed long-term risk capital—equity capital and long-term debt capital.

On another point, representatives of the American Bankers Association and other experts in the field of financing were in agreement in testimony presented to the House Small Business Committee and that point is that the needs of small business for risk capital—equity and long-term debt capital—is not and cannot be met through the existing facilities of banks, insurance companies, and other sources. In fact, representatives of the American Bankers Association went further in their testimony. They emphasized that banks should not be permitted to engage in the business of taking the risks that would be incident to the investment of the funds of their depositors directly into small business enterprises.

Since the committee is probing all wells containing information regarding this subject, you are invited to submit to me any information you have which would prove of

help to the committee in its further consideration of the problems of small business financing. Particularly, we would like to have from you any information which would tend to show any inaccuracies in the testimony given to our committee by the representatives of the American Bankers Association to the effect that the banks do not provide risk capital to small business; that they are not equipped to provide such financing; and that nothing should be done which would require banks to provide such financing.

Likewise, you are invited to submit to us for our consideration any plan which you have in mind with any likelihood of approval by the Congress which would propose the establishment of a system for providing small-business men with facilities for securing the capital they need.

Allow me to use this opportunity to thank you again for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KEATING), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. KEATING), for 2 weeks, on account of naval duty.

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. FLOOD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa), for today on account of absence from city.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, to transfer his special order obtained for today to Thursday next for 45 minutes.

Mr. PELLY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, for 45 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN (at the request of Mr. KEATING) to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. HILL and include an address by the Secretary of Agriculture before the Washington Press Club.

Mr. LECOMPTE on the soil-bank program.

Mr. REES of Kansas and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. RAY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 228. An act for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Maud Claer Wahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1249. An act for the relief of Martha A. Calvert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Hovhannes H. Haidostian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1657. An act for the relief of Lloyd C. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Norma Josephine Hodges Dowd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Maria Van Arendonk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Barbara Hollinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Constantinos N. Alivantistos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2004. An act for the relief of George and Emma Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Biro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Marie Ethel Pavlovitch and her daughter, Dolly Hester Pavlovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Eva Lichtfuss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2132. An act for the relief of Leonard C. Fink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Chong Sook Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2166. An act for the relief of John J. Griffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edvin Jansson-Viik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Josef Winter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2196. An act for the relief of Annadore E. D. Haubold and Cynthia Edna Haubold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2245. An act for the relief of Moy Tong Poy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2256. An act for the relief of Luz Poblete and Robert Poblete Broaddus, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2274. An act for the relief of Mario Lazzarotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Genevieve M. Scott Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2346. An act for the relief of Lucy Hedwig Schultz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2430. An act for the relief of Carlos Olmos Chang and his wife, Maria Luisa Chin de Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria H. Aguas and Buena M. Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Karl L. Larson;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Alfred Hanzal;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Dr. Royal W. Williams;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of William F. Kempe;

H. R. 3210. An act to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels;

H. R. 3770. An act to rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 5161. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine A. Work;

H. R. 6069. An act for the relief of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey;

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6660. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the Tuscaloosa lock and dam on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam.

H. R. 7052. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for appointments of cadets from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7200. An act for the relief of the estate of Isa Hajime;

H. R. 7591. An act for the relief of Anton N. Nyerges;

H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Margie C. Stewart;

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky; and

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 7, 1958:

H. R. 10146. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

On February 10, 1958:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Karl L. Larson;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Alfred Hanzal;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Dr. Royal W. Williams;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of William F. Kempe;

H. R. 3210. An act to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels;

H. R. 3770. An act to rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 5161. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine A. Work;

H. R. 6069. An act for the relief of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey;

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Meyer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6660. An act to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the Tuscaloosa lock and dam on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam;

H. R. 7052. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the appointments of cadets from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7200. An act for the relief of the estate of Isa Najime;

H. R. 7591. An act for the relief of Anton N. Nyerges;

H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Margie C. Stewart; and

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 13, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1584. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1957, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1585. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited by the Courtland unit, Bostwick division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, was completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a plan for the project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer a 40-foot motor launch (hull No. 19472), with engine, to the Jamestown Corp., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1587. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1588. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1589. A letter from the Director, Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, pursuant to Public Law 182, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1590. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of laws enacted by the Fourth Guam Legislature, 1957, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all reservations made relating to lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 5, 1958, the following joint resolution and bill were reported on February 7, 1958:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10589. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 10, 1958*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: From the delegation of the United States House of Representatives to the third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. Report on the third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Congress (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8544. A bill to provide for the restoration to tribal ownership of all vacant and undisposed-of ceded lands on certain Indian reservations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8958. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Indian land to St. Anthony's Parish; with amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEMPHILL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 10320. A bill to provide for additional charges to reflect certain costs in the acceptance of business reply cards, letters in business reply envelopes, and other matter under business reply labels for transmission in the mails without prepayment of postage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5005. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10242. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959 at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5624. A bill to clear the title to certain Indian land; with amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 5, 1958, the following bill and joint resolution were introduced on February 7, 1958:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 10589. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred February 10, 1958*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 10590. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 10591. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 10592. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to purchase certain insured mortgages for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure in cases where the mortgagor is in financial straits for reasons beyond his

control and could not otherwise retain his property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 10593. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10594. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 10595. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10596. A bill to provide that banks in the Territories may be designated as depositaries of public moneys only if they are national banks or their deposits are insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10597. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require that the deposits of every national bank be insured thereunder whether or not such bank is a member of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 10598. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize loans under the college housing loan program for the construction of science buildings and libraries at educational institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10599. A bill to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 10600. A bill to provide that certain cities in the United States having a population of 50,000 or more persons shall, upon application therefor, be connected with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 10601. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 10602. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 10603. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the charitable contributions made by corporations and individuals which may be deducted from gross income, where such contributions are for basic research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 10604. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10605. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10606. A bill to supplement the Saline Water Act of 1952 by providing for construction of a large-scale demonstration plant for the production of fresh water from salt water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 10607. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10608. A bill to provide evaluation of rehabilitation potentials and rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who as a result thereof can achieve such ability of independent living as to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or who can dispense with or largely dispense with the need of an attendant at home; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10609. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 10610. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1956 to extend the period during which loans and grants may be made for the construction of hospitals under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, and to make additional funds available for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 10611. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10612. A bill to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold the obligations of States and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10614. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the State of Florida to Sumter County, Fla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 10615. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10616. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 10617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10618. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10619. A bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10620. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10621. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10622. A bill to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as the same are amended, to provide for an increase in the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 10623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 10624. A bill to provide that a portion of all surplus cotton sold or exchanged for export by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be processed cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 10625. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 10626. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10627. A bill to exempt milk checks and accompanying materials conveyed outside the mails from creameries to milk producers from certain provisions of law prohibiting the transportation of mail by private express; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10628. A bill to provide for increased custom duties on fluorspar under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H. R. 10629. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel equitable to those being otherwise provided for civil service and other officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 10630. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10631. A bill to promote ethics in Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10632. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10633. A bill relating to mining claims on lands within the national forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER (by request):

H. R. 10634. A bill to remove the present provision of law which permits Federal courts to issue writs only in aid of their respective jurisdictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 10635. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10636. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of

upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10637. A bill creating the Home Loan Guarantee Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10638. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Secretary of Commerce of two transatlantic superliners; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10639. A bill to provide that certain Hungarian escapees paroled into the United States may upon application be admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10640. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10641. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Soil Bank Act so as to end Federal cost-sharing and technical assistance in farm drainage harmful to wildlife, and to create corresponding incentives for maintaining wet lands in the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 10642. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Soil Bank Act so as to end Federal cost-sharing and technical assistance in farm drainage harmful to wildlife, and to create corresponding incentives for maintaining wet lands in the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10643. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 10644. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment-insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10645. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 10646. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1959 and 1960 crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10647. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10648. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 10649. A bill to provide that certain cities in the United States having a population of 50,000 or more persons shall, upon application therefor, be connected with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 10650. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 10652. A bill to provide a 5-year program of assistance to enable depressed segments of the fishing industry in the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 10653. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10654. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 10655. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10656. A bill to alleviate the critical shortage of high quality cotton and to protect farm income and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. J. Res. 536. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the popular election of judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 537. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. J. Res. 538. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 539. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 540. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 541. Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant at San Diego, Calif., for the production, from sea water, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should call a conference of leaders of labor, industry, and Government with a view to the formulation of a long-range program to bring about full employment in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the United States take the lead in efforts to gain international agreement that outer space be devoted to peaceful purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Res. 474. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 475. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the scope of and justification for activities of the United States that compete with private enterprise; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to limit expenditures for fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to allow the passage of any legislation authorizing pay-as-you-go television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10657. A bill for the relief of Domenico Galli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10658. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Afonin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10659. A bill for the relief of Miss Assunta Ristagno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10660. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 10661. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the United States Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

392. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. N. Cobb and others, Longview, Tex., relative to stating opposition to the proposed pay television, and being for continued free television the same as radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

393. Also, petition of Ophelia Beard, Chicago, Ill., relative to requesting admission to citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

394. Also, petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to requesting admission to citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

395. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to requesting that favorable action be given to the consideration of H. R. 9499, proposing to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, Before Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] before the Reserve Officers Association in the city of Washington on Saturday evening, February 8, is a challenge to all Americans as we face and seek solutions to the serious problems of the future. I ask unanimous consent to have this outstanding speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT BEFORE THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 8, 1958

General Morrison, General Sarnoff, officers of the Reserve Officers Association, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly pleased and honored to be present on this occasion when your awards have been given to General Sarnoff and to the late Chaplain Peter Bol. The remarks during the presentation ceremonies are a fitting introduction to what I should like to say—for we are indeed engaged in a cold war. I may say there are more Senators here tonight than the last time I spoke in the Senate.

It has been nearly 3 years since General Sarnoff wrote his now famous memorandum—his plan of battle, so to speak—and offered it as a formula for victory in the fight for ideas—a fight which now is being waged throughout the universe. It is a fine tribute to a great American—whose greatness you have recognized tonight—to note that he has every right to be discouraged, but that he reveals no inclination whatsoever to stop fighting for his conviction.

The tragic death of Chaplain Peter Bol, who was en route to Washington to attend this meeting, saddens all of us. We can take pride in the fact that Chaplain Bol measured up to the highest traditions of his calling. The manner in which he gave spiritual sustenance to the men in the lonely and bleak surroundings of Little America should encourage us to persevere no matter what adversity we should face.

You who serve in the footsteps and the spiritual likeness of the citizen soldiers who founded this Nation, also understand the meaning of Chaplain Bol's contribution to mankind. So, in the confidence that we understand each other, I wish to talk to you tonight about our country's destiny.

In 1858 the United States faced a crisis not unlike today. The Nation was fast drifting toward the abyss of a tragic and disastrous war. Lincoln sensed that a policy of Presidential firmness and candor might foster a national self-awareness—the indispensable preliminary to any saving act of government. But President James Buchanan, a tired and amiable man with tired policies, continued to spread the contagion of his own confusion over the land.

It was then that Lincoln, in his House-divided speech, gave us a maxim which I believe should be applied to our current crisis. Lincoln's key words were: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

The issue in 1958 is not slavery; rather it is the global conflict of cold war; a war in which military strength or weakness is a consequence rather than a cause of how things stand on the economic, political, educational, and cultural sectors of the battlefront. Meanwhile, one unnerving similarity to the America of a century ago remains in being: It is that the Nation is unaware of the nature and of the seriousness of the danger which confronts it. Let us consider for a moment two questions:

How strong is the Soviet Union today?

How strong is it likely to be tomorrow?

Sputnik I and II brought to America sharp, and alarming wakefulness from a dreamworld in which propaganda tranquilizers had laid us. A bland diet of sugar-coated half-truths could have carried us, in the belief communism was defeating itself, into extinction. But the Soviets dramatically brought us back to the harsh realization that Soviet strength, and Soviet advancement, had far exceeded anything we had suspected. We are indebted to the Kremlin for having made their warning so dramatic.

It is neither pleasant nor popular to make this admission. The one who does so risks every manner of false charge. Inevitably, it will be said of him that he has lost faith in America; that he is an apologist for the Soviet way of doing things. Nevertheless, precisely because I feel that the stuff of greatness has not gone out of the bones of America; precisely because I feel that our democratic society is equal to the emergency it faces, provided it knows what it is dealing with, let me here try to sketch the nature of Soviet strength, and the specific areas of weakness in the American community, for the tests ahead.

I assert straight off that the Soviet system may, in fact, have to be altered. In the long run, it may even collapse. But, as the saying goes, in the long run too, all of us shall be dead. Anyway, what counts most of all in the life of nations, is the pace and timing of events. And right now, when the world all around us is being hammered into new shapes, nothing on the line of vision points to a collapse of the Soviet system. True, the Soviet ideology has been, can be, and may be further repudiated by events. But the Soviet power system is something else again.

For one thing, the Soviet Union itself represents a land mass three times as large as the United States, with enormous natural resources of every kind, and with a population of more than 200 million inhabitants. Moreover, in recent decades, its natural resources have been increasingly exploited at a rapid pace; and its industry—especially its heavy industry—has been developed enormously.

Secondly, it is true enough to say that the people of the Soviet Union lack consumer goods: automobiles, refrigerators, television, and fine clothes. But it does not follow from this, that they are without enough to eat, or that they are lacking in warm clothes and shelter. What actually has happened is that the Soviets have devoted the materials and efforts, which might have made automobiles and other luxuries, to the development of rockets, satellites, jet planes, basic research, and education. And, as it happens, the latter activities have a far greater meaning in terms of national strength, than does the availability of luxurious consumer goods.

The relatively bleak internal conditions of Russia may, in fact, have the effect of inducing the people of the Soviet Union to work all the harder. In the case of the young, especially, it may induce them to exert every effort to achieve an excellent education—this, because they know that if they remain uneducated, they are doomed to live at a bare subsistence level. In the words of Edward Teller the Russians have excelled because they work harder.

It is, in fact, precisely in the field of education and basic research that the Russians have apparently made their greatest progress. Why should this be so? How is it that they recognized some years ago that trained minds were indispensable to modern technology, modern weapons, and modern methods of subversion? How is it that they had the vision to upgrade the pay and status of educators and scientists to a level just below that of the ruling hierarchy itself?

The question intrudes itself, and we can answer, in part, that the Soviets inherited from the old czarist government a tradition of intellectual excellence and scientific curiosity going back to Peter the Great and the founding of the Academy of Sciences at a time when America was still a wilderness inhabited by savages. Yet the greater part of the answer, so it seems to me, lies elsewhere. It lies in the fact that the principal rulers of Russia are professionals who have spent their entire lives in governmental affairs. Their past and their future, their personal fortunes as well as their political positions, are identified with the strength and success of the government of Soviet Russia. These rulers take the long view of events, because they expect to be around a long time.

It may be argued that as the numbers of Russian scientists and technicians increase, they will impose their humanizing demands on the power group in control of the Soviet apparatus; and by forcing changes in their policies, bring the cold war to an end. Maybe so; and indeed, let us fervently hope so. Yet there are two answers to this argument.

One is that the prospect it holds forth is not an immediate prospect. If it materializes at all, it will be at some point in the distant future—which leaves unanswered the immediate problem of how the rest of the world is to survive until the so-called contradictions in the Soviet system exert their full force.

The second answer is that the analogy of what happened in Germany on two occasions undercuts the assumption that the increase in the number of scientists and technicians within a country necessarily means that the country in question will be directed into the paths of peace. On two occasions in the 20th century, German scientists and technicians—certainly among the best in the world—did not stay the aggressive march of Kaiser Wilhelm or Adolph Hitler.

It does not seem, therefore, that we ought to count on any easy salvation such as might be produced by Russian internal developments. If we are to survive as a nation and as a democratic society—and if the West is to survive with us—it will be through what we do, and therefore force the Russians to do, and not through what the Russians on their own do or fail to do.

Where, then, do we now stand?

Fat, rich nations—like fat, rich old men—are prone to overestimate their powers. They tend to believe that they are entitled to the admiration and respect of others because of their wealth, or, at least, that money will purchase the subservience of less fortunate people. The employees of the rich man can scarcely be expected to tell their employer

the truth about his public relations, and thereby put their own jobs in jeopardy. So, in a democracy, elected officials dependent upon the approval of their constituents for political life, are equally unlikely to draw comparisons with foreign powers which are unpleasant to the voters. Self-criticism is not the most popular platform upon which to run for office.

There are many important aspects of our national policies which need strengthening, such as the organization of the Military Establishment, our tariff or reciprocal trade program, our mutual assistance effort, but all of these over the long pull are secondary in importance to our educational program. The the heart of the contest with the Soviet Union is in the field of education.

As things now stand in America, there is no particular incentive for young people to exert themselves to achieve excellence in intellectual attainment. Our students can leave school with a minimum of learning and still be reasonably sure of a life of relative ease and luxury. Truckdrivers, bricklayers, and factory workers often receive a higher income than professors; an Elvis Presley makes more than the President of the United States. Of a piece with this, there is no particular prestige attached to intellectual attainment in America. A man's success or status is measured, not so much by the ideas he may have developed or his service to the community. It is measured, rather, by the size of his house, the number and the vintage of the cars he owns, and where he spends his vacation.

Indeed, during the recent McCarthy era, the prestige of educators and intellectuals generally sank to an all-time low. The free discussion of ideas, the basis for our strength since the days of the Revolutionary War, was stifled. Security was substituted for scientific research. Discoveries which were made were locked in safes instead of becoming available as stimuli for new discoveries. Some of the best minds in the land were expelled from Government service, and a suspicion of educated people was spread throughout the land as if they were enemy aliens. The big doubt came to full flower in an orgy of flamboyant newspaper and television spectacles. Yet the McCarthy era was but the culmination of the long period of neglect of education, going back for many decades. It was the result, not the cause, of our anti-intellectualism—an outlook that was the very opposite of the highly educated men who were the Founding Fathers of America.

There will be those among us who will say: "But education takes too long, and we do not have the time; our efforts must be devoted to missiles and outer space." This is truly the counsel of despair and disaster. The start toward improvement in education must be now; it should have been yesterday. Our most pressing short-range objestive should be to start now on our long-range programs.

Not only should we provide more money for education as a whole, but we should also reform our basic ideas about elementary and secondary education. We must emphasize the rigorous training of the intellect rather than the gentle cultivation of the personality which has been so popular in recent years.

Mathematics, languages, the natural sciences, and history must once again become the core of the curriculum, and a way must be found to induce the students to study, preferably by inducing a desire to learn. Intellectual discipline is essential to our national purposes.

None of these observations, I hope, need lead to the conclusion that the Soviet system is necessarily superior to our own, nor that we must emulate the Soviet Union in order to maintain our superiority. On the contrary, if we lose our liberties, by imitation or by conquest, we have lost all worth striving for.

We have failed, as a people, to educate ourselves to discriminate between that which is true and that which is false, to develop within ourselves that sense of direction and of values which a self-governing people must have to choose wisely among leaders and policies.

