

the world to an era in which we can settle our differences at the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

Now I say that type of challenge is one we should enjoy meeting; it is one in which we appreciate the opportunity for leadership which may have been placed upon us, and I would only close by suggesting that we can and will meet this challenge, provided we have the inner strength which has made America the great country it is today, and which we need above everything else if we are to survive against others in the world, particularly leaders and not people, but others who are dedicated not to peace, not to freedom for all, but to world domination, because, make no mistake about it, whatever we may think of the ideology of those who lead the Communist world, they know what they want; they believe in it; they are dedicated; they are willing to make any sacrifice to gain their end, so what we need on our side is the same dedication; the same belief in our religious principles, and

the same willingness to sacrifice economically, anything, in order not to dominate the world but in order that all peoples will have the opportunity to national independence, to freedom, and the opportunity to live in peace with each other.

Now this is a great principle, a great challenge for all of us, and I know that the fact that this conference will be held here in Washington, will be a splendid influence in strengthening the resolve of those of us in Government who provide the leadership that America and the Free World needs today.

We thank you for coming, and we wish you well during the course of your stay here. [Applause.]

SENATOR CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. We very much appreciate your attendance, and the splendid remarks you have made.

I suggest now that we all rise and we will have the Hallelujah Chorus sung by the University of Maryland Choir, under the direction of Fague Springman.

I think it was wonderful of them to come over today, and we will remain standing then for the closing prayer by Mr. Abraham Ver-eide.

(Alleluiah Chorus by the University of Maryland Choir.)

Mr. VEREIDE: Eternal God, Hallelujah, we sing, we say, we pray, for God eternally reigneth, and we thank Thee this morning for meeting with us, charging and recharging our batteries and strengthening us for the task ahead. In Thy presence there are no wants; by Thy grace we walk forth with a consciousness of Thee, and pray Thy presence hour by hour, trusting Thee for wisdom, for power, for love, for the sound mind for every situation, and unto Thee we give all the praise, our Father, who now, oh God, we trust for thy special touch upon our President; help him, O God; bless him and keep him, and our Secretary of State, and all our officials, that they may serve Thee and serve this Nation.

(The Lord's Prayer.)

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1958

Dr. Frederick E. Reissig, executive secretary, Council of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Good Shepherd, our refuge and strength, the bread of life, the spring of living water, grant to each of us this day the faith that assures us that Thou art all of these, and more, to us.

To all who travel this day by land or sea or air, grant a safe journey. Be Thou the physician to all who wait for healing.

Shed Thy light upon our paths, lest we fumble, and stumble, and fall, and fail both Thee and others.

Through Him who is the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 13, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] may be excused from attendance on the Senate for the week of February 17 through 22, for the

purpose of participating in active duty with the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McNAMARA, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader; and I should like to announce that it is our hope that the Senate will conclude its business today by not later than 4 o'clock. We request the cooperation of all Members of the Senate. As all of us are aware, the weather is very inclement, and the roads are in dangerous condition for travel. I hope it will be possible for the session today to be concluded at an early hour, so the employees, who are so dedicated, and who so faithfully serve the Senate, may have an opportunity to return to their homes before nightfall.

Mr. President, I announce that there will be no rollcalls today, if they can be avoided. We plan to have two general statements made by Senators.

On Wednesday we expect to have the Senate proceed with the consideration of Calendar 1178, House bill 5822, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

We hope to have the consideration of that bill followed by the consideration of the postal pay bill and the classified pay bill and the postal rate bill. I understand that the committee will conclude its hearings tomorrow.

### CALL OF THE CALENDER DISPENSED WITH

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter K. Scott, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip D. Reed, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for term expiring January 27, 1961, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for term expiring January 27, 1961, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Abbot L. Mills, Jr., of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1958.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 that statements in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

## AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT, RELATING TO PRIVATE PARTICIPATION IN FINANCING LOAN PROGRAMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act to encourage private participation in financing the loan programs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## REENLISTMENT BONUSES UNDER CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control for the fourth quarter of 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## REPORT ON SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## AUDIT REPORT ON PRACTICE OF INSURING GOVERNMENT-OWNED FACILITIES, CHANCE VUGHT AIRCRAFT, INC., DALLAS, TEX.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Practice of Insuring Government-Owned Facilities, Chance Vought Aircraft, Inc., Dallas, Tex. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## SESSION LAWS OF ALASKA, 1957

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Session Laws of Alaska, 1957 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORT ON EL JARDIN DIVISION OF LOWER RIO GRANDE REHABILITATION PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the El Jardin Division of the Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, in Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORT ON LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1957; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORT ON PROTECTION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of

that Commission, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, and a report of all cases heard and/or decided by that Board, during the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report 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.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of A. George Kato, and sundry other citizens of Ogden, Utah, relating to the reinstatement of Col. John Nickerson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Aeronautics and Communications Commission, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Federal airports program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the enactment of legislation to restrict Federal control of the sale of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the continuance in force of the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Covina, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to improve the Walnut Creek system for the control and conservation of floodwaters; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the city of Claremont, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to improve the Walnut Creek system for the control and conservation of floodwaters; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution condemning the administration of the soil bank program and requesting the Congress to appropriate additional funds

"Whereas the funds allocated for the payment of soil bank participation was done on a first-come, first-served basis; and

"Whereas such allocation of public funds are highly inequitable and unjust; and

"Whereas the continuance of this manner of allocating funds could result in serious turmoil; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, through circulars and otherwise, caused many farmers to be lulled into a false sense of assurance that sufficient funds would be available for participation in the soil-bank program; and

"Whereas the funds were exhausted before many farmers received their lawful entitlement under this program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the General Assembly of South Carolina does condemn the manner of administering the soil-bank funds and memorializes the Secretary of Agriculture to institute such programs in the future that will be handled on a fair and equitable basis; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to appropriate a sufficient additional sum to supply the entitlements of applications now on file by farmers desiring to participate in the soil-bank program; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the two Senators from South Carolina, and the Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of those farmers under the 1958 cotton acreage reserve agreement who have planned to place cotton acres in the soil bank program

"Whereas the Federal Government has failed to appropriate sufficient funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve agreement to permit all farmers who had planned to do so to retire a definite number of acres into the soil bank program; and

"Whereas the cotton-growing farmers had been led to believe that sufficient funds would be appropriated and available to pay them for such acres as were placed in the soil-bank program; and

"Whereas the cotton-growing farmers, relying on such assurances, have planned and have made financial arrangements accordingly to plant a definite number of acres and to retire a definite number of acres; and

"Whereas the cotton farmers are now apprised of the fact that insufficient funds are available to defray the cost of the entire program and they must operate on a first-come, first-served basis; and

"Whereas by such action on the part of the Federal Government, faith has been broken with the cotton farmer and he has been placed in an extremely difficult financial position through no fault of his own by virtue of the fact that he relied on the assurances of the Federal Government that sufficient funds would be available; and

"Whereas this is working an undue hardship on the cotton farmer and has made it necessary that he replan and revamp his entire planting program for the coming year: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program, within the provisions of the act, to allow all farmers to place into the soil-bank program such acres as they had planned to retire from cotton planting; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and to the Clerk of the House of the United States and that a copy be forwarded to each United States Senator from South Carolina and to each Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress from South Carolina."

#### RESOLUTIONS OF JAYCEES, TULSA, OKLA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter from Charles E. Shearer, Jr., president, Jaycees, Tulsa, Okla.:

JAYCEES,

Tulsa, Okla., February 14, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