If we are to do the things upon which our future depends, we must understand better than in the past our relationship to our Government. We must view the Nation, its problems and resources, as one great whole. And in this view of things, we must understand that it is only as we are ready to sacrifice portions of our personal egoisms for the sake of the Nation—years in and year out—that we have a chance of surviving as a society, not by luck but by our own efforts.

The Government is not "they." The Government is "us", all of us.

Mobilizing and focusing power in a democracy is surely difficult, and some may say impossible in this type of crisis. But we can never know it is impossible unless we try it, and it is a fact that we have not tried.

In this room tonight are the men and women who can favorably affect the course of this Nation in meeting the challenge before us.

I am told that the term "citizen-soldier" has a traditionally significant meaning to the Reserve officers, and particularly to you who are leaders in the Reserve Officers Association. Its significance is in the linking of the two terms, but of great importance is the placing of citizen first.

Your military service is an obligation; your citizenship service consists of opportunities, privileges, and responsibilities.

During the past few weeks, I have been encouraged by statements of two fine officers of our Armed Forces. A few days ago in an executive hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, I asked Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if he thought a substantial effort directed to increasing the quality of our educational system would improve our military posture relative to the Soviet Union. The general replied as follows:

"I think that is probably the most important thing this country can do."

In this morning's paper, Gen. A. W. Betts, military executive assistant to the Department's director of guided missiles, said:

"Only a dynamic change in the national attitude toward education can take care of the more serious long-term problem."

The lesson of sputnik, to me, is not merely that we have fallen behind in a significant scientific field, important as that may be. What is more significant is that we have failed to appraise honestly and dispassionately the strength of our adversary and the weakness of ourselves. Either we have failed in this appraisal, or, if not, we have been so blind and satiated with our luxury and our slogans that we are unwilling to admit that which reason tells us must be true.

Whether it is a failure of knowledge, or of will, it has, so far, been a failure to cultivate properly the very element on which our society fundamentally rests—the proper education of its people.

I do not minimize the importance of maintaining, at the least, parity with the Russians in missiles and nuclear weapons. Our country has demonstrated on various occasions its willingness and its ability to wage war effectively. Our efforts in the nonmilitary aspects of international relations and especially in the struggle with the Communists, have been less successful. It is in this area, sometimes called competitive coexistence, that education is of vital importance. And it is in this area that we are suffering an erosion of our influence and face the prospect of a disastrous defeat without the firing of a shot, or even a missile.

Where are we? We are in serious trouble. Whither are we tending? We are tending toward national disaster—unless important and drastic changes of policy in many aspects of our domestic and foreign affairs, make a true revival of learning the wheel that makes all the other wheels turn.

A Tribute to Guy Lombardo and All the Lombardos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in this satellite era when our nerves are rattled and fear grips our hearts by talks of weapons of destruction, permit me to speak of a family whose musical talents help to steady us and make life worth living.

The enduring popularity of Guy Lombardo's Royal Canadians is a well-known phenomenon. Year after year, the Royal Canadians' playing of Auld Lang Syne has been the magic wand which waved in the New Year for millions of listeners all over the country. Equally impressive in the annals of success, but less publicized, is the durability of the marriages of the two brothers, Guy and Carmen Lombardo. Guy and Lilliebell were married September 9, 1926, and Carmen and Florence were married May 13, 1926. Both couples celebrated their 25th anniversary in 1951, a year which also marked the golden anniversary of their parents, Gaetano and Lena Lombardo. With their gracious wives, Guy and Carmen have enjoyed over 30 years of happy matrimony.

This is particularly remarkable since the rate of divorce and remarriage is notoriously high among show people. Entertainers' lives are beset with irregularities and temptations. Demanding schedules with much time spent away from the family; vanity, cynicism, mercurial temperaments, and all the fabrications of a glittering existence take their toll. These encouragements to inconstancy and emotional inconsistency produce a tragic amount of what Leo C. Rosten once termed "libidinal hoopla." Therefore, it is most satisfying to take stock of the people in the entertainment world whose personal lives refute the first Mrs. Lawrence Tibbett's remark that "fame and family happiness are not consistent."

Indeed, the Lombardo brothers seem to prove that the qualities that contribute to a successful career or a successful marriage need not be so contradictory after all. The emphasis on close-knit family ties has carried over into their careers. A top band for some 30 years, it has remained a family enterprise. Guy Lombardo has had at least two violins broken over his head, but happily his wife, Lilliebell, was not involved in these incidents. On the contrary, Guy still calls her after nearly every broadcast to get her impressions, for he highly values the opinions of one of his earliest and most avid fans.

The qualities that characterize Lombardo marriages are also found in their musical performances. Predictability and affection for the audience are two trademarks of Guy Lombardo's Royal Canadians. Practically every year since 1929, they have returned to play at the Roosevelt Grill. There they have become one of the exceptional and fondly regarded fixtures of a place which the band has now for many years regarded as its home. Parlaying romance and nostalagia into tasteful merrymaking, they delight their fans with new and old favorites. Children of old fans esteem the grill as the place where "Dad courted Mom." The Roosevelt has a Lombardo suite which is saved for honeymooners, and the grill's wine list even offers a drink called a Lombardo smile cocktail. Guy Lombardo makes no bones about his preference for songs with a happy or hopeful air, such as Powder Your Face With Sunshine, with lyrics written by his brother, Carmen.

Harmony is another trademark of the band which lets musical fads pass it by. The Royal Canadians make sure that the dreamy melodies they play are relaxing and pleasant for dancing. One of their most steadfast admirers, Louis Armstrong, has rapturously praised the band's perfection of style. And even a critical jazz columnist, who has been quoted in the New Yorker, once confessed with some mortification that "occasionally we have to forcibly resist our impulse to throw ourselves on the nearest floor and let the soft clouds of an age of wonderful innocence sweep over us again."

These qualities speak for themselves and tell us much about the men who possess them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the Congress, I should like to take this occasion to congratulate Carmen and Florence, and Guy and Lilliebell Lombardo, who are now in their 32d year of marriage. It is deeply gratifying to call attention to the men and women in our country who place a high value on happy, loyal marriages, for I sometimes feel that happy marriages and normal lives receive less publicity than they deserve. May the Lombardos' felicity attain the cherished day which their fine parents have already celebrated—their golden anniversary.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, again this year I am asking the opinion of residents of the Sixth District on a number of the important issues confronting Congress this session. Through such polls, residents of the district are given opportunity to express their views more directly on the legislative issues pending before the Congress. The response last year was so encouraging and helpful that I have attempted to reach a much larger number of residents in this year's poll. I ask unanimous consent to have my questionnaire reprinted in the RECORD. The results will made available at a later date.

The questions are as follows:

Questionnaire	Yes	No	No opinion
1. In your opinion, does the world situation demand that we forgo a balanced budget for reasons of national security?			
2. Do you feel that Federal taxes should be reduced now?			
3. Do you favor continuance of the mutual-security program of military and economic aid to friendly nations?			
4. Do you favor the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?			
5. Should a separate Department of Science (with a Secretary of Cabinet rank) be created to promote and coordinate scientific research?			
6. Do you feel a need exists for some form of Federal assistance to encourage scientific education?			
7. Should college education be encouraged by allowing income-tax deductions to parents?			
8. Are you in favor of the Federal Government retaining its present regulatory control over prices which producers can charge for natural gas?			
9. Do you favor Secretary Benson's proposal for a flexible program of Federal price supports for basic farm products, ranging from 60 to 90 percent? (Answer only if engaged actively in farming, please.)			
10. Do you favor, at this time, a Federal flood-control project for the Flint River (cost, $2.5 million) and Grand River (cost, $13 million)?			
11. Do you approve of the proposal to establish pay television on a trial basis?			
12. Do you favor the President's labor-management program? (1) Filing public reports of welfare and pension funds; (2) financial reports by labor unions; (3) secret ballots for union elections; (4) employer reports of financial dealings with unions; (5) establish Office of Labor Reports; (6) make misuse of union funds a Federal offense; (7) amend secondary boycott provisions			
13. Do you feel that a nationwide civil-defense atomic shelter program is needed now?			
14. Do you favor increasing social-security benefits with corresponding increases in individual and employer contributions?			
15. Do you favor a summit conference between President Eisenhower and Soviet leaders on current East-West differences?			
16. In general, do you approve of the manner in which President Eisenhower is doing his job?			

Transatlantic Superliners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement regarding the bill which I have introduced today to provide for the construction of two transatlantic superliners by the Secretary of Commerce and their sale at a fixed price to the company which will operate them. Under the bill the construction of the vessels and their sale to the operating company cannot be undertaken until the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administrator have first approved the economic feasibility of the project and the qualifications of the operating company under titles V and XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, to the same extent as if the operating company were the applicant for construction subsidy under that act. National defense features, principally speed and size, would require Department of Defense approval and certification.

Justification for the Government subsidy in this, as in other cases, lies in the national defense features of the project. I have introduced this bill in order to place those questions before the proper authorities and to help the operating company get a hearing and decision on those questions. Certainly its plans are bold and imaginative, and I hope the bill will receive an early hearing.

The vessels would be among the world's largest and it is expected they will provide ocean transportation at a $50 fare to Europe. They will be operated as floating commercial hotels rather than as luxury liners. The emphasis of the service provided will be focused upon the middle and lower income groups comprising people whose opportunities of sailing to Europe are almost nonexistent at present passenger rates.

As for the physical characteristics of the ships, each will be 90,000 tons and 1,152 feet long. Each vessel will carry 6,000 passengers and a crew of 1,350. They will be constructed with 20 airtight compartments, a safety feature designed to make them unsinkable. The cruising speed will be 34 knots and ocean crossings will be made in four days. In time of war or national emergency, the ships can be readily converted to aircraft carriers or to troopships. Emphasis will be placed upon operating the ships on a motel policy, eliminating the frills and luxury items, yet providing every facility for complete oceangoing comfort.

Funds for the Soil-Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I express hope that we will be given an opportunity to provide additional funds for the soil-bank program this year. Farmers everywhere are expressing great disappointment in their inability to participate in the acreage reserve this year. Funds were exhausted so quickly, at least in counties of the

Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, due to the large number of applicants, that a great many who are eligible were turned away.

From a letter I received from Elmer Broders of Malcom, Iowa, and from a news story in a recent issue of the Grinnell Herald Register, I learned that in Poweshiek County, Iowa, all the soil-bank funds were used on 185 farms. Yet there are about 1,800 farms in the county. Thus the door was closed to its other 1,615 farms.

It has been recommended that in order to have effective production control this year, either funds not needed for other crops should be transferred to the soil bank or legislation should be enacted to provide supplementary funds and authority to fully implement the acreage reserve this year.

Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence I have had with President Eisenhower on recalling and reassigning Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr., to duty on the missile program. The successful launching of the Explorer, our first satellite, indicates that Colonel Nickerson was right in his basic views.

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

JANUARY 25, 1958.

Hon. DWIGHT EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States, Washington.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wanted to personally urge you to review the court-martial record of Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr., with a view to returning him to duty in the United States and reassigning him to the missile program.

Certainly our country desperately needs this man who is an acknowledged expert in the rocket field, a man of much experience and foresight. No doubt Colonel Nickerson made some mistake in judgment in the manner he so forcefully brought the lag in the missile program to the attention of the country. However, I think placing the welfare of the country above his own welfare took much courage, and time has justified that courage.

I believe that a review of the record of Colonel Nickerson would confirm his great abilities and the desirability of having him again in the program.

Yours sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 28, 1958.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: On behalf of the President, I am pleased to acknowledge your January 25 letter respecting Colonel Nickerson. The Army advises that he was charged with the commission of certain security violations punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Following his plea of guilty he was duly convicted and sentenced, the record of his trial was examined according to law, and it was determined to be legally sufficient to support the findings and the sentence. The result is that the case is not subject to further legal review. As you know, there is no Presidential review of sentences of court-martial except where a general officer is involved or where the sentence is death.

The matters mentioned in your letter, along with other aspects of the situation, have been carefully considered. The Army reports that it would be inadvisable to change Colonel Nickerson's present assignment.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

The Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill identical to S. 3914, the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1958, which was recently introduced in the Senate after lengthy hearings on the part of its Select Committee on Small Business. In my opinion this measure to accomplish certain tax adjustments in order to give small business a better chance to survive, is long overdue.

We are all forcefully aware of the added expenditures necessary to finance a needed expansion and speedup of our defense program. Yet there is urgent need to enact tax adjustments which will stimulate the expansion and growth of small business if we are to increase Federal revenue. Small business is the cornerstone of our free enterprise system. It is my belief that the needed tax adjustments contained in this bill can be made consistent with current revenue needs. If subsequent evidence brought out in committee strongly indicate that a substantial revenue loss will result from this legislation, I recognize that action may have to be deferred on the measure.

The bill contains four major tax adjustments.

First. It provides for a reinvestment allowance or deducion up to a maximum of $10,000 in any one year for profits reinvested in the business. This reinvestment deduction will provide sorely needed funds for small business to reinvest. It will expand the tax base. The immediate revenue loss therefrom will be offset to some extent by deduction in the depreciation which will be permitted on assets against which the allowance has been applied. Thus this reinvestment deduction should result more in a deferral than a loss of revenue.

Second. The bill provides a means by which individuals and partnerships may establish a retirement deposit along the lines now available to corporations under the present tax laws. The bill will permit a taxpayer to deduct each year an amount up to 10 percent of his taxable income or $1,000, whichever is the lesser, to set aside for retirement purposes. The retirement deposit would be placed in a special restricted account or on deposit with a life insurance company and the benefits from the said retirement account when received by the taxpayer would be taxable. The deposit would provide a rather simple and workable plan whereby the taxpayer would be relieved of taxes on a reasonable sum set aside for his own retirement, but the taxpayer would be required to pay taxes on all amounts received by way of benefits after retirement.

Third. The provisions of section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 concerning alternative methods of depreciation would be extended to the purchasers of used property for use in a trade or business similar to the alternatives which are now available to purchasers of new property.

Fourth. Estate taxes could be paid in installments over a period up to 10 years and a further extension to 20 years where hardship can be shown in cases where an estate has more than 50 percent of its assets tied up in a closely held business. Interest would be charged on the unpaid balance of the estate tax in the case of estates electing to pay by installment and thus no revenue loss would result. This type of legislation is sorely needed in order to permit family-type businesses to remain intact after the death of the owner and operator rather than be liquidated to pay estate taxes. It will go a long way to reduce the prevalent trend toward merger and sale of small business to larger firms.

The measure would also permit a corporation to elect to be taxed as a partnership similar to the election which is now available to a partnership to be taxed as a corporation. Further measure provides for procedural steps to simplify and bring some finality to tax litigation.

In summary it is my belief that the tax adjustments for small business contained in this measure will greatly stimulate the expansion of small business, thereby broadening the tax base; will eliminate unfair and inequitable discriminations in existing tax laws; and will tend to slow down the trend toward merger and consolidation of business enterprise.

Milestones of Eagle Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1958, the Fraternal Order of Eagles observed the 60th anniversary

of its founding. The order also celebrated 60 years of service. Eagles have established a distinguished record of civic, humanitarian, and fraternal service of which every individual member can be justly and genuinely proud. Contributions to the betterment of the community and to the Nation are too numerous to enumerate in detail. But there are some milestones of Eagle progress which deserve special mention, and I am pleased to list them here. They are as follows:

Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight: Order was founded in Seattle on February 6.

Nineteen hundred and eight: Sponsored America's first workmen's compensation laws.

Nineteen hundred and ten: Sponsored America's first mothers pension law.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-three: Sponsored America's first old-age pension law.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-five: Supported enactment of social security law.

Nineteen hundred and forty-two: Built Eagle dormitory at Boys Town, Nebr.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four: Established the Eagles memorial foundation.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: Completed the Chapel of the Four Chaplains.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three: Founded Eagle Haus in free Berlin, Germany.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven: Inaugurated nationwide jobs after 40 program.

The last mentioned jobs after 40 program merits the support of every citizen whether he is an Eagle or not. Congress also would do well to support it.

Cuts in the Coast Guard Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest concern that I take note of the drastic cuts in the Coast Guard Reserve program ordered by the Treasury Department. As some of my colleagues may know, I have the honor to be a member of the Coast Guard Reserve, and I take considerable pride in having served in an organization which has had such a distinguished record, both in peace and war.

Violating what appeared to me to be the clear intent of Congress, the Treasury Department reduced the $15 million appropriation of the Coast Guard Reserve for the current fiscal year through a forced savings of $3½ million. Next the Treasury ordered that no agency could request more money for fiscal 1959 than it had been permitted to spend in fiscal 1958. The Coast Guard, trying desperately to meet the 1960 ready-for-mobilization date of all of the other services, reportedly had planned to ask for more than $15 million in 1959. Under this Treasury order, however, it can request only $11½ million. In simplest terms, this means that the Coast Guard will not meet its mobilization goal until 1964 or later. It means that the planned, phased buildup outlined in last year's budget, for which we appropriated sufficient funds, has been abandoned. Already, the program for enlisting additional reservists and establishing new reserve units has been severely impaired.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this is the time for any cutbacks in any fields directly related to our national security. The United States is heavily dependent upon the Reserve units of our Armed Forces, and must rely largely on combat-ready units. I cannot believe further that the decision as to the size and purpose of the Coast Guard should be made by the Treasury Department, after such a policy decision has, in fact, been made by the Congress.

Congress has indicated that it wants a strong, ready Coast Guard Reserve, able to carry out its mission to defend our ports and shores.

In the interest of the defense of our country and the Coast Guard Reserve, I urge the Secretary of the Treasury to restore the funds which have been cut from the Coast Guard Reserve program. In the absence of such favorable action by the Secretary of the Treasury I respectfully urge the appropriate committees of the House to review this situation carefully in that the intent of Congress, as heretofore expressed, will not be circumvented.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, now that we are thinking in terms of the international aspects of the freedom of man, it may be hard for us to realize that almost 200 years ago the fight for freedom was also international. One of the best examples of this is a man whose birthplace was Poland, but whose vibrant patriotism and humanity have given him world renown.

Thaddeus Kosciusko was born in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, an integrated part of Poland, on February 12, 1746. From then until his death in Switzerland on October 15, 1817, this remarkable man was to gain international fame as an outstanding patriot. Kosciusko was to be ranked highly in the history of a century that boasted such outstanding fighters for freedom and human rights as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the Marquis de Lafayette.

His story begins as an American success story often does. Raised by his mother and an elderly uncle, educated at home, he early gained notice for his unusual ability and energy. His military education begun at a cadet school in Warsaw was completed with the aid of the state in Germany, Italy, and France. It was fine training for one who was to impress his ability upon the American people and the world as a master strategist.

He returned to Poland in 1774, now with the rank of captain of the artillery. It is likely that he would have remained there except for the fact that he fell in love with a pupil of his named Ludwika. Her father intervened as they attempted to elope and Kosciusko fled to Paris in 1776.

It was fortunate for America that he did. Silas Deane was in Paris promoting the cause of American independence. To Kosciusko a trip to the new Republic was a great opportunity to put some of his personal ideas about human liberty into practice. If this American venture would succeed, would it not be easier to make liberal reforms on the continent and especially in his beloved Poland?

The American experiment was successful and so was Kosciusko. From his first major task, fortifications on the Delaware, George Washington embarked to defeat the Hessians on Christmas Eve. His second job involved him in the strategy for the Battle of Saratoga. The American victory there was the turning point in the war and Kosciusko received his due praise. He was assigned next to West Point, where he worked until 1780; then he participated brilliantly in the final battle at Yorktown.

A grateful America bestowed upon this unassuming man her highest honors: American citizenship, membership in the Order of Cincinnati, a grant of land, and the rank of brigadier general. But, although he said, "I regard the United States of America as my second country," the cause of freedom was calling him from his homeland.

Poland was already advanced compared to some European countries. Kosciusko wanted to see it resemble American patterns yet more closely. The remainder of his life he spent on this mission of freedom. In everything he attempted, America was the model. When he was asked to lead a revolution after the second partition of Poland in 1793, he based his organization and his strategy on experience gleaned from America. Like Washington he could have become a dictator. Unlike Napoleon he refused to take advantage of this opportunity.

Like so many Poles of today, he also knew Russia as his enemy. He suffered defeat at Russian hands and 2 years of captivity inside an earlier version of the Iron Curtain.

When he was released in 1796, disillusioned, he returned to the United States by the way of Paris. The new Republic of France hailed him as a fellow reformer and gave him French citizenship. He was now a citizen of three countries.

His American sojourn until May 1798 was welcome respite from Europe. Here he could see freedom in practice, liberty in operation. He and Tom Jefferson

could discuss their common interests in France, the rights of man, art, and gardening. Jefferson said of him:

He is the purest son of liberty that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all.

But he could not forget Poland. Again he went to France to plead Napoleon's aid for restoration of Poland, but the ambitious First Consul would not commit himself to a free Poland. Neither, in later years, would the Congress of Vienna hear his pleas.

Kosciusko could not believe that Poland and the cause of freedom were dead. He continued to hope and work for that end until his death and his words and deeds helped countless others not to give up hope. In this time of darkness in Poland, his voice must still remind us that Poland is not dead and will never be, so long as the people have freedom in their hearts. The sons of Poland who know the taste of freedom and her other friends must not rest until Kosciusko's dream comes true, in Poland and throughout the world.

Prospects for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few days ago the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] spoke to the New Jersey Farm Bureau in Trenton, N. J. Entitled "Prospects for Peace," his speech shows the thoughtful, statesmanlike approach we always associate with the distinguished Senator. In the light of his long experience as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, his analysis is particularly valuable. Especially noteworthy is his estimate of the potentialities of the exchange program recently agreed to with the U. S. S. R.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

(Address by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH before the New Jersey Farm Bureau in Trenton, N. J., on Monday, January 27, 1958)

I. THE CHALLENGE TO PEACE

The Russian moon placed in the sky last fall had shed a great deal of light on the status of American security. As sudden as its appearance was the change sputnik wrought in our thinking, both in Washington and throughout the country. Almost overnight, talk of budget cuts and tax deductions was drowned out by the demand for more missile money and a speedup in the race to outer space.

In a way, sputnik turned our world upside down. Across the Nation, Americans were shaken out of their lethargy of confidence as the orbiting satellites provoked humiliating questions: How did we fall behind the Russians? How far behind are we? What must we do to catch up?

Congress is now seeking the answers to these questions. They must all be answered for they are all aspects of the one supreme question: What are the prospects for peace in this new space age? This is the question which I would now like to discuss, for it concerns all of us deeply, and we must dedicate ourselves to its solution.

Sputnik, of course, did more than prove the superiority of the Russians in the field of missiles. It also provided unsettling evidence that they have made stupendous strides in broad areas of science. But greater than either of these was the demonstration to the rest of the world that Russia's military and scientific position is now equal to that of the United States.

At the same time, the Russians have greatly stepped up their economic offensive in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Instead of seeking control by arms or threat of arms, they have begun to extend their political influence by economic means. They have started competing with our own foreign-aid program: In fact, they have recently been quite successful in outbidding us in offering aid to these countries.

This is indeed an ominous threat, for the Russian offers are not intended, as ours are, to help the underdeveloped countries gain economic strength and independence. The whole object is, rather, to bring these countries behind the Iron Curtain by making them increasingly dependent on Communist aid.

The intensification of this economic offensive has been accompanied by insidious propaganda campaign calculated to weaken the NATO alliance and make the United States appear to be opposed to peace and unwilling to negotiate.

All these related developments of recent months have had a tremendous impact throughout the world, particularly in the uncommitted countries. They have shaken world faith in American leadership and placed the security of the free nations in doubt. This, then, is the grave nature of the challenge: Can we rebuild our strength and reestablish our security to meet the Russian challenge, and still maintain the peace?

II. THE RESPONSE TO THE CHALLENGE

It will take years to fully meet this challenge, which, we must admit, caught us all by surprise. Even so, however, it did not take us long to respond: under United States leadership, the free world quickly began to develop a program to meet and counter the challenge.

The initial response produced an important and much-needed strengthening of our alliances at the NATO Conference last December. It had been President Eisenhower's idea, just before his last illness, that a special meeting of the NATO members should be called to restore confidence in the organization. The success of the meeting seemed in jeopardy for a while when, after he suffered his slight stroke, it seemed that he would be unable to attend and exert his personal leadership.

But our President was not to be deterred, even at the risk of his health and his life. As NATO's first commander when it was established 9 years ago in response to earlier Russian threats of aggression, he knew better than anyone that NATO must be maintained in strength as a central pillar of our security system. Acting on this deep personal knowledge and conviction, he went to Paris to successfully instill new unity and purpose among the 15 member nations.

Some 3 weeks after the NATO Conference, in his brilliant state of the Union address of January 9, the President outlined the main features of his program for action to meet the Communist challenge. This, to my mind, was one of the greatest, most forthright statements of American policy which I have witnessed in my 14 years in the Senate. The eight-point program he formulated in this address provided the American people with a blueprint for future peace and security.

Then, in his January 12 reply to Premier Bulganin's letter, the President further spelled out his program. Additional details were enunciated by Secretary Dulles in his fine speech to the National Press Club on January 16. These 3 documents, appearing within a period of 7 days, give inspiring proof that our leadership has fully comprehended the nature of the Communist threat and has developed a positive, effective policy to meet it. I would now like to discuss some aspects of this policy in more detail.

III. THE EISENHOWER EIGHT POINTS

First, the President's program as outlined in his state of the Union speech. At the outset of the address, he frankly reviewed the extent of the present danger and issued a clear call for action. Then he put forward his 8 points, of which the first 7 constitute a detailed plan to strengthen American security, both at home and abroad.

On the home front, this is to be accomplished by an accelerated defense effort, a thorough reorganization of our military structure, Federal support for education and scientific research, and maintenance of a strong economy.

Overseas, the program would be carried out primarily by increasing our mutual and and trade projects to develop the military and economic strength of friendly nations and to build the economic foundations of the underdeveloped countries so that they can resist Russian penetration. We would also share scientific information with our allies for effective technical progress.

These steps will enable us to match the Communist efforts. Action in each of these areas is, as the President declared, not only desirable but imperative. At the same time, he emphasized, the seven points in themselves cannot lead to lasting peace unless we place equal stress on the eighth point of the program, which calls for works of peace.

It is this eighth point, this concept of works of peace, which gives inspiration to the whole program. It captures the imagination in visualizing an exhaustive, determined exploration of all possible means for greater communication and understanding between the peoples of the world, and particularly with the people of Russia. Constructive, worldwide cooperation in programs for human betterment, at the person-to-person level, would make great progress toward that mutual confidence which is the only basis for peaceful solution of the present stalemate.

Together, the eight points give us a positive plan of action to promote the cause of peace and security, not only by strengthening our military position, but by mobilizing our total resources to wage total peace. Just as Winston Churchill told the people of England in their hour of crisis that blood, toil, tears, and sweat were required to save their country, so President Eisenhower has called on all of us to work together in sacrifice and high understanding to meet the threat of Communist imperialism.

IV. THE BULGANIN EXCHANGE AND THE CALL FOR NEGOTIATION

"Of all the works of peace," President Eisenhower concluded, "none is more needed now than a real first step toward disarmament." But even as he explained our country's desire and eagerness for negotiation of any disarmament proposals which offer reliable means to insure compliance, the Russians made a calculated bid to neutralize the effect of his words on world opinion.

Premier Bulganin's second letter to the President, released to the international press on the same day with the clear intention of overshadowing the state of the Union message, once again sought to cast doubt on

America's desire for peace. Wide attention was focused on Bulganin's request for an early summit meeting, which was coupled with a repetition of previous Soviet proposals for an East-West nonaggression pact and a ban on nuclear weapons—both previously rejected by the West because of Russian refusal to include adequate safeguards.

In his reply to the Bulganin notes, President Eisenhower exposed the weaknesses of the warmed-over Russian proposals and took a major step toward establishing a concrete basis for renewed negotiations. He asked the Soviets to join in strengthening the United Nations by modifying the power of veto in the Security Council, and he urged them to restore world confidence in their pledged word by taking immediate action to unify Germany and to guarantee free elections to the people of Eastern Europe.

On the central issue of disarmament, the President proposed a joint agreement on the peaceful use of outer space, the end of nuclear testing and the controlled reduction of conventional weapons and military manpower. He further affirmed his willingness to meet with the Russian leaders, but he insisted that a summit conference be preceded by lower level negotiations.

The United States position on this issue was further clarified by Mr. Dulles in his National Press Club speech which warned of the dangers in an inadequately prepared summit meeting, yet gave positive expression to the possibilities of such top-level talks when based on sufficient preparation to assure a prospect of significant agreement. This, in effect, was an elaboration of the state of the Union declaration that works of peace, not mere words of peace, must be required.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This, then, is our program and our policy for action. We must diligently strengthen our military preparations, develop our missiles, expand our Strategic Air Command. But at the same time, we must earnestly pursue the search for a basis of understanding, a basis for negotiation. We must seek to replace international distrust with international confidence.

Today's announcement that the United States and Russia have signed an agreement on exchanges is a step in just this direction. This represents a new approach, and one of the most significant developments in all these years of cold war. We are beginning to explore avenues of greater communication between peoples—not the leaders, but the people. We are beginning to move in a direction which goes beyond the exchange of diplomatic formalities to the exchange of people, seeing each other's countries and customs, breaking down the manmade barriers which have prevented the peoples of the world from getting to know and understand each other.

This is to be a broad program of exchange in the fields of industry, agriculture, science, and the arts. I would suggest that the most promising area in which to start would be that of science. If there is any place where Americans and Russians can meet in mutual confidence, it should be in the research laboratory. In the realm of pure science there are few secrets to be guarded, and the objectives of dedicated scientists are the same.

Cooperative scientific projects for peace could produce major benefits for humanity, and set an example for every other program of cultural exchange. The results could be stupendous in terms of human relations and human progress. I may be going too far in this hope, but I think we are on the trail of something which holds great promise for the future, something which may give us the ultimate solution to world disorder.

In the long run, after all, we may very well be grateful for sputnik. It has already done a wonderful service in awakening us to the full extent of our present danger and evoking a fully developed program from our leadership.

It now remains for us to make the all-encompassing national effort which the President's program demands. In his state of the Union address, he concluded: "I am fully confident that the response of the Congress and of the American people will make this time of test a time of honor. Mankind then will see more clearly than ever that the future belongs, not to the concept of the regimented atheistic state, but to the people—the God-fearing, peace-loving people of the world."

In these few words, it seems to me, are summed up both the opportunity and the responsibility which we face.

The Crossroads for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, last week, on February 6, I was privileged to address the 21st annual meeting of the Minnesota-Iowa Swine Institute. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CROSSROADS FOR AGRICULTURE

(An address by the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator from Minnesota, before the 21st annual meeting of the Minnesota-Iowa Swine Institute, Austin, Minn., February 6, 1958)

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 21st annual Minnesota-Iowa Swine Institute, you are meeting in Austin, Minn., as active participants in a vital and important part of America's agricultural economy—namely, as swine producers. Although your primary interests rest in this specific field—you by necessity are interested in the welfare and prosperity of our entire agricultural industry.

We have now reached a crossroads when the future of American agriculture has reached a momentous point of decision. In the years ahead agriculture will either reach up to new horizons of accomplishment, strength, and prosperity, or it will turn to a path of sectional strife, disintegration, and capture for the benefit of a few and to the detriment of many.

PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURE

I intend to be quite frank and candid in my remarks today. I speak to you as one who is completely devoted to the proposition that American agriculture can enjoy a prosperous future never before dreamed of and a future which will tax the imagination of every farm producer in the United States.

Agriculture has been weakened in the past 10 years since the end of World War II. It has not moved forward with industry and labor in the sharing of our unprecedented prosperity. It is unbelievable that the American farmer today should be caught in the clutches of a vicious cost-price squeeze which everyone recognizes and which to this date has not been solved.

It does the farmer little good to see Government officials, Congressional leaders, the major farm organizations, and the consuming public at odds over the solutions to such problems as agricultural surpluses, falling farm prices, increased costs of operations, ever increasing price increases to the public. If ever there was fiddling while "Rome burns" it is going on at the present time in regard to agriculture.

THYE ACTS

I want to make my position very plain during the next few minutes. I am completely committed to the proposition that immediate action must be taken to bolster the agricultural economy. That is why I took these problems to the President of the United States last week. That is why I have differed with the Secretary of Agriculture over the matter of price supports during the past 4 years. That is why during December of 1956 I called the major farm leaders of Minnesota into conference in my office in St. Paul to attempt to iron out differences and to see if we could not agree on a general approach to the farm problems. That is why I have introduced what I believe to be sound legislation in the Senate of the United States. I have done this without regard to partisan political thought.

These problems are not going to be solved through political fighting and bickering. I do not want the future of American farming to be sacrificed upon the altar of political advantage and partisanship.

In the past session of Congress we witnessed the disintegration of the farm bloc. We saw the corn farmer, the wheat farmer, the livestock and swine breeders, the cotton, rice, peanut, tobacco—interests working for their proposals without a genuine united effort for constructive overall legislation. We have also seen in many places the farmer pitted against the consumer.

There has been distortion of fact in the many arguments which have been presented.

This type of activity must be eliminated if we are to move forward to the new horizons which lie ahead.

The first task is to search out the planks in a farm program which can be agreed upon by the many parties in interest. There are such common areas of agreement.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT

Let me name a few. There is little or no disagreement today to the extension of Public Law 480 which seeks to reduce surplus commodities through the channels of trade, barter, and relief. Most people agree that the conservation part of the soil bank should be extended. There is no argument over the need for immediate and searching research into new uses for agriculture products and new markets. The goal of all of these measures is a more prosperous agriculture in tune with our general prosperity.

PUBLIC LAW 480

Let us examine these areas of agreement more carefully. I cosponsored Public Law 480 and have introduced a bill for its extension because it places American surplus into the hands of people who need it—because it has become an effective supplement to our foreign-aid program—and because it places our surpluses in a position to play a vital role in our destinty as a world leader for the cause of freedom and decency. Under the provisions of this law up to September of 1957 the United States had actually shipped 10,800,000 pounds of butter and butter oil valued at $4,776,000 in trade with other nations. We have shipped over 14 million pounds of powdered milk at a value of nearly $2 million. We have shipped 183,638,000 pounds of lard at a value of over $23 million. This helps to explain why the price of pork has held more firm than in past years. We have also disposed of cottonseed oil, powdered milk, and peanuts for oil under the barter provision of Public Law 480. In the area of international donations, we have shipped out over 325,400,000 pounds of butter and butter oil in an amount of over $225,500,000. Over

1 billion pounds of powdered milk in the amount of $220,400,000 has been disposed of through the donation provision. In addition, we have donated 71,400,000 pounds of cottonseed oil valued at over $17 million. This record demonstrates surplus products are being disposed of to the benefit of American agriculture and to the benefit of those who have received these products.

Yesterday morning I participated in a hearing of the Senate Agriculture Committee where we heard an up-to-date report on Public Law 480 by officials of the Department of Agriculture. Let me give you some figures about agreements under Public Law 480 which were released at that hearing. These figures related to agreements whereas the figures I gave you before pertained to actual shipments.

The agreements already signed provide for the shipment of 550 million bushels of wheat, 3 million bales of cotton, 25 million bags of rice, 1.8 billion pounds of vegetable oils, 133 million bushels of feed grains, 175 million pounds of tobacco, 150 million pounds of meat, 225 million pounds of lard, 162 million pounds of dairy products, 197 million pounds of fruit and vegetables, as well as other commodities.

In 1955–56, the first full year of operation of title I, foreign currency shipments totaled $427 million at export market value, or 12 percent of total United States agricultural exports. During 1956–57 title I shipments amounted to $900 million, nearly 20 percent of the record breaking $4.7 billion total achieved.

Agreements signed to date will result in foreign currency payments of more than $2.5 billion. About 60 percent of the total will be used for economic development purposes in importing countries, about 10 percent will be used to support the defense forces of our allies and the remaining 30 percent is planned for meeting United States expenses overseas and expanding certain United States programs.

The bulk of the commodities included in these agreements has already been exported and the increase in title I shipments from year to year has been one of the major factors leading to the rise in our total agricultural exports. In 1954–55 our agricultural exports had a market value of $3.1 billion. Title I shipments were small that year accounting for 3 percent of the total. In 1955–56 our agricultural exports rose to $3.5 billion. Title I accounted for 12 percent of the total. In 1956–57, the year ending last June 30, agricultural exports rose to an all-time high of $4.7 billion. Title I shipments made up almost 20 percent of the total, or about $900 million.

The rise in total exports was the principal reason that last year the direction of surplus accumulations was reversed. During 1956–57, CCC investment in price-support commodities declined almost $1 billion with the principal reductions being in wheat, cotton, and rice, commodities for which there were heavy movements under the title I program.

Public Law 480 is the type of program which permits this Nation to use its surpluses in three ways: (1) As an export commodity; (2) as a humane program for the relief of hunger; and (3) as a defense asset.

In Spain we took monetary earnings from our grain exports and used them to pay for air base construction. We have taken prefabricated housing and labor from Finland to bolster our NATO allies in return for grain shipments.

It is a program which is winning friends for the United States through a benevolent approach. It is more effective than all of the armaments we could parade before hungry people in a troubled world. I ask your support for the efforts of myself and others in both political parties who call for its extension.

SOIL BANK

The conservation reserve section of the soil bank is designed not only to reduce surpluses, but also to reforestrate our land. This type of reforestration and conservation program has met with enthusiastic support and the extension of this part of the soil bank should receive bipartisan support in the Congress.

RESEARCH—THE KEY TO PROSPERITY

There is a crying need today for the most concentrated research program into new uses and markets for agriculture products that this Nation has even seen.

On March 31, 1956, I cosponsored S. 3503, which is designed to provide scientific study and research programs for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products. Through research we can develop these new uses and cut down our surpluses.

We can and we must inspire research to increase the industrial uses of agricultural products, and, thus, increase the income of agriculture. We have the facilities. We have both public and private laboratories. We have our land-grant colleges, universities, and the extension services. They should be utilized night and day to develop new uses for our products. We have already developed synthetics from oil and coal. But these are resources which can and will be depleted over the years ahead.

But the productive capacity and output of America's farm land is increasing—not decreasing. This fact alone dictates action into vast and far-reaching research programs. It is no credit to American ingenuity that industry today spends from 3 to 10 percent of its sales income in the development of new products—while agriculture spends less than 1 percent of its sales income for the same purpose. This disparity cannot be allowed to continue if agriculture is to share in our prosperity. In terms of dollars and cents industry spent about $3 billion in research activity during 1956. During the same period agricultural research totaled about $375 million.

If anyone doubts the value of research consider the following programs involving livestock. I can recall in 1946 the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and Texas. This outbreak threatened the entire livestock industry in the United States.

Shortly after I came to the Senate in 1947 I was asked to serve as a special subcommittee chairman to go to Mexico and investigate the spread of disease and to propose a solution. At the time I reached Mexico the United States was engaged in slaughtering the cattle and oxen of the Mexican farmers. I saw the resentment which was spreading in the minds and hearts of the Mexican people. I immediately proposed the development of a vaccine and the inauguration of an innoculation program.

There were those who scoffed at this suggestion. However, with the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture we were able to develop the vaccine, innoculation became a common practice, and today the threat of foot-and-mouth disease has been erased. This is a striking example of how a little money spent in research can save millions of dollars and thereby protect the prosperity of the farmer.

Later, I introduced legislation providing for an extensive research laboratory for animal diseases in the United States. Today the Plum Island Research Laboratory in New York under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture stands as a monument to what scientific research can accomplish.

Right now the Agricultural Research Laboratory at Ames, Iowa, is under construction. When this laboratory is completed, we will have another great research development which can eliminate such threats to domestic animals as rabies. The Ames laboratory will be of great assistance to you as producers in the care and management of your animals.

The same type of forward-looking programs must be developed for all of our products.

PRODUCTION RECORD

It is ironic today that achievement in production has worked to the detriment of our farmers. The farmers have developed and advanced faster in the expansion of production than any other phase of our national economy. Industry has increased its production by about 3.2 percent per year during the past 10 years. Agriculture has advanced in production at a rate of 6 percent per year. In terms of total productive output this means that agricultural production is 60 percent higher today than it was 10 years ago.

This accomplishment must be converted into an advantage rather than a disadvantage. It must be approached from the standpoint of reaping a higher income for agriculture rather than to be made a liability in the form of forced Treasury payments.

Let's take a look at this production record so that we can get a true understanding of what it means in terms of the various products. Corn production the past 4 years has ranged from a 3.1 percent estimate to a high of 7.3 percent as a carryover to the subsequent year. The result of this rather low percentage of surplus has, however, forced a ruinous low price upon the feed grain price structure of the Nation.

RESULT OF SURPLUS

This surplus threatens to increase your pork production in 1958 to a dangerous point which might well depress the market in spite of the efforts made to dispose of the surplus. We already know that poultry and turkeys have risen to a dangerous high level of production. We also know that the surplus in grains is threatening an increase in dairy production even though the cow population is at a low level. In 1953, for example, the number of milk cows was 21,691,000. In 1956 that number was down to 20,927,000. However, because of better breeding methods and the presence of low-priced feeds the production per animal has risen.

In the case of wheat we find that during the past 4 years production declined. In 1954, 983.9 million bushels were produced while in 1957, 947 million bushels were produced. In the past 3 years our domestic disappearance of wheat has been 62.6 percent of our production. Our exports have accounted for 42.2 percent of production. This has effected a 4.8 percent withdrawal from existing surplus stocks. In the calendar year 1954, the withdrawal from annual production was 93.9 percent—with the balance going into surplus. During 1955, 1956, and 1957 the situation changed. We have recorded a withdrawal from surpluses during those years.

Wisdom dictates that this relatively small percentage of surplus must be processed into industrial channels. These products are storable, nonperishable, and can be drawn on the same as you now draw upon strategic military stockpiles. You and I can recall when rationing was imposed upon grains. These grain products found their way into the manufacture of industrial alcohol which was in turn used to develop synthetic rubber. Alcohol was used in the manufacture of ammunition for defense needs. You can also recall when the fibers from the cotton plant as well as wool had to be rationed to the civilian population. Our memories are not so short but what we cannot recall those facts. Certainly the same type of ingenuity can be applied to surplus agricultural products today.

Wheat and corn can be stored in various parts of the Nation. The storage costs to

preserve a fighting reserve could be administered at a minimum cost if natural storage places were used.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

I have already called to your attention the bills now before Congress which would establish the machinery to utilize surplus crops. These bills are sponsored by Democrats and Republicans alike. These bills, if passed, would unshackle the agriculture economy and take it off dead center. It would lead to unrestricted planting, the curtailment of controls, and would allow the market to reflect the strength of the national economy for agriculture as it does for steel and its byproducts. Why will not the Congress or its committees act? Why does the Agriculture Department concern itself more with the issue of price supports than with progressive research action to develop a new prosperity for agriculture? These are the questions which must be answered in the near future if agriculture is to grow and prosper.

If we do not solve the dilemma entailed in increased production and a shrinking use of products produced in the near future—we may awaken in the next quarter of a century to find that we will have a completely corporate type of farm and the destruction of the family farm and free ownership of our agricultural land. We have already lost too much time arguing over the issues of support factors rather than addressing our efforts to the broad phase of technical development of new uses for our production. Today we have acres of land producing 100 bushels of corn. Our fathers would have been grateful if they could have harvested half of that amount per acre. Can we be so blind to the need of matching this increased production with new and vital uses for these products?

NEW CHAPTERS MUST BE WRITTEN

There are new chapters to be written in agriculture which challenge the imagination and ingenuity of all of us. It is utterly inconceivable that we can project a satellite into outer space and have it circle the earth in regular orbit every 100 minutes—and still not be able to discover a way to put food and fiber to new uses.

As I see it—research should be made the key to open the door to new and exciting frontiers in agriculture. Such a program is not installed overnight. I am talking about a program which must begin today and continue so long as we have an agricultural economy. I propose the following plan of action which can and must work:

1. The Congress must enact legislation to establish a sweeping program of research into industrial uses of agricultural products. Executive power must be granted by the Congress wherever necessary to establish the necessary machinery to carry on this research.

2. The executive branch of the Government should immediately use every means at its disposal to take advantage of research facilities. The Secretary of Agriculture can begin by giving a favorable report to existing bills in the Congress or by coming before the Congress with what he considers to be a better plan.

3. The extension of Public Law 480 to dispose of surplus products through trade, barter, or donation.

4. The extension of the conservation reserve portion of the Soil Bank Act.

5. Temporary acreage allotments until such time as controlled acreage is no longer necessary.

6. Added concentration on the development of the rural development program which seeks to assist the farmers and residents of rural communities throughout the United States.

7. The maintenance of higher price supports until such time as they are no longer needed.

I should like to elaborate on the last point for a few moments. I cannot and will not support the continued attempts to lower present support prices at a time when we have not solved the deeper problems of agriculture and at a time when the farmer is already caught in a cost-price squeeze. I shall continue to oppose this type of approach to the farmer's problems. The recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture to lower dairy supports is the latest chapter in this controversy. Many who supported previous attempts to lower supports on other products joined in opposition when the proposal to lower dairy supports was made.

8. Establishment of a strategic stockpile of surplus products.

Rural America is still the formulation for future prosperity in this Nation. We have a clear choice. Reject progress in the development of programs for agriculture which will amount to the destruction of a free agricultural economy—or take immediate action to open up new horizons and frontiers through a far reaching program of new uses of farm products.

This is a monumental task which demands the cooperative spirit of all concerned. We must strip ourselves of prejudices, partisan politics, shortsightedness, and the willingness to let the other fellow worry about the problems of the American farmer.

You—men of the Swine Producers Association have used your initiative to develop better animals, to provide Americans with better meat—and to keep up with consumer demand. You are to be commended. You have helped to raise the standards of our agricultural economy. Now we need you and thousands of others like you to pick American agriculture up by the bootstraps, and point the way to new progress and prosperity in rural America.

Distinguished State Service Award to Senator Pastore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of the award for distinguished State service given to my colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, by the American Tariff League, Inc.

I also ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Senator PASTORE upon the occasion of his acceptance of the award.

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

AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED STATE SERVICE TO SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE

The American Tariff League, Inc., at its 72d annual meeting, expresses to the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, United States Senator from the State of Rhode Island, its admiration and gratitude for the outstanding service he has rendered to the people of Rhode Island, the Congress of the United States, and our Nation.

Senator PASTORE has served his State as assistant attorney general, Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and United States Senator. His understanding of the complex problems currently facing this country is unsurpassed. He has consistently pursued a progressive legislative program dedicated both to the welfare of his constituency and the vital interests of the United States. As a highly respected member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator PASTORE has worked toward the objective that our internal and foreign trade policies be so administered that our national security shall be the common responsibility of us all, and not the special burden of any particular State, or industry, or group. His activities as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have steadfastly furthered the adoption of a sane, forward-looking program for American development of nuclear power. In addition to a penetrating intellect and admirable legal judgment, he brings to his senatorial duties an impressive forensic talent.

With best wishes for his continued career, the American Tariff League, Inc., on October 30, 1957, in New York City, unanimously resolves that this award for distinguished State service be presented to Senator PASTORE.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR J. PASTORE IN ACCEPTING THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE'S AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED STATE SERVICE, AT THE LEAGUE'S 72D ANNUAL DINNER, THE PLAZA, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 30, 1957

I deeply appreciate the invitation of your organization to come here on this occasion. Especially I value the emphasis you have placed—in the day's work—on our State of Rhode Island. It is a small State—but we love it. Its problems may be minor in the sweeping world picture—but both its triumphs and its troubles are close to our hearts. Perhaps it is because it is a small State and we all live and labor close to one another that we develop friendships more intimate than you of the bigger States can enjoy.

One of my most valued friendships through all the days of my public service has been that with Ted Walker, and I was happy to respond to his urging to be here on my return from Europe. I see many friends in the gathering.

So this is a very pleasurable personal experience—and I am certain, also, that I will have many helpful ideas as I come to review the contributions that your list of excellent participants have made to the success of this entire day.

It is the duty of a public official to be ready at all times and under all circumstances to discuss the problems of industry and the individual. I feel that the trials and tribulations of any segment of our economy cannot be dismissed in cavalier fashion.

I do not believe that a sentence of execution upon an industry should be summarily handed down from high places.

There are two sides to every question. In the field of economic foreign policy—in the matter of trade between nations—on the subject of tariffs and controls—there seem to have been developed through the years—sides and angles beyond all count.

So, when either side—or any side—or any angle—pauses to applaud a public servant—if anybody admits that he has done a reasonably good job, that public servant should feel flattered indeed.

In all sincerity, therefore, I value this award, the honor you have seen fit to bestow upon me.

I am both pleasantly surprised and gratified by your action.

My conduct will continue to be guided by my conscience. I will always steer my course for what I believe to be the best interests of America—having in mind my special respon-

sibility to that part of America which I represent.

I will not seek to embarrass our economy for the sake of unfair advantage.

But I will not hesitate to speak out when I feel that an overall policy is riding roughshod over an industry whose only fault is that it is small—and that its voice is weak amid the uproar of the giants.

If the theories of commerce must be divided into two camps, then I must say that I am neither an out-and-out protectionist nor a fanatic free trader.

I have never believed that the United States is sufficient unto itself. Self-interest and self-preservation do not and cannot stop at our shoreline. Our security and prosperity cannot be separated from the well-being of the free world.

As you know, I have just returned from my assignment to the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Vienna. I have made a brief but intensely directed journey to other points of our alliances and friendships overseas.

Every day I am more and more impressed that, as a vital part of our military and political alliances we must consider the economy of the countries we would possess as our friends.

What we do about our foreign trade policy fundamentally affects our ability to have and hold them as friends. Their chance of prosperity and their choice of friends can be the key to world peace.

Foreign trade is not altogether a one-way street. For our own industrial progress and our own military security we have a great dependence on imports of critical materials. In some fields we have a total dependence. International trade is supremely important to us as well as to the rest of the world. We would not be serving our country if we permitted that trade to contract unduly.

We would be in peril if our foreign trade were to shrink in the fact of our necessities and in face of the constant, competitive, communistic threat to the free world.

This does not mean, however, that we have to accept the very easy suggestion—and yet the very questionable extreme of free trade.

Certainly there are certain industries which would promote this. Many kinds of products, including automobiles, can be exported to all parts of the world at a profit. But the balance sheets of such industries do not help other industries in a less fortunate economic position to stand up against foreign competition.

Take for example, the textile industry so important to our New England area. The New England governors, individually and collectively, have for years been worried about the present and the future of textiles. Five years ago the governors joined in a caution to the administration to make no trade concessions in textiles in the immediate future. We were all deeply disappointed that tariffs on textiles were cut just the same.

This year the New England governors join again in repeating their warning that the United States should not increase foreign competition in textiles by making trade concessions.

The textile industry and the New England governors are aware of the dollar gap abroad. We are all aware of the shortage of dollars that prevents other nations from buying as much as they would like in our markets. That dollar shortage, of course, is the problem that tariff reduction seeks to solve. But we feel that the dollar shortage problem is a concern of the whole Nation. We do not feel that the solution lies in the excessive sacrifice of one segment of the national economy.

Now this is not the offhand complaint of an individual. It is not a mere surface, partisan protest. What the New England governors had before them was a deep study of the textile industry's problems.

These problems are summarized in some 180 pages of an excellent report. This nonpartisan effort—and I mean nonpartisan—sees much to criticize in various attitudes of the administration.

It dwells upon the policies of Federal credit and investment and recounts its subsidies at home to other elements of the economy.

It deals with generous selling policies abroad and its current high money rates which hit such vulnerable industries as textiles. Having been hit by all these other Government policies, we question the justice of further hurting textiles with unfair foreign-trade policies.

We have a great disliking to be paid off in lame explanations and lamer accusations. It is small comfort for a mill owner who sees his machinery being auctioned off and his lifetime efforts disappearing in thin air—to be told that the trouble with him is that he is not flexible enough—or there isn't really any serious import competition—or that he is too small—or that he is not essential for the war effort—whenever that war is to be expected.

It isn't any comfort to the head of a family, to a man who has spent all his years developing his textile skills, to be told, after all, there are only a few of you, and the world is ever so big.

What if there are only 1,600 people in an industry—only 1,200—or perhaps only 200. It is no part of a Government policy to disregard the few—to tell them, because they are so few, they are going to be sacrificed—that they can't be given a little protection—for the very reason that they are so little in the big measure of international trade.

If you have ever had a caller whose job is gone because the mill is gone—the humble head of a family to whom that mill was neighbor, friend, and future from his boyhood days—if you have ever had so discouraged a man knock at your door to tell you his future is a blank wall—please don't try to tell him that a hundred jobless men or women are not important—don't try to tell him that he and his family are expendable so that we can make life a little sweeter for the same number of people in some unnamed country the world around.

Both narrow protectionism and extravagant free trade are in error in the consideration of modern economic and political realism.

It is strange indeed when we can think of nothing more original than continue to make across-the-board tariff cuts.

One of the great weaknesses of our present policy is that by cutting tariffs on an across-the-board basis, and by extending concessions to all countries by way of the unconditional most-favored-nation policy, we are making it profitable for some countries to concentrate on products that are most damaging to our own economy. For instance, in the case of Japan this would be certain kinds of textiles, pottery and hardwood plywood.

It is natural—without restriction or inducement of some kind—that countries with low wage standards will send us such goods in the production of which they have the greatest comparative advantage.

Isn't there some means by which we can induce those countries to concentrate upon goods other than these—goods in the production of which they have considerable advantage—but not an overwhelming edge.

Take Japan. Japan has excellent workmen who can produce at competitive cost in many varied specialized fields. Would there be advantage in guaranteeing to Japanese manufacturers in these fields—exemption from the escape clause on a limited quantity of imports.

It might be that other nations—for the same purpose of maintaining friendly relations—would also cooperate.

They would send us fewer of the exports that are damaging to our economy. They would find their increased sales in the new fields much more profitable. When these items had reached the agreed-upon limits, the escape clause could be invoked, as it is now, if serious damage threatened our American producers.

Such a limited sharing plan might do more to build up genuine good will between Japan and the United States and the other countries of the free world than has all of our talk about token reductions of tariffs and membership in the OTC.

To encourage trade along those lines, it seems to me, might be more effective with self-respecting countries than millions of dollars poured out in direct financial aid.

We have been very generous with our tariff cutting and today we are one of the low tariff countries of the world. The protective effect of our tariffs is down 75 percent from its average level 22 years ago. Twenty years ago it stood at 50 percent on our dutiable items. Today it is a little over 12 percent.

Our tariff policies certainly have not been perfect—not by a long shot. In 1 day the newspapers tell us of the complaints from clothespins to copper while Japan takes another look at her plywood activities and Brazil takes a second look at automobile imports.

This is no time to be complacent. But when we are critical we intend to be constructively critical. We see nothing un-American in taking a good look at our foreign-trade policies any more than we hesitate to survey our foreign policies in general.

There is nothing un-American in saying that the Dulles flights of fancy have been something less than 100 percent correct. There is nothing un-American in declining to accept the White House verdicts on our economy as being infallible. The White House itself often declines to follow the recommendations of its own Tariff Commission.

We yield to no one in our loyalty to America—to these United States and to its efforts to strengthen the free world in history's most critical hour. We can make sacrifices where they are sanely required. But we will not and cannot surrender our consciences. We shall be conscious of our duty to remain strong in every segment of our economy. For in that strength alone lies the security of mankind—the one guaranty that the world will have a tomorrow worth sharing.

Resolution Backing Peaceful Use of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] and I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should take the initiative in efforts to devote outer space to peaceful uses. Prompt and firm Congressional approval of such a resolution would show the world that the American people stand squarely behind their leaders as they attempt to gain international agreement on the use of the solar regions for nonmilitary purposes.

The imminent invasion of space by man-made machines presents very real

problems which must be faced up to by Congress, by the American people, and by all the nations of the world Specifically these enigmas are military, legal, and jurisdictional in nature

The military dangers involved in the development of outer space are very real. The prospect of reconnaissance from satellites, or of rockets armed with nuclear weapons is clearly a reasonable probability. This extension of the tools of war into space heightens tremendously chances for the total destruction of earth civilization. At least, it seems plain that the nation which controls outer space could easily dominate the earth from this vantage point.

It follows that to avoid turning down a road of sure global suicide, the nations of the world must devise means for preventing the use of outer space for military purposes. And in a more positive vein, we must make every effort to achieve cooperation and sharing of solar information in order to stimulate peaceful advances.

The United States has already taken the lead in pressing for international cooperation on the peaceful utilization of outer space. President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles and other leaders have proposed that immediate steps be taken to insure that space will not be used for warlike purposes.

The timing of such steps are of the essence. Now, while the patterns and precedents concerning space exploration, use and control are being established, is the time to reach agreement that solar areas will not be used for military purposes. It is far wiser to control the infant now than to attempt to chain the giant later.

A ringing vote of approval by Congress, speaking for the American people, would strongly back up our leaders in their quest for agreements. It would reaffirm in the eyes of the world our dedication to the cause of peace.

In this great endeavor, America must lead the way. We must pioneer with boldness, imagination, and resourcefulness. We must continue to take the initiative, fully aware of the promises as well as the perils that lie ahead.

And in the end, if our efforts for peaceful use and control of outer space are successful, we may have opened a new era for all mankind. Perhaps man, freed from the ties of his earthbound existence by the common challenge of space, might even shake free from some of the jealousies and differences which beset human affairs and place peace on earth on such a precarious footing.

Passage of this resolution by Congress will show the world that the people of America are ready, willing, and able to accept the future with vision, not vexation. It will demonstrate to the world that we choose the path to greatness—not to oblivion.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the paramount aim of United States foreign policy is to promote peace by all possible means; and

Whereas recent developments have demonstrated that outer space will be used increasingly by the nations of the world; and

Whereas the use of outer space poses great military dangers to the world but also promises untold treasures for peaceful uses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States express in strongest terms its desire that the regions of outer space be devoted to peaceful purposes. It is further the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to take the initiative and to press for devotion of outer space to peaceful purposes through the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate. Such means may relate to, but need not be limited to—

(1) an international agreement barring the use of outer space for any military purpose;

(2) an international agreement that outer space and all outer space planetary and subplanetary masses are not subject to appropriation by any Nation;

(3) adaption of an existing international organization or agency or formation of a new one for the joint exploration of outer space; and

(4) efforts to gain international agreement and cooperation on legal, jurisdictional, communications, navigation, and other problems concerning the use and control of outer space.

Danes Score United States Shipping Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Journal of Commerce stating that Danish shipowners will tell the United States Government that they resent the idea of new subsidies to American shipping as outlined by President Eisenhower in his budget message. The article states that the shipowners consider it dangerous to Danish shipping if Congress grants the President's request and that they have asked the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Commerce to convey their views to our Government.

This may be a good time to briefly review our program which involves budget requests for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, for $160 million for the construction differential subsidy and $120 million for the operating differential subsidy. Quite possibly the Danish shipowners who do not know what our program is nor why it is necessary to us.

We usually have about 1,200 ships in operation under the American flag. They carry about 20 percent of the cargoes and passengers moving in our trade with foreign countries. About 300 of these vessels are involved in our subsidized operations and are restricted by contract as to their operations, their availability to the Government in case of emergency, and to the amount of profit that they may earn without completely repaying our Government for any subsidy involved. The other American-flag ships are in unrestricted trade and can go and come as they please.

Two wars and more have taught us that we must have a shipbuilding and repair industry. Our subsidized operators compete with foreign flag ships. Our operators are required to buy ships built in the United States. American standards of living and wages are higher than foreign standards and our costs of building in United States yards are about 80 percent higher than foreign costs. To keep an industry essential in wartime, in an operating condition during peacetime, we require that the American operator should buy his ship in an American yard. We provide, however, that he shall contribute only an amount equal to the price that he would pay a foreign yard at which his foreign competitor might buy a similar ship and our Government makes up the difference in cost under our construction differential subsidy program.

The same wars taught us that we could not depend on foreign shipping during wartime. World War I and II were lengthened and almost lost for want of ships. We know from bitter experience that we must have a substantial fleet of passenger and cargo vessels owned, operated and sailed by Americans for our own security and for the preservation of our peacetime trade. All other ships failed us during those two wars as they were withdrawn from our use by their own governments or were lost in action.

Our subsidized ships are required to run on designated routes with American crews. American sailors require American wages and standards of living. If they cannot get them at sea, they will stay ashore to get them. Our Government required that our operators use American sailors and to pay that portion of the wages and labor costs which equals those of his foreign competitor with our operating differential subsidy making up the difference.

In other words, our American operator gets his ship at the price that his foreign competitor pays for the foreign-built ship and our American operator hires an American crew at the same rate that a Danish competitor might hire his. From that point on, the American operator is on his own and must compete for what he gets.

Without the participation of our Government in our shipping industry, American operators would be run off the sea by their low-cost foreign competitors. With that participation our operators stay in business and we preserve in healthy condition two industries essential to our security and trade. In every recent war the American-flag merchant marine has been an essential arm of our Defense Establishment and has contributed equally to the preservation of our freedom, and, incidentally, to the freedom of the rest of the free world, including that part in which we find our Danish critics.

The article to which I refer which appeared in the Journal of Commerce of Friday, January 24, 1958, reads as follows:

DANES SCORE UNITED STATES SHIP SUBSIDY

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK.—Danish shipowners will tell the United States Government they resent the idea of new subsidies to American shipping as outlined by President Eisenhower in his budget message.

The Merchant Shipping Press Office said Danish shipowners asked the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Commerce to convey their views to the United States. The shipowners consider it dangerous to Danish shipping if Congress grants the President's request.

"These giant subsidies will enable American shipowners to give uneven competition, on an increasing scale, to shipowners in other countries who operate on their own," the shipowners said. "And * * * (this will be) detrimental to the ability of Danish shipping to earn dollars for the Danish society."

Aid to Dependent Children for Educational Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal assistance under the act to certain dependent children who are over the age of 18, just as long as they are attending school.

Title IV of the Social Security Act deals with grants by the Federal Government to the States for aid to dependent children. The purpose of this program is to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes, or in the homes of relatives, by enabling each State to furnish financial assistance to needy children in order to help maintain family life and to afford them parental care.

According to this program, the State submits its plan for aid to dependent children. If the State program meets the specifications listed in title IV of the Social Security Act, then the Federal Government provides an amount up to certain prescribed limitations, and the State contributes the balance.

When the Social Security Act was originally enacted in 1935, a dependent child under this program was defined as a child under the age of 16. Under Public Law 880, adopted by the 84th Congress in 1956, the age maximum for dependent children was raised to 18. Thus, when such dependent child becomes 18 years of age, the Federal Government withdraws its share of the aid, regardless of the child's circumstances or conditions. Of course, the individual State may choose to retain the child on its aid rolls, and many do so.

I believe that this is a shortsighted step, certainly in such instances where a child desires to continue his education but is prevented from doing so because upon reaching his 18th birthday he finds that this assistance has been stopped. In 1954, the income-tax law was amended to provide that so long as a child, regardless of age, was a student and the parent furnished half of his support he could be counted as dependent entitled to an exemption.

Why not apply the same logic to dependent children who need aid? Why not give such children an opportunity to acquire an education? We talk about the shortage of scientists and engineers; we hear a great deal about the shortage of teachers. We seek means to eliminate these shortages at great costs. Yet, here we have needy children who desire to continue their education, but because of a quirk in the law which says that upon reaching their 18th birthday they cannot be aided we stand to lose future scientists and engineers and teachers.

For this reason, I am introducing my amendment to the Social Security Act to strike out the age limit in this program and to continue its aid to dependent children, even if they are over the age of 18, so long as they continue their education. This is a reasonable step. It is one from which the country will gain much more in the long run than the current outlay of funds to maintain this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to give this matter early consideration and to make the necessary change in the Social Security Act. This is a correction of the law which everyone can readily understand and which deserves general support.

Remarks by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at National Press Club Luncheon, Thursday, February 6, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

It is always an honor and a pleasure to appear before this group. I see many familiar faces, many old friends. I have seen enough of the world to know that the American press is the fairest and most objective press on earth. You report the facts—honestly, responsibly. You do a fine job and I am glad to say that our relationship has always been frank and most pleasant.

This opportunity to meet you on your home grounds is a privilege all its own—and a challenge, too. Previous experience has taught me that a guest at your board is treated with objectivity only slightly tinged with mercy when the question-and-answer period arrives.

One thing especially appeals to me, however. At these Press Club luncheons a speaker is granted the opportunity to make his statement in full before he is called upon to square away for the questions. I therefore approach this discussion with some assurance that I will get through to the end and not be interrupted in midsentence—I like the ground rules here.

I am not going to open my remarks here today with a long list of what has been done for farmers in recent years, or with impressively documented proof of the Nation's prosperity.

We all know that individual farmers, like individual newsmen, may be economic islands in a sea of national prosperity. We know, too, that in spite of any recital of progress made in meeting agricultural problems we must face up to a few unpleasant facts about the farmers' situation today.

It is a fact that in the past 7 years realized gross farm income has gone up $2.7 billion—but farm costs of operation have gone up $3.7 billion.

It is a fact that farmers are not responding to the old prosperity pills the Government has been giving them and it is high time we made further changes in the prescription.

It is a fact that the old price-support program, written to cope with a depression, changed to help fight a war, and revised again in an effort to meet the needs of peace, has been an expensive effort but it has not solved farmers' problems.

It is a fact that many of those operating very small farms have found that they must increase the size of their units or supplement their incomes from other sources.

It is a fact that, despite heroic efforts in moving our surplus farm commodities, we still hold disturbing quantities of price-depressing surplus stocks.

It is a fact that since 1950 the cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income has totaled close to $10 billion. As I have often said before, this would have been money well spent if it had solved the problem. But it has not.

These are some of the unpleasant facts our farmers are facing today. And if we are going to help them in making necessary adjustments we must face these facts too.

Let me assure you that I shall continue to do everything in my power that is economically sound and fair to improve the conditions of our farmers.

This is no time to point the political finger of blame. It is a time for action. Farmers have had about all the political panaceas they can stand. What farmers really want is more freedom.

If the voices of 22 million farm people in America could be crystallized into one voice, it would, I feel sure, demand Four Freedoms for Farmers.

That voice would say:

Give us more freedom to plant—so that we can run our farms efficiently.

Give us more freedom to market—so that we can increase our incomes.

Give us more freedom to meet our competition—so that we can expand our markets.

Give us more freedom from government interference—so that we may again be independent and self-reliant.

This Nation will never reach its full strength until our farmers have more freedom to plant, to market, to compete and to make their own decisions.

Farmers want government at their side, not on their backs.

One of the largest national farm magazines has just released the results of a nation-wide poll of farm people who were invited to express their opinions on whether farmers needed more or fewer government programs. In that poll, over 50 percent said that the government "should get clear out of farming." Another 11 percent said farmers needed less government help than they now have, and 12 percent wanted help "about the same as now." Only 27 percent wanted more government programs.

The mail received at the Department of Agriculture indicates much the same sentiment. My personal mail is now running about 8 to 1 in support of the farm program changes proposed by the President last month. I might say that while I find the "eights" encouraging, some of the "ones" are dandies.

Most of these unfavorable letters are sincere expressions from farmers who see no solution to their problems except bigger government checks. A few give evidence that a ditto machine has been used overtime.

In the main, however, I am impressed with the clear thinking our farmers are demonstrating.

This is a time of adjustment for agriculture. Most farmers know that. Since early 1951 when farm prices started to fall even in the midst of the Korean war, farmers have been groping for a satisfactory adjustment to three basic conditions.

First, they have been trying to adjust to peacetime markets. Peacetime demands are smaller than wartime demands. We saw that in foreign markets especially back in 1952–53 when our agricultural exports dropped by nearly one-third in one year's time.

Second, they have been trying to adjust to the technological revolution in agriculture. In the past decade, output per man-hour of farm work has gone up more than 50 percent.

Third, they have been trying to adjust to ever-changing legislative restrictions. Outdated farm laws, laws designed to meet problems long past, were carried forward into a new era.

Farmers, I repeat, have been striving to adjust to these three conditions. Our goal is to help them make the adjustment in the most efficient and satisfactory way possible. That is important not only to farmers but to every person in this room; yes, to every person in this land.

I am convinced that the old road for agriculture, the road of the economic straightjacket and the political blind alley, can only bring results that are distasteful to real farm people.

Economic and technological progress cannot be stopped with legislative blockades. The day will no doubt come when the rapid growth of our economy and population will call for all available farm production. When that day comes, our farmers must be free and strong and ready.

Meanwhile, neither the vigor of farm families nor the march of modern science should be impeded. That is why we have been building markets, not curtailing them. That is why we have helped producers promote and sell farm commodities. That is why appropriations for agricultural research have been doubled since 1953, with special emphasis on market expansion and new uses for farm commodities. That is why we've been trying to move toward more freedom for farmers.

In the past 5 years we have had some significant gains—gains even during the transition from war to peace—an adjustment always difficult for agriculture.

Here are some of the gains:

Income per person on farms last year—including income from all sources—was up 4 percent over 1953. It was the second highest income per person on record. It was exceeded only in 1951.

The level of living on farms is higher today than ever before.

Productivity per man-hour of farm work is up 14 percent over 1953.

Farm exports in fiscal 1957 set a new record of $4.7 billion—68 percent higher than in fiscal 1953.

The abundant production of American farms has been used to meet the needs of hungry people at home and abroad.

The downtrend in prices has been stopped. Prices received by farmers in January were 4 percent above a year ago and 10 percent above 2 years ago.

The build-up of surpluses has been reversed. Government investment in surplus farm products owned and under loan has dropped about one-sixth in the past year and a half.

Those are some of the gains. Our critics are strangely silent about them, but they are there. This is not the time, however, for resting on past laurels. We must continue to push forward, and the blueprint for this further forward push is the new farm food and fiber program presented to Congress last month by the President of the United States.

The adoption of this program will mean progress in three general areas:

First. The program will develop bigger markets. We have asked that the surplus disposal program be extended and expanded and that research into new uses for farm products be increased.

We need to drive hard for further expansion of markets. There are no satisfactory substitutes for markets and a Government warehouse is not a market. Forty percent of our record agricultural exports in fiscal 1957 moved under Government programs. The biggest factor in these programs was the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or Public Law 480. As you know, this law provides for movement of surplus farm commodities through sales for foreign currencies, barter, donation, and other means. We must push to the limit sales through commercial markets.

Three-fourths of the surplus farm product disposals by CCC in the past fiscal year were made through export channels. More than 60 percent of all our grain exports moved under Government programs.

I wish I could help you visualize how our exports are helping the Free World meet the challenge of communism by raising living standards abroad—building good will—laying the ground work for future markets.

We also need increased agricultural research for market expansion. Only about 7 percent of the products of our total farm acreage now go into industrial outlets. Surely we can do better than this. Research can develop new uses and new markets—and there are few things wrong with commercial agriculture that new and expanded markets won't cure.

Second: The recommended program will allow more freedom for farmers. We are seeking revision of the acreage control and price-support programs to permit farmers more freedom to plan and to widen markets.

The program changes proposed by the President would give farmers more freedom to plan by increasing acreage allotments. Some of these allotments have become so small as to cripple efficiency. Do you know that seven out of nine cotton allotments are less than 15 acres—and that the average burley tobacco allotment is 1 acre?

The program we have proposed would make price supports more realistic by widening the range of supports. The present range of 75 to 90 percent of parity on the basic crops and dairy products does not permit sufficient market growth. These commodities are being priced out of potential markets. Increased allotments and a wider range of price support logically go together.

The program would eliminate the so-called escalator clauses.

These are formulas which provide that the level of price support shall rise as the surpluses decline. So long as this basic law is unchanged farm people can expect to be kept continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

Farmers do not want that. Nor do other taxpayers want it, and remember it is taxpayers who get the bill for the heavy charges of storing surplus commodities, and farmers are taxpayers, too.

To melt down one economic iceberg just to make room for another is foolhardy. It runs counter to the better judgment of almost every thinking person.

Third: We must help the forgotten segment of agriculture—those people on small, low-income farms. We have urged that the rural-development program, which was started in 1955 and is now operating in 30 States, should be given increased emphasis.

The program changes recommended look to the needs of small farmers who have been passed over all too long. More than half our farms—the small farms—produce only 9 percent of farm products marketed. There is a crying need for an expansion of industry and education in underdeveloped areas—for new opportunities that will help rural people improve their level of living.

The greatest resource this country possesses is its people—especially our youth.

I'd like to mention right here another important product of the farm that goes largely unnoticed.

Approximately one-half of the rural boys and girls, reared and educated at the expense of farm families, will spend their productive years off the farms. They will move into positions of leadership and service in the cities. And were it not for this annual transfusion of new blood our cities would be sorely crippled. This is a real contribution—substantial in size and important in character—which farmers and rural people make to the Nation as a whole. No development in agricultural policy in recent years, I believe, holds greater long-term importance for our rural youth than the Rural Development Program.

We must move forward by adopting the President's recommendations, so we can consolidate and add to the progress that has been made these past few years.

Bigger markets—more freedom for farmers—special help for the small low-income farms—these are some of the steps which would be taken under the Farm Food and Fiber Act of 1958 to help farmers make the adjustments they must make. We feel certain they are sound, effective and reasonable, and they will work to provide the freedoms farmers want: Freedom to plant, freedom to market, freedom to meet competition, freedom from Government interference.

Unfortunately, however, the progress toward enactment of this needed legislative program is being impeded by an unbelievable accumulation of untruths.

Gathered here today is the world's greatest aggregation of information specialists. You are successful defenders, judges, and disseminators of truth. No one knows better than you the difference between fact and fiction—between truth and untruth. That's a basic prerequisite for a cub reporter as well as a bureau chief.

This is one of the reasons I was pleased to be able to accept your invitation today. I can think of no better way to serve the farmers of this Nation at this moment than to expose a few of the vicious untruths which have been plaguing agriculture. It is time to separate the fact from the fiction.

Fiction No. 1: That the Secretary of Agriculture is trying to scrap all price supports. This is untrue. The fact is, and I want to make myself perfectly clear, we have never proposed—and we do not now propose—that we should scrap price supports.

There is nothing wrong with the idea of providing more orderly marketing and much needed stability to agriculture through a sound and realistic storage and loan price-support program. What is wrong today—and what has been wrong for several years—is the attempt to supply price support and acreage control by rigid formula—to fix prices and acreage allotments by Government mandate. We have tried that now for many years. Instead of helping agriculture it has made the farmers' position increasingly insecure. The farms and ranches of America cannot be run from a desk in Washington, D. C.

Fiction No. 2: That the higher farm incomes in the past were due to rigid price supports. This is untrue. The fact is that it was war—the insatiable demands of war and wartime inflation—and not price supports—that forced prices up. Farmers sold all they produced at well above support levels. In fact, their prices would have been higher yet had it not been for Government-imposed price ceilings.

Fiction No. 3: That high rigid price supports can hold up farm income even though

surpluses accumulate. This is untrue and the fact is that there was just 1 year between 1947 and 1955 that farm income did not decline. In all these years until mid-1955, high rigid price supports were in effect. Our present farm problem developed under such price supports. If high rigid price supports were the answer, we would have no problem.

Fiction No. 4: That the old support program helps the small farmer. It does not. The fact is that more than half of our farms market only 9 percent of agricultural production. Obviously most of the Government dollars are routed in the direction of the bigger producers.

Fiction No. 5: That most farm prices and incomes today are Government supported and on an artificial basis. This is false. The truth is that most farm products are being sold competitively and on free markets.

Only 19 crops, plus dairy products are being supported—out of 250 commodities that farmers produce.

More than four-fifths, 82.2 percent, of our costs for price stabilization in fiscal 1956 and 1957 were for four commodities. Wheat and cotton alone accounted for more than 48 percent of the total cost of our price stabilization programs.

Fiction No. 6: That agricultural production can be successfully controlled by Government action. It cannot.

The fact is that since 1940, the per acre yield of corn has risen 56 percent—wheat 40 percent—cotton 67 percent. Last year's yields of all major crops averaged 27 percent above the 1947–1949 level. To control crops effectively so as to maintain price at 90 percent of parity would mean setting allotments impossibly low. Congress would never vote such controls. No Secretary of Agriculture could effectively enforce them. And American farmers just wouldn't stand for such regimentation.

Fiction No. 7: That farm programs of this administration are driving people off the farms and undermining the family farm. This is not only false—it's ridiculous. The family farm has been, is now and always will be the backbone of American agriculture—operated by the most efficient farmers in all the world.

The size of the family farm is changing, but fortunately for America, there is no weakening of its moral or economic foundations. Today, some 96 percent of our agricultural units are family farms—the same percentage as 30 years ago. And the family farm of today—like the family farm of yesterday and tomorrow—simply means a farm on which most of the labor, capital and management are supplied by the farmer and his family.

The farm part of our population has been declining for many years. But the truth is that families were leaving farms and shifting to nonfarm jobs more rapidly just before I came to Washington than ever before or since.

There are some who would like to see the tales of fiction I have mentioned on the national best seller list. But I am sure the vigilant, objective American press will never allow this to happen.

I sincerely believe that, in spite of these obstacles, we are making marked progress in helping farmers make necessary adjustments. I want to emphasize, however, that no one is more concerned than I about the cost-price squeeze which still confronts agriculture.

From 1939 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers more than doubled. Since then, this index has risen 3 percent. But the damage was already done. These higher prices—higher costs—have hardened into the farm-cost structure.

I have always believed in good farm prices, good wages, and just profits. I also believe that the three go together; that when any of these gets out of line, it adversely affects the others. There is not any question that farm prices today are out of line with profits and wages.

It is not for me to say what labor or industry should do, but as a spokesman for agriculture, I will say that I am deeply disturbed by any action which adds 1 penny to the production costs of farmers at this time.

Let me say again how much I appreciate the privilege of being here with you. I am deeply impressed with the efficient job you people of the press, radio, and television corps are doing. Your work is vital, because after all, the best tool for solving our farm problems is an informed public. I believe that with all my heart.

We all want an agriculture that is dynamic, forward-looking, prosperous, and free—where there is continuing opportunity to live on the land—and live well.

We in the Department want to help, but we all know that Government cannot assume and solve all our farm problems.

Farms have to be run, decisions have to be made, and responsibilities have to be borne, by the families on the farms. There are many ways in which Government can help to promote stability without limiting opportunity.

May God in his infinite wisdom grant us the ability to meet these great challenges of our time. May we all recognize the basic truth that freedom and responsibility are inseparable.

Mr. Chairman, it was a pleasure to have been heard—without interruption. Thank you, and thanks to the membership of this wonderful group.

Our Independence—Is It Not in Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, our very able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable WINT SMITH, of Kansas, on Saturday morning, February 1, here in Washington before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., delivered an address which is not only helpful, but a warning to every citizen who believes in our form of government, values his personal liberty.

While our colleague is one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House, he seldom speaks from the well of the House, and one seeking information from him as to his record hits a very dry well.

Few of our colleagues know that WINT SMITH has a long record of law enforcement in Kansas, that he was appointed by the governor of that great State to head a special detail which quickly ran down bank robbers who were terrorizing the Midwest in the late twenties and early thirties.

He carries combat wounds received in both world wars, one of which came in hand-to-hand bayonet fighting in World War I. Three Purple Hearts are among his decorations. Immediately after cessation of hostilities in World War II, he was given charge of the prisoner-of-war camp in Lambach, Austria; later, the one in New Ulm, Germany.

He has rendered distinguished service from the first day he came here.

His timely warning, to which reference was made, reads as follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE WINT SMITH, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE 32D WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, INC., FEBRUARY 1, 1958

Just 168 years ago today—February 1, 1790—the first session of the United States Supreme Court was held in New York City. Up until some 15 years ago the Supreme Court was held in the highest respect by the citizens of this country.

There probably were some convulsions among the people beginning in the 1850's over the slavery question, but these harsh feelings and criticisms subsided and the Court was again in favor, until a president, for his own selfish motives, in order to carry out his theories of an all paternalistic Federal Government, sought to pack the Supreme Court with Justices who were in sympathy with his views. This packing scheme failed because the Congress refused to go along, but, unfortunately, through the passage of time and death, new members were appointed to the Court who were proclaimed to be in sympathy with the "mores of the times" rather than their knowledge of the law or judicial experience. These New Deal appointments were garbed in the dignity of black robes. They held the scales of justice on high for all to see, but apparently their ears were not closed to the siren music and the ensnaring voices of the false, pink, intellectual liberals, whose theme song always started and ended with the heroics of international socialism.

During this revolutionary period of the Supreme Court's history great changes were made. The Court upheld collective bargaining for unions, a cheap dollar, minimum wages, shorter work hours, social security, and control of farmers' crops if tied onto soil conservation. Many of these measures, many people felt, did great violence to our original concepts of the Federal Constitution. Many critics of these decisions frankly admitted, however, that new pressures, new problems, and new men, gave impetus to these decisions.

Those who read history objectively and try to understand its meaning, generally, will agree that just a few centuries ago the king with his shining sword and the holders of the cross were allies. They defended each other—one lived on taxes, the other on alms. The kings made the laws and the high men of the church made the creeds and dogmas.

There has been a growing tendency in the past few years among many strong groups that the executive department must become stronger and all dominant in our Government.

The Executive no longer needs to use the sword or the fist. Nine willful men in black robes can be the chief adjunct of the Executive and his policies, because, never forget, the Executive names these men to this highest Court.

It is not a pleasant duty to come before this patriotic conference, made up of patriots from throughout the breadth of this land, and speak—to some it may seem disrespectful of the United States Supreme Court. I do not speak disrespectfully of the Court, but point out some very obvious failures of individual members.

But, I am reminded that in Genesis, 37th chapter, 5th verse, we find these words: "And Joseph dreamed a dream and he told it to his brothers and they hated him yet the more." And I also know full well that Joseph ended up in Egypt as a slave, and I also know that conditions in Egypt today are somewhat in the shadow of the Middle East doctrine.

I believe it to be my duty to point out the dangers and not be carried away or to glorify the social theories of the social planners, the

sociological experts, the blueprint society boys, even though the above theories are held valid in some of the opinions of the United States Supreme Court.

I believe I have not only a right but a duty to question the wisdom of the Supreme Court, citing sociological treatises of Gunnar Myrdal and Theodore Brameld in the recent school-segregation case. Many know that these two individuals are not only avowed Socialists, but could easily be classed as "pinkish" leftists.

I believe the citizens of this Republic should be warned as to the direction the Warren Court seems to be traveling. We had better be talking and concerned about the direction of travel today, rather than wring our hands and cry out tomorrow that another nail has been driven into the coffin of the Constitution.

Public opinion was keenly aroused, beginning with the Korean war, in regards to the dangers of communism in the United States. Loyalty and security laws were strengthened. Billions of tax dollars were appropriated under the theory United States tax dollars scattered around the world will stop Russian communism. The late patriot, Senator Joseph McCarthy, was also instrumental in pointing out the dangers of the Communist conspiracy infiltrating our Government.

The people's resistance to communism was developed and Congress became more fully aware of the necessity for more adequate laws to deal with international communism. The people—the Congress—through its various committees reacted patriotically to this communistic menace.

Communists were exposed both in and out of Government. Communists were sent to jail and prison. But during the past year our Supreme Court, disregarding their own previous views and judicial precedent, seem to, by these decisions, throw away and destroy all legal barriers that had been erected to protect the Government, the States, and the people from the subversion and infiltration of avowed Communists.

Time will not permit me to go fully into—or mention—the cases that have been decided by the Warren Court in favor of the Communists. But it can be safely said without fear of contradiction that on every decision day of the Court since last June some Communist has been turned loose, his sentence nullified or sentence lightened.

In other words, since June the decisions of the Warren Court seem bent on rescuing some Communist Party members from punishment.

The Warren Court seems to declare that its basic reason for holding anticommunism laws unconstitutional is that the individual must be protected from his own Government, even though this individual would destroy our own Constitution in favor of a foreign ideology.

This seems to be what Khrushchev was talking about when he described the cult of the individual and accused the dead Stalin as being the exponent of individualism.

Several members of the present Court seem to be lost in a fog of unrealities. These Justices—and they have many adherents—seem to regard communism as no danger to the individual. Some point out that if communism presents any real danger it is to the established governments of nations, and not to the people.

This is simply not true. It shows how far from the true nature of communism they can get.

Europe has had many wars for the past centuries. The Germans and French have long been bitter foes. The Alsace-Lorraine question is very familiar to all of us. It changed hands three times—the government was changed—but the individual and property were protected. The official language might be changed in Alsace-Lorraine, and a new flag might fly overhead, but through these changes in government the citizen of this country was not deprived of his house, his garden, or his land, his religion, or his God.

The Communists' basic theory is not to wage war on nations and their governments. The Communists' ultimate objective is the abolishment of private property on a worldwide basis. Karl Marx wrote in his manifesto, basic objective "abolition of private property." This means your private property—not just your neighbors.

These Communists also state in their books and pamphlets "The middle-class owner of property must be swept out of the way * * * and made impossible." It is self-evident the present rulers of international communism adopt this theory—they wage war on you and me—but the men in black robes on the Supreme Court don't know this.

These Communists would deprive us of all property rights, all religious blessings, and all freedoms.

International communism doesn't wage war and oppress the Polish or Hungarian Governments. They wage war against individuals to deprive them of basic human freedoms.

That is where the Supreme Court is in fatal error. Some Justices even say on street corners—and on the high mountain peaks of Asia—"The United States Government is in no danger from communism." But these same Justices seem to forget what communism does to individuals when communism gains control.

Most people have always believed that the Government exists to protect the well-being of the whole society. It seems a bit strange and unrealistic for our Supreme Court now to say that there is no present danger from communism—when the record shows that the United States Federal Government has spent 40 billion tax dollars to stop communism from spreading throughout the world.

And again we wonder at these words in a Supreme Court edict a few years ago, "It—communism—is a clear and present danger."

The average American citizen is fully aware—notwithstanding the recent decisions of the Warren Court—that he, under communism will have only two alternatives, either a number in a slave camp, or just a corpse, and that this same average American believes it is just as much a duty of the Supreme Court to protect his basic rights as an American citizen as it is to write decisions favoring the theoretical rights of known Communists bent upon the destruction of the United States.

Many Americans are deeply concerned by the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. The mail to Congressmen from people in all walks of life bitterly resent these recent decisions.

Too many people—including a lot of lawyers and students of the Constitution—do not remember the exact phrasing of the Constitution in regard to the creation of the Supreme Court and its power. The creators of the Constitution put restrictions and limitations on this Court. They did not intend for it to be supreme. The Constitution says—"The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact * * * with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." No clearer language was ever written.

Congress can divide up the judicial power as it sees fit. This Supreme Court has no right to change the Constitution by even a single word, either by implication, interpretation or pure subterfuge. For the Court to attempt to usurp any unconstitutional power should be resisted by all citizens. The Court has no right to commit an illegal act just because they wear the black judicial robes.

There is no easier way for the Constitution to be destroyed than by the termite decisions of a bad Court. This danger is ever present because when a President, Senator, or Representative goes bad he can be gotten rid of at the next election. But members of the Supreme Court are appointed for life and hence not subjected to the checks on their conduct as the other two branches of Government.

It is interesting to note that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were adopted for the sole purpose of protecting the citizen from his Government.

It would be a tragedy to our system of government under a written Constitution if men in black robes can destroy the purposes of the first 10 amendments.

Most of these Warren Court decisions simply add emphasis to the power of those who believe in compulsory civil rights with bayonets at the backs, internationalism and pro-Communist policies, foreign aid to Communist satellite countries, and unrestricted immigration.

This resentment doesn't come from the so-called laymen. Listen to what Charles A. Walsh, a foremost ex-judge in Kansas has to say:

"The Court has departed from its customary function, and has become revolutionary. It has abandoned the accepted norms of constitutional interpretation and has ventured into political and social areas beyond its competence. It has become the most important oracle of Fabien Socialism in our midst. It has turned upside down the legal concepts of constitutional law. It has upset the balance between the Congress and the Executive. It has upset the balance between the States and Federal Government. It has destroyed our defense against subversives. It has, in effect, rewritten the Constitution of the United States. Its absurd rulings in reference to desegregation have created tensions and provoked riots. All this has come about by overruling previous decisions of the Supreme Court itself, and the decisions of the highest courts of many of the States. Racial bigotry is not abated by informing the bigot that his bigotry is unconstitutional. A bayonet is hardly a proper instrument to inspire racial cooperation and mutual respect among Negroes and whites. An armed soldier is not a proper classroom personage."

Another judge had something to say about these recent decisions of the Warren Court. Justice M. T. Phelps of the Arizona Supreme Court recently said:

"I say to you in all candor, it is my honest conviction that it is the design and purpose of the Court (the Supreme Court of the United States) to usurp the policymaking powers of the Nation. By its own unconstitutional pronouncements it would create an all-powerful, centralized Government in Washington and subsequent destruction of every vestige of States' rights expressly and clearly reserved to the States under the 10th amendment of the Constitution.

"I know there are those here today who heartily disagree with what I have said. In your minds you place me as an old fogey and a reactionary—that such a thing can't happen here.

"Well, it is happening here right now under our noses and we refuse to recognize it."

Chief Justice Stone said before the American Bar Association in 1928 when speaking about the Supreme Court being criticized:

"Those [Members of the Court] who bear its responsibilities now and in the future will do well * * * to recall that in the course of its long history the only wounds from which it has suffered have been those which in the words of Justice Charles Evans Hughes were self-inflicted."

A great many Americans feel that they too have suffered wounds and have been

betrayed by this Warren Court in regard to these soft decisions on communism.

Since the ratification of the Constitution in 1787 most lawyers have always been in agreement, "Only Congress can pass a law that is the 'law of the land,'" but the present Warren Court has arrogated to itself this right to make laws by judicial decree.

It has always been assumed that the President and Congress made the basic policies in all matters concerning the welfare of the people of the United States. Hence, these policymaking decisions in regard to the control of communism by the Warren Court came as quite a shock to many people. It was a great shock because most thinking Americans have believed for a long time that their heavy tax load, with American soldiers stationed in 69 countries of the world, 30,000 dead American soldiers in Korea, the continued draft of their own sons and relatives, was all due solely to the dangers of worldwide communism.

Not only does the rank and file American know what communism means but students of history—both amateur and professional—realize the methods used by the Communists and intellectual fellow travelers has always been the Trojan horse approach. Everyone seems to know of this except the black-robed men on the Warren Court.

There is no other conclusion that can be reached except that this Warren Court has now thrown its protective cloak around the fellow travelers and Communists. The Court is simply blind to the reality of our times.

These decisions grant an absolute immunity and aid to known Communists and fellow travelers. They place individual Communist rights above national security.

Very few people seem to realize that these June decisions of the Warren Court wiped out not only Federal legislation but State legislation. And again the field of States rights was invaded not by the President, not by the Congress, but by the Court.

When you wipe out another States-rights concept that States can't pass their own sedition laws, you just put one more nail in the coffin they are constructing to destroy all States rights.

Jefferson once said, "There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, unalarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

We should also remember that ancient Rome existed for 800 years under the classic maxim that the safety of the nation was the supreme law. There are some who seem to think that the Warren Court's attitude toward communism can best be summed up by saying, it seems more concerned about protecting the big bad wolf of communism than of Little Red Riding-hood.

Perhaps some will doubt the propriety of a Member of Congress pointing out some of the anticipated effects of these decisions. Justice Clark, a member of this Supreme Court in a dissenting opinion in the Watkins case put it this way, "The Court has become the grand inquisitor and supervisor of Congressional investigations."

But why has the Court suddenly become so enamored with its position and why seek so much power? The answer to this question is not hard to find if one only remembers, reads, listens, and looks at the mores of the times. The attitude of the Court and its decisions is nothing more nor less than the natural product of 20 years of New Deal-Fair Deal, and now modern Republicanism concepts.

There is a famous motto cut in the marble canopy in letters 3 feet high above the entrance of the Supreme Court Building, it reads: "Equal Justice Under Law."

The general American public wants the Supreme Court to follow this motto and forget the theory that they should write sociological decisions to achieve their false ideas of social justice for enemies of this Republic.

This Warren Court seemingly is determined to build up the doctrine that the idea of a limited government must give way to the ideal of totalitarianism.

Congress still has the power to change this direction of travel, but it cannot do it by sitting idly by and letting these decisions go unnoticed. Congress has still not been completely captured by the leftwingers and the internationalists.

Congress still controls the purse strings and can create such inferior courts as it deems advisable, and designate the duties and procedures of these courts.

Congress has always had—and still has—the power to curb a bad court because the Congress gets its power from the people and the courts get theirs from the Congress.

It is my most fervent hope that the Members of this patriotic Congress, as they think about this topic Tyranny in Black Robes will remember as you have on many other subjects these simple words: "The past is our heritage and the future our responsibility."

Benjamin F. Fairless Receives Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C., on January 31, at which Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON presented the 1957 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications—highest tribute of the business press—to Benjamin F. Fairless, longtime head of United States Steel and now president of American Iron and Steel Institute, for distinguished service to the progress of Government and industry through unparalleled business leadership. In keeping with Silver Quill tradition, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who was last year's recipient, served as chairman of the selection committee which unanimously named Mr. Fairless to receive the 1957 award.

The excerpts follow:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUSSELL C. JAENKE, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, PENTON PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

It is always our hope that the state-of-the-Nation dinner may serve as a forecast of good things to come. At our head table there are leaders from government and industry who have graciously consented to briefly answer one specific question related to our future security. All have agreed to operate under a tight 3-minute rule.

We are also privileged by the presence of a group of distinguished journalists. They have likewise graciously agreed to ask the questions which are to be answered. I have the high honor of introducing this question-and-answer sequence which is themed "What Price Security?"

Inquiry by Roscoe Drummond, Washington columnist, New York Herald Tribune: Secretary Seaton, I believe all of us agree that supplies of water and electric power are indispensable to national security. At the same time, I believe all of us realize that, within recent memory, in various parts of the United States, there have been shortages of both and that the demands for both are continuing to grow at a terrific rate. Now, this is my question: Can you tell us what is being done to assure that we shall have plenty of water and power to meet all of our future needs?

Response by Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior: That is a very good question—maybe I better say a series of questions. The question of whether America will have just enough plain, ordinary water, in the next 25 years, could quite likely be the No. 1 domestic problem of this country. And, of course, whenever you talk about water you're talking about its corollary, which is electric power.

Now, I think that the Government of the United States is thoroughly aware of the twin problems. We recognize the fact that, by 1980 at the latest, the combined electrical industries of America—private, public, and Federal—will have to expend somewhere in the magnitude of hundreds of billions of dollars, in order to satisfy the electrical needs of the country. Translating that another way, it means that we shall have to triple the kilowatt production of America, at least by 1980, if not by 1975.

When you talk about water you have to realize that, in 1957, the industrial requirements for water equaled the agricultural requirements for water and that's the first time, in our history, that that has happened. We expect that, by no later than 1980, two-thirds of all the water requirements of the country will be soaked up by industrial appetite. In the last 4 years, the Government of the United States has increased the reservoir capacity of water in the United States by some millions of acre-feet. We realize that that is only a start on the problem. I should like to hazard the guess tonight that the real and eventual answer to it is the successful solution of the problem of making saline and brackish water into potable water—in other words, taking the waters of the oceans and taking the brackish waters of the Middle West, the West, and some places in the East, and converting them so that, not only industry, but also human beings can use it.

That latter involves a very fascinating story. I think that scientists who are versed in the field will all admit that the world has come further in the direction of solving that problem, since 1953, than it has in the previous 150 years of human existence. We now have laboratory experiments in the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior that indicate that we can convert sea water to human use for a cost of about 60 cents a thousand gallons. We are testing that out this next year in two pilot plants. If that is successful, we will have solved at least two-thirds of the problem of conversion, in the ratio of economical cost to human and to industrial use.

When we were in school, Roscoe, you and I, we were taught and we worried about the fact that it took 67,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of steel. Today, when you think in terms of the rayon industry, the synthetics in clothing and synthetic rubber, you are talking in terms of water used per ton that makes the 67,000 tons for steel look like something that came out of elementary school, which indeed it did.

I don't think there's any question but what the Government of the United States is on top of the job and I don't think there's any question but what the nations of the free world are all conversant with the problem and are all working together. And I

should hazard the guess that, in the next 15 or 25 years, we shall have solved this problem of the saline and brackish water reduction. If that should happen, I should like to remind the ladies and gentlemen here tonight that that probably will become one of the greatest revolutions in all the history of industry in the world—from the time when history was first recorded—because you can almost dream forever about it.

If you could make all of Australia fruitful, if you could return the Middle East to the days of Babylon and Carthage before they were destroyed, and if you could make all of the land expanse of the United States and its possessions and Territories fruitful, you would stop a lot of the problems of the world. The people wouldn't be hungry and you could move industry almost where you wanted to.

Today, the limit on the decentralization of industry is not so much the corporate investments that people have but the question whether industry can even have water. And that's perfectly true, if you realize that 1,200 communities in this country had a water shortage last year, and, particularly when you realize that some of our industrial concentrations in the East have run out of water. They can't find it in the streams; they can't find it in the ground. If we don't solve that problem, it doesn't make any difference what industry wants to do or what technology finds out it can do. Then you are concentrated to the areas where water is available.

Inquiry by Ned Brooks, news commentator, Three-Star Extra, NBC: Senator McClellan, throughout the Nation, people are shocked by recent disclosures of unethical practices by certain labor organizations and among certain union officials. From testimony before your select committee; from your own private store of related information—do you feel that such unbridled activities constitute a contributing factor to our present security predicament? In other words, Senator, have we concentrated too much on meeting the demands of labor for its individual worker, but not enough on labor meeting the demands of our economy in its expanding role as world leader?

Response by John L. McClellan of Arkansas, chairman, Senate Select Committee on Labor Activities: I believe you have asked two questions, or at least, you have asked one question in two parts. First, you asked: Do I feel that the improper labor practices revealed by this committee's investigations constitute a contributing factor to our present security predicament?

Well, now, our present security predicament involves many phases and many aspects. My answer, with proper qualifications, is in the affirmative. I do not see and I seriously doubt that such improper practices, as have been revealed, are a direct or, necessarily, a major contributing factor to what you term our security predicament. They could be, and they very likely are, an indirect factor, in that any practice in labor-management relations that tends to pollute the economic stream or to, in any way, weaken our economy would, in my judgment, definitely have some adverse impact upon our national strength and security.

With respect to your second question—I do not necessarily think that we have concentrated too much on meeting the demands of labor for its individual workers, but rather that we have done entirely too little toward the prescribing of standards of conduct and of ethics needed for the protection of the rights of the workingman and of management and of the general public. Also, we have done too little to prevent the exploitation by some criminal and disreputable elements that have infiltrated the labor movement. So far as I know, labor has met the demands of our economy in its expanding role as world leader. We have not experienced, so far as I can tell, any appreciable shortage in the personnel required to meet our production demands.

Inquiry by Robert T. Hartmann, chief, Washington Bureau, Los Angeles Times: Mr. Douglas, when I was a very small boy, I used to ride my bicycle out to Clover Field in Santa Monica to watch some of your first Douglas airplanes being flown. You have just come back, I believe, from watching your Thor intermediate rocket test flown in Cape Canaveral. As a pioneer, both in the air age and the space age, would you give us your views on two very controversial questions of the day. First, do you believe that we should rely on Government to spark our missile program or should the role of private enterprise be increased in the research, as well as the production end? And second, has your company ever been hampered by contracting with the various military services on a competitive basis and is this now slowing up our progress? Do you think that a single centralized Defense Department agency would be more efficient and economical?

Response by Donald W. Douglas, Sr., chairman, Douglas Aircraft Co.: You have touched on a subject very close to my heart. America was built on the foundation of free competitive private enterprise.

I do, indeed, believe that private enterprise should be encouraged in essential research of development and production for national defense. Our strength stems from our industrial, self-supporting enterprises, and not from official oligarchies. Private enterprise and individual initiative—the people, the dreamers and the doers—are the very essence of our resources.

We have the broad base of our entire industrial establishment, with all of its technological skill, management experience, and manufacturing plant capacity to anticipate and fulfill the requirements of our Armed Forces.

Private industry, as exemplified by the Nike and Thor projects, with which I am familiar, has demonstrated its ability to coordinate effectively the skill and resources of many different companies toward a common goal. This technique has given us some of our most important missile systems. Currently, it is being applied to some of the most advanced concepts, such as the Nike-Zeus antimissile system.

Private enterprise, in short, can do the job if it is given timely, clear-cut and firm decisions by the military, with the necessary, but only the necessary, amount of supervision by governmental agencies. Here, I am happy to add, I have been greatly encouraged, in recent weeks and days, by the fact that Congressional climate and signals being called from the Pentagon on matters of defense reflect a refreshing climate of private enterprise philosophy.

This brings me to another part of your question. I do not believe that our company's proper functioning has been hampered by contracting with the military services on an independent, competitive basis. I believe that a certain amount of rivalry between the services is constructive.

It seems to me that the last part of your question concerns the current subject of reorganization of the Defense Department. Personally, I should like to see the Defense Department return to the size and system as it was in the days of Mr. Forrestal, the first Defense Secretary. Then, it was a small policymaking and coordinating agency over the three services. The Army, Navy, and Air Force developed and procured their own weapons under the policy guidance only of the Defense Department.

If you give the existing departments authority to make the proper decisions, in the first place, and have the right men at their heads, many of our troubles will vanish.

A pyramid of committees and agencies is no substitute for men of vision, courage, and ability. We have such men in America. Let us give these men an opportunity to do the job. We've done it before and we can do it again.

Inquiry by Albert Clark, chief, Washington bureau, Wall Street Journal: Senator Knowland, you have recently introduced legislation to amend existing labor laws for the purpose of providing additional protection for rank-and-file union members. Will you elaborate on the provisions of your proposal and how they could assist the Nation in securing its leadership in technology and productivity?

Response by William F. Knowland, of California, Senate minority leader: The workers' bill of rights I have introduced in the Senate provides the following:

1. The election of union officials by secret ballot.

2. A recall provision so that members may replace union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Procedures for approval by a majority of union members on the question of calling or continuing strikes.

4. Registration and public disclosure requirements of union welfare funds.

5. Safeguards for members against unauthorized use of union funds or dues.

6. Protection for members against arbitrary or cohesive actions by union officials.

7. Limitation on trusteeships by national and international unions over local unions to not exceeding 1 year.

8. Penalties for cases involving management collusion with union officials against the interests of the union members and the public.

In my judgment, these provisions will help safeguard basic human rights of union members and give them a representative voice in the management of the affairs to which their salaries are contributed.

Our bill of rights for the working man and woman does not and should not constitute an indictment against all labor officials. Many of these individuals, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interests of their fellow man and the Nation. Unions have played in the past and will assume in the future an important role in the strengthening of our national economy. Unions will continue to grow in membership and importance. They must also grow, I believe, in responsibility to their members and to the American public.

The American way of life had its foundation fixed on maintaining the God-given dignity of man and the noble aspirations of free men in a free society. In order to assure the success of our purpose, we must always insist that with power must go responsibility. This concept cannot help but strengthen our leadership and our productivity.

Inquiry by Leslie E. Carpenter, Washington correspondent, Arkansas Gazette, Houston Post, Tulsa Tribune: Dr. Waterman, in our efforts for scientific supremacy in the space age, are we placing too much emphsis on an all-out numbers game? By that I mean would the national interest be better served if the Federal effort—the spending effort—were directed at quality rather than quantity? I wonder, for example, if an intensified effort to interest high-school students in science would produce more geniuses, or if it would only add to the total number of scientists without enriching the quality? Does it really matter that Russia is graduating a larger number of scientists than we, or is it the quality of a graduate that means the most? And, also, would national security benefit more by providing our scientists already qualified with larger research and development opportunities, rather than placing so great an emphasis on training more new scientists?

Response by Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director, National Science Foundation: Your question brings out essential elements in the

situation. It would certainly be a great mistake to consider this an all-out numbers game. However, many of our boys and girls with high aptitude for science or other professional careers are not developing these talents adequately for this modern age. Thus, from among the top 25 percent of young high-school graduates, only about 6 of every 10 go on to college. It is, of course, true that, by intensified effort, one cannot produce high natural aptitude, but, by intensive training, one can develop such aptitudes to the fullest. Merely to increase the numbers of scientists and engineers will not only fail to solve the problem—it will complicate it.

Our emphasis must be on quality—quality in native ability, quality in training and quality in performance.

Quality in native ability we have in abundance, latent among our youth, from all walks of life. But, we must identify these young people early, give them every encouragement and opportunity to develop their aptitudes to the fullest—whatever these may be—for their own future and that of our society.

Quality in training for these young people we must insist upon. This means superior teaching and superior teachers, together with the equipment and materials they should have.

Quality in performance, in science and technology requires that we push forward the frontiers of science with all the vigor at our command. This means full support, both financial and moral, to our competent basic research scientists and engineers for their needs. This includes, especially, the construction of costly capital installations, such as those required for nuclear physics, astronomy and the exploration of outer space.

These goals are clear. But, above all, we must have the determination to achieve them. This will not be easy. In this, every organization, every citizen, every parent must realize his responsibilities and play an active role.

Inquiry by Marquis W. Childs, Washington correspondent, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Mr. Moss, as you so well know—much has been said, both pro and con, about the adequacy of public information regarding the needs and developments of our Defense Establishment. You have been forceful in your statements about the withholding of news and my question is directed to that vital area of security. How realistic is the price we are forced to pay for a dubious security based on withholding information from the public, which must be partner to any effort to secure our future and the necessary financing? Also, Mr. Moss, is it not damaging to the unity of knowledge and action so essential to adequate preparedness to withhold information—then use it as a scare technique when appropriations are sought from Congress by the military?

Response by JOHN E. MOSS, of California, chairman, House Subcommittee on Government Information: You've correctly identified the article we buy when we withhold facts from the people—dubious security. The truth is, of course, that real security cannot possibly result from our being misinformed, or uninformed. The only result is dangerous ignorance, or worse—complacency.

The key to this question goes to the heart of our democratic process. Our system of self-government requires the people, through their representatives, to make the important policy decisions which guide our Nation's actions. To make such decisions intelligently, the people must know the facts, must be aware of the alternatives and must not be stampeded by misleading or incomplete information.

When the people don't know the truth, they cannot possible make the correct decisions. When that happens, it is only too easy for Government leaders to claim that only those on the inside can deal with the important problems of the day. The result of that situation is clearly spelled out in history—recent history, I might add. Whenever the people lose control over decision making, there are many only too willing to take over and run things.

That's the importance of full and complete information in a democracy, as I see it. Obviously, we pay a price that is too high—a price that destroys the market place—when the vital information needed to live and act intelligently in this modern world is withheld from the people.

Years ago, we used to be able to talk about long-range and short-range effects, but modern technology has compressed both time and effect into terribly short moments. Take your example—raising funds for defense appropriations. In the past years, an uninformed Congress and a complacent people—lulled into dubious security by suppression of facts—could talk economy and slash defense budgets without permanent damage. The next budget, the next Congress could act to restore the situation and the harm would be repaired.

But this is 1958, the era of sputnik and intercontinental missiles with atomic warheads. A wrong decision now could be fatal. We can no longer afford the luxury of mistakes. Our Nation must make its decisions promptly and correctly, because there may be no time tomorrow to recover from today's mistake. Instead, we are being spoon fed a few facts here, a few facts there, each accompanied by a request for money.

The people must know the truth—whether it is good or bad. The people must have the facts, must be told the whole story, to be prepared for the crucial decisions of this day. A leadership that fails to discharge this responsibility to its people—a responsibility to tell the full truth—is committing a tragic blunder that could well destroy everything we believe in.

Inquiry by William McGaffin, Washington correspondent, Chicago Daily News: Secretary Brucker, for hundreds of years, armies have traveled thousands of miles to fight for liberty at home and abroad. Now we are told that ours is a landlocked army; that the American Army has hardly a modicum of mobility with which to meet and master space-age attack. We also hear that any future war is going to be a pushbutton affair. So—Mr. Secretary—what we would like to know from you is: Who's going to guard the pushbuttons?

Response by Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army: I welcome that question. Two years ago, on this same occasion, my question was: "Is the Army obsolete?" Last year, my question was: "Is the Army outmoded in the atomic age?" This year: "Is the Army landlocked?" Well, we're making progress. Or, I might say, by Jupiter, we're holding our ground.

And now about mobility and the integrity of our national defense. I realize that I represent the Army, but it isn't fair for me to forget that there are others in this great national defense team of ours—the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force, along with the Army, with which I am particularly familiar. What a great team it is. And how powerful and mighty that team is, working together. With respect to this matter of the team, your Army is, of course, an indispensable part of it, but, together, it's an indestructible team. And the person who perhaps knows that best tonight is crafty Khrushchev. The deterrent strength that the United States has at this time is great. Without boastfulness, may I say to you that, with over 2½ million dedicated men and women under arms, and with over another million civilians in the services, it is a great force for our country.

Now, with respect to this business that you ask about—mobility—may I be pardoned to answer that just directly. What you mean is, Can we move and get there in a hurry? Yes; in either a global or a limited war. Some think that the most likely is an atomic war with atomic equilibrium. That is not likely any more so than national suicide. So, the Russian effort will undoubtedly be to nibble away country by country by subversion or otherwise in order to take over.

The question comes, Are we ready to demonstrate our mobility to the world? Two examples quickly come to my mind.

We put on an operation a year and a half ago called Operation Firm Link. You know that in Asia, at that time, the Chinese Communists and the Russians had been talking about Uncle Sam as the "paper tiger." You remember that phrase, certainly. Well what happened? It was necessary to demonstrate to the people of the area that we could do something; that we were not just a paper tiger but, at the same time, would not brandish the sword. We had to demonstrate quietly that the United States had the power. So, in the country of Thailand—at Bangkok, to be particular—this exercise called Operation Firm Link was conducted. Inside of a very few days, the Navy had its great power concentrated on Bangkok Harbor; the Air Force had its great planes flying in, the Marines came with the Navy, and our Army sent two battle groups from far-off Japan, by way of the Philippines, and flew them to Thailand. In the vicinity of the Bangkok Airport, the Army parachuted to earth. Then they marched through the city of Bangkok, dissipating forever the words "paper tiger" attached to the United States. The cheering tens of thousands who lined the streets were enough to carry the word around all of that part of the Asiatic world.

Again, quickly, as to operational mobility—over 2 years ago, by plane, we carried a regimental combat team located at Fort Campbell, Ky., and we flew them over to Tokyo. Using those same planes, we picked up a regimental combat team that had been on duty there and brought them back to Fort Bragg, N. C., in 10 short days. And we're going to do better than that.

So, when they talk about the Middle East and are we ready, or when they talk about some other place in the world—and I would not mention names, because that's not perhaps the thing to do—all I can say to good Americans is, here are two examples of what you can expect, if that occurs.

Now, I am mindful of the fact that the Army has a lot of other missions. The Army has the mission of ground defense against air attack. Involved in this is the antimissile missile that Mr. Douglas just spoke about. What a great trust that is at this moment, in addition to all the rest, to develop a weapon which will destroy the incoming missiles going over 10,000 miles an hour before they hit. We're in the midst of that. We've been working 18 months on that development and we're now getting some of it in the hardware state. We're pushing fast. It will be the third generation of the Nike family along with the Nike Ajax and the Nike Hercules—the Nike Zeus. We're very proud to have this air-defense role.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it's not missiles and it isn't the antimissile missile that's the ultimate weapon. Please don't misunderstand it. I listened carefully to the last part of that question. Ours will never be a pushbutton defense. No responsible military man will ever support that, because he knows that, in the last analysis, the ultimate weapon is man himself. It's dedicated young men like these who are up here tonight who will live for their country and fight and die for it if necessary. That's the quality plus that will keep America and the Free World free.

Inquiry by Charles O. Herb, president, Society of Business Magazine Editors: Mr. Brundage, it is recalled that the President, in one of his 1952 speeches, is quoted as saying "The facts must be given to the American people; they must know our aims, the reasons for them, and the cost of attaining them." Therefore, if we are really getting set to engage the Nation in a total venture to assure our security, should the people not feel some concern regarding their ability to pay for the program, within the framework of our existing economic system?

Response by Percival F. Brundage, Director, Bureau of the Budget.—My answer is definitely yes. The people are showing that concern and they are more interested than I think they have been for years that they are getting what they need—the value for what we are spending. The President has already set forth, in the state of the Union the budget and the economic messages—a description of his programs, their purposes and what they will cost.

We must maintain a strong economic system to support the necessary programs—whatever programs are necessary, at home and abroad, which will contribute to our defense and that of the free world and continue to advance our standard of living. These programs take into account our total resources and they are many and varied and are well balanced in their aims and distributions. I am confident that the Congress and the people of the United States will support them.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES RUSSELL C. JAENKE

We come now to another proud moment for the business press—the presentation of its silver quill award. You may be assured that there were numerous candidates of high degree recommended to the selection committee. But—in the ever-challenging area of business statesmanship—there could finally be but one name above all others.

It belongs to one whose deeds are already legend as a leader of industry. His is a rich record of no uncertain proportions and accomplishments. Let it therefore be clearly understood that it is we who are honored—beyond measure—in having the privilege of honoring him.

In truth—ladies and gentlemen—we are doubly honored and twice privileged. To make the quill presentation—we have back with us a man of conviction and action—a man beloved by all of us as a great patriot and good friend—a man who himself received our 1953 award.

Mr. Vice President, the business press is and always will be honored by your presence. We believe your annual return to our rostrum indicates a sincerity of interest and friendship which we intend to cherish and serve to our fullest ability.

We are delighted to have you here again to make the presentation—at this time—to another great American known to you and all of us simply as Ben.

REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1957 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO MR. BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—I have appeared many times in this room but never when the audience was one that had more influence. I have been talking to the man on my right and the man on my left and I learn more about this group, which is represented here, each time I come. But, when I realize that, represented in the Business Publications of America, there are 2,000 publications with a circulation of 40 million, I realize that this is the most powerful audience that has ever gathered in Washington, D. C.—and we are happy to be here with you tonight.

Now, your president said, very appropriately, I think, that this Silver Quill award could not have been made to a man who deserved it more. As a matter of fact, there is only one thing inappropriate about the award and that is that it is 300 ounces of silver rather than gold—because the man we honor tonight is one who has had, as you know, a fabulous career and everything he's touched has turned to gold—almost everything, with one exception—which I will mention in a moment.

When the first song played was about Ohio, I suppose some of you wondered why. This man was born in Pigeon Run, Ohio, and all Ohio is proud of him, as is all of America—because he is the son of a coal miner and became the head of the largest corporation in the United States. He is a man who proved that it can happen in the United Staes of America and his whole life is one that makes us proud of the country we live in and of the American dream which we hope will always be with us. As a matter of fact, I was looking over his background. I have 4 pages here indicating the various organizations of which he is either president or trustee or director—17 major ones, each successful. As I said a moment ago, everything he has touched has turned to gold—except one. I notice that he is a director of the Pittsburgh Pirates. And may I say, Mr. Fairless, if you have any success with the Pittsburgh Pirates, come down to Washington—we need somebody for the Washington Senators.

Now, may I turn to a serious note, before making the presentation. When I was thinking tonight, as you were, about this man and his career and, as I listened to the various questions and the answers which were given to them here, I thought, as you must have thought, of the characteristics of our economy; of our society. And I thought, as you must have thought, that we have many problems today. Many of us, I suppose, might wish that we didn't have the problem of information about Government activities; the problem of an economy that, instead of always running level, goes up and down—although, in the long run, it goes up, as I will point out, in a moment. We perhaps wish that we didn't have the problems between labor and management in various segments of our society. And I think, perhaps, that all of us would recognize the truth of Thomas Jefferson's statement, when he said that there are those who prefer the calm and orderly processes of despotism to the boisterous turmoil of freedom. There are those who do, but there are not many of those of that type in the United States.

We have had problems and we have them today, but as we consider the past 50 years—the span of the working life, I should say, of our honored guest—I think we can realize the dynamism of our economy and the validity of our basic political and economic philosophy. In the industry which he proudly represents—50 years ago—the steelworker worked approximately 80 hours a week for approximately $20 a week. Today, he works one-half as long for 5 times as much, and in that 50 years we have had 3 wars; we have had several recessions and, depending upon whether you call it depression or recession, 2 or 3 depressions. But, overall, as we look at the broad picture, we see that America has progressed, always forward, always upward, with a better standard of living for our people. As we think of that progress, I think we recognize that it is due to a number of factors—to our form of government and the leadership we have had in Government; to our people: also to the leaders of management; the leaders of labor—to those in our economy who, working sometimes in competition with each other and sometimes cooperatively, have together produced the economic might of the United States. Mr. Fairless, of course, is one of those who has been in the forefront of that group.

We heard the song, Around the World in 80 Days. Mr. Fairless went around the world in 50 days and conducted an investigation for the President of the United States in the field of economic assistance to countries abroad.

Secretary Brucker said, a few moments ago, very properly, that, in the event of war, the ultimate decisive factor would probably not be missiles, but the man. He is certainly correct, if he talks of a hot war—a war that we may not have to fight. But our honored guest, today, in his 50 days around the world, reached another conclusion which we must also have in mind. We are engaged today in another type of war—one that has always been launched against us. It is a war in which the economy of the slave world has been pitted against the economy of the free world; one in which millions of people all over the world are trying to determine which way to turn—toward freedom or toward slavery. It is a war in which the leadership the United States enjoys is tremendously important because, if we show, in this country, that our system is an effective one and provides the good things of life for our own people; if we show, in our attitude toward other countries, that their best hope is in working with us—with what assistance we are able to give them—rather than working with the slave world; if this happens—then the hot war will never have to be fought, in order for the objective of world domination to be gained by those who oppose everything that we stand for.

Tonight, then, as we honor Ben Fairless, may I say we think of him as we should—as a leader of business, but we also—those of us who are here from Government—deeply appreciate, as all Americans do, the fact that he has given so much of his time and his energy for his Government and, particularly, in this service most recently rendered. I can think of no term with which to describe him more appropriately or more succinctly than to say that the man who receives the Silver Quill award tonight is a statesman—a statesman of industry.

REMARKS OF MR. BENJAMIN F. FAIRLESS, LONGTIME HEAD OF UNITED STATES STEEL AND NOW PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE, IN RECEIVING THE 1957 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 30, 1958, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, your kindness to me has been so overwhelming that I hardly know what to say.

To be selected to receive the Silver Quill award is one of the highest and most welcome honors that has come to me in my professional life. And, to receive it from the hands of our country's capable and distinguished Vice President—a man for whom I have the highest personal regard—makes me feel very, very proud.

When Bob Harper wrote to tell me that I had been chosen by your award committee, I was naturally delighted. But, at the same time, I have to admit that I was also perplexed by certain doubts and misgivings which stubbornly persist.

Of course, I know that the award committee does a thorough job and checks on a thing like this pretty carefully. But, I can't help wondering if, when their ballots were counted, a clerical error didn't creep in somehow. The Silver Quill, after all, is a mighty big award for someone like myself who was frustrated in his life's ambition.

As some of you may know, I just got into the steel business by accident. What I really started out to be was a baseball player. And, as a matter of fact, some people apparently believe that I still am a baseball player. The other night, at a dinner in New York, a fellow referred to me as "that Pittsburgh

Pirate"—with what degree of affection or confusion, I cannot say.

Unfortunately, I never got very far out of the sandlot league in our great American pastime. So, you can easily see how it would occur to me that, perhaps, somebody slipped up on tonight's award somewhere.

And, if that's how it happened, then I feel I should say a word of consolation to the conscientious members of the award committee. Gentlemen, I know and you know that there are many, many others far more worthy to receive the Silver Quill. But, I assure you that among all those you might have selected, you could not find anyone, anywhere, who appreciates it more. So, in the reassuring light of that rationalizing, I accept—with pleasure, with pride and with heartfelt gratitude—this very distinguished honor.

Tonight, I sincerely wish that I could turn the tables on you editors and publishers of the Nation's business press. If I could do so I would present to each one of you an award that I feel you deserve.

Each of you, to my mind, deserves recognition for the important work you perform in your 200 trade, technical and scientific journals. With clarity, judgment and deep insight you help those of us in business to understand better the complex issues that we face.

But, even more important than that, you help the American people to achieve a better understanding of business—its problems, its legitimate needs and hopes and the way in which our free enterprise system works to serve the best interests of our society.

Obviously, this is the kind of job that never ends. Just as obviously there is no other group that I know of that is more qualified to do it. And, I believe that this work for better understanding of our own system is one of the most compelling and challenging responsibilities of our time.

We face today a divided world. We have seen it stained by blood over the bitter issue that divides us. Two powerful forces—freedom and slavery—repel each other. Both have now split and fused the little world of the atom but, thus far, the larger world we both live in remains only split and confused.

Clearly, at such a time in such a world, we must not be and cannot be divided among ourselves. Lincoln warned us that a house in that shape cannot stand. We know that at present one of the foundations of the free structure of the world is the economic strength of America. And, our Nation's economic strength grows by a system of free enterprise as free men and women understand, support, and conduct it.

That strength thus far has been great enough to rally the Western nations of the world to the virtues of resistance and the values of freedom. We have been and, hopefully, will continue to be the encouragement not only of the West, but the entire world.

We do so, fundamentally, by offering the finest example of freedom's great practical as well as ethical worth. We may not have as yet a successful space satellite. But, we do have, in action, for all the world to see, a successful society of free people—who save, risk, and profit under an economic system which provides material and spiritual values and individual lives of dignity, opportunity, and unequaled comfort.

If that were not so one might wonder, then, why millions come to our side each year, and why millions more risk death to escape from the East to the free world. If it were not true we might believe that the barbed wire borders, the check points, guns, guards, and dogs were there to keep us out instead of doing what, in fact, they are doing—keeping the slaves in.

Thus, it seems to me that surely one of our greatest challenges—yours, mine, and every American's—is here in our own house. We should stand together to keep it strong. And, we should be working together to keep it growing not only for ourselves and our children but to help keep steadfast this great faith in freedom.

Not of our choice but by our very progress as a society, we have been thrust into leadership of the free nations. As leaders, we cannot permit confusion and division to misguide us. And, that is why you gentlemen, with your skill and wisdom in ways of making clear to the American people how our free enterprise system works and how it can continue to grow, do such an important and award-deserving job.

In recent months we have been split and confused over the temporary—and I emphasize temporary—dip in our rate of progress. We hear again of a cure for it that, strangely, sounds exactly like the treatment prescribed for a boom. It involves one of the discredited and bewhiskered economic arguments of Lord Keynes. And, it seems to me, that it is based on a serious lack of understanding of our system and the sound way true progress has been and can be achieved. The debate is now at that dangerous stage in which more heat than light is shed.

Certain labor leaders declare that the reason key industries are now operating below capacity is because of a lack of consumer purchasing power. This reason sounds so simple and the cure, bigger and bigger wage increases, so appealing that I suspect many persons want it to be true. But neither the simple sound nor the natural wish for more make it a valid reason.

If it were true, of course, then we would have a dandy remedy for any temporary downturn and a pat formula for all future progress. All we would have to do would be to double everyone's wages and then, under this concept, we would all be twice as well off. But, unfortunately, even in theory it doesn't work out that way.

I suppose that this isn't precisely the way an economist would look at it, but I think of our national wealth as being stored in a gigantic warehouse. Packed inside are all the goods, services, foods, and fiber we produce. The money we use is merely a receipt for what we produce and bring to this national warehouse.

At the other end—the shipping side—we bring our receipts, or money to exchange for other things we require. Now, if we double the amount of receipts and do nothing about the amount of goods, we have not added one bit to our national wealth. All that happens is that now we have twice as much money to buy the same amount of things. And, of course, in short order we pay twice as much as before.

Many Americans recognize and have experienced the truth of this very simple illustration. In labor's camp there are wise leaders today who understand perfectly that we cannot take out of our national warehouse more than we put in. They know, too, that it is what we can actually buy with our pay rather than the number of dollars we get that really counts.

Still, the consumer purchasing power theme is played, again and again, very cleverly and apparently very carefully timed in relation to forthcoming bargaining sessions. It is a beguiling as well as confusing melody and, I suppose, on the rank and file of labor it has the same lulling effect that the songs of sirens have on sailors. The results are the same, too.

Now, the minute anyone says something like this in a speech—as I have tonight—he is immediately accused of being against wage increases and the labor unions. I wish to make it very clear that I am not opposed to either. In fact, I am emphatically for both. As to unionism, I could hardly feel otherwise. My father held a union card; my brother held one, also. I signed the first corporation-wide contract in the steel industry with the United Steelworkers of America. The late Phil Murray and I shook hands on it.

I am not, nor have I ever been against wage gains. And when I say "wage gains" I mean ones that will buy more. I think everybody should get more as it becomes possible to create more. But increases in general wage-rate levels to make real dollars and sense (spelled s-e-n-s-e) must bear a fair relationship to advances in national productivity. And, in the last 10 years they haven't. A 26-percent gain in industrial productivity has been more than absorbed by a 61-percent rise in wage rates.

Consumer purchasing power, reflecting the real income and the confidence of spenders, is one of the vital parts of a prosperous America. But it is a power that has to be earned to be effective. It cannot be assumed by attempting to take a share at the expense of somebody else. The difference between the 26-percent gain in output and the 61-percent gain in wages is illusion. It is a phony as far as increasing consumer purchasing power because, of course, it represents inflation.

While it sounds perfectly delightful to stuff more money into pay envelopes, it must be understood that, if new wealth or efficiency is not created, that money must come out of someone else's pocket, who is also a consumer. Total purchasing power in the market place is not raised by as much as a fraction in this way.

What any man earns in our system stems from the value of what he produces; and, therefore, a real increase in his earning power comes about as he increases his productive power. So the really puzzling question is how can a man become more productive?

Now, a human being is truly a marvel and at the same time something of a mess. He has the mind of a giant but the muscles of a pygmy. With his mind, his imagination and wondrous creative powers, he can write a book, paint a picture, or sculpt a statue. He may search and find in science the secrets of the universe. But when he had to depend solely on his muscles for his basic needs—his clothing, food, shelter, and comforts—he was a sorry specimen and lived a primitive life.

Of course, he no longer has to depend on his muscles. Over the years we have developed a great army of inanimate slaves which add productive power to each workingman. These are the machines and tools which, in our national warehouse, are the capital goods, the product of savings invested. They permit each man to turn out many times more than he could if he depended only on his muscles.

So the next question is, then, how do we get more of these aids to productive power? And the answer is, bluntly, from profits. Profits under our free system are not something we need apologize for because with profits we have the real key to more productive power and thus earning power and thus progress.

The new machinery and tools which enable a workingman to increase his output and which equip the new workers joining the labor force each year would not be available without profits. Whether they are used directly by being plowed back into the business or indirectly as an incentive to investors, profits start our forward motion in providing rising living standards.

The corollary argument to the consumer-purchasing-power theme is that wage increases can be subtracted from profits without price increases. In answer to this notion, the Saturday Evening Post recently carried a pertinent editorial using the steel industry as an example:

"Suppose the 1946 level of steel prices had been maintained through 1956. And suppose the industry had shipped what it actually did ship during that decade. Assume further that wage rates and other costs

rose as they actually did during this 10-year period. Where would the steel industry stand today?

"Well, on the basis of official, published figures, it would be more than $21 billion in the red.

"The steel industry would have operated in the red in 9 out of the 10 years. Its losses in 1955 and 1956, taken together, would have been at least equal to the entire sum spent by the industry for its postwar expansion.

"Of course, none of this could have actually happened, since the whole industry would have been bankrupt long before it could have accumulated a deficit of this size. The shipments could never have been made since the plants which made the shipments possible could never have been built. Failure to recover costs would have prevented expansion.

"Steel prices, like any other prices, must reflect increases in the cost of doing business, including wages—or you go out of business."

To show up the absurdity of any significant wage increase coming out of profits you need only compare the size of a 5-percent increase in wages with total corporate profits. In the highest year on record, 1950, such a wage increase would take about 20 percent of all corporate profits before taxes.

A squeeze like that on profits would have three inevitable effects: It would stop investment cold, lower productivity, and increase unemployment. And that, I submit, is hardly the pattern of progress or the way to strengthen our economy.

The mystery is why anyone would think wages should come out of profits in the first place. The result is to pinch off a principal source of additions to productive power. And, since the only way we can hope to live better is if we produce more for our national warehouse, then the minute we take from profits we are, in effect, subtracting from living standards.

So, I think it is time we replace confusion with understanding of the real source of our economic strength. And the time is overripe for us to end the squabble over dividing what we have and get on about the business of multiplying more for the greatest number of our people.

For one thing, we can cease trying to get more by taking it from someone else. In particular, I mean trying to take from profits to put into wage envelopes. No one really gains in that attempt—least of all the workingman. As unemployment increases, production drops and progress halts. Instead of raising costs, prices, and the cost of living, let us rather raise productivity, progress, and the standard of living.

That is what we all want. A balanced overall movement forward with wages, profits, and productivity going up in and not out of step. And I am confident that this is well within our abilities, despite the marking time we may have to do this year as inventories are pared down.

Ahead of us is a new era—a space age as some call it. It will be a time of tremendous technological change. In my opinion we are just now at the doorstep of a new warehouse for America. One that can be filled with greater wealth, more new things from more new processes in the next 5 years than we have ever seen before in our history.

As the result of research and development financed by American industry because profits made it possible to do so, there is a great backlog of new ideas, theories, and principles building up in our Nation's laboratories. To translate them into new jobs, factories, machines, and finished products will require tremendous new investments.

Those investments, however, will not be forthcoming unless a real incentive—a prospect of profit—entices investment. And, unless those investments are made we will, indeed, slip behind the Russians. Not just in single, spectacular scientific achievements, but in the real race we are running and in which our free system far excels their slave system. I mean our success in providing better living standards and an opportunity for a better life for more people.

Let us admit and have done with it that the Russians have impressed the world. But, let us also recognize that they have done so with a policy of fear and an instrument of terror. I think we would much rather be what we are, the encouragement of a world yearning for freedom and for a better life in peace to enjoy useful progress.

Lincoln said it for us a long time ago. Speaking on Washington's birthday in 1861 at Independence Hall, he referred to the inner meaning of the Declaration of Independence as "giving liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to the world for all future time."

That hope was never needed more than in the year 1958. We provide it as we stand together, adhere to and apply those economic principles which can make America stronger than ever in a greater age of progress than any so far known. For that goal and to keep alive that hope of all men for a free, undivided world at peace, we stand together—or fall.

Thank you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop V. J. Brizgys, auxiliary of Kaunas, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the common father of all people, we praise Thee and give thanks for the dignity bestowed on men created in Thy likeness and who call themselves Thy children and each other's brothers.

We pray for all those who, understanding this dignity, were and are harbingers of culture, peace, mutual love, and respect among people and nations. Today we wish to pay tribute to all those who, having understood the dignity of man, were and are pioneers of freedom for people and nations.

Today, too, we remember a nation whose name has been mentioned among European nations from days beyond recall, and which time and again has served Europe's Christianity and civilization by crushing dangerous forces that threatened to destroyed it. We remember Lithuania, which in her long history has tasted of glory and misfortune, and which today has lost her freedom. She hopes and strives to regain this freedom. In her sufferings, she has not been left alone. A whole world of good will sympathizes with Lithuania and other unfortunate nations. Lithuania thanks Thee, O Lord, especially for the friendship of the United States of America, whose motto is In God We Trust, whose way of life is freedom, and who, being the most progressive and dynamic nation, is at the same time a pioneer of true peace and freedom for other nations. Almighty God, we beseech Thee to bless and protect this Nation, that it might be a servant of Thy divine providence in establishing in the world an order worthy of the dignity which Thou hast bestowed on man.

We pray to Thee for the Lithuanian nation, which for centuries has held dear and has protected Thy greatest gift—freedom; and which today, bowed under the yoke of bondage, cries to Thee and to all people of good will for help. She wishes to live and work in a family of free nations for her own and mankind's welfare.

O Lord, bless America, bless Lithuania, and bless all other nations who trust in Thee and strive to create life in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, February 10, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 12, 1958, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1408) to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 13, 1958.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7300. An act to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 9271. An act to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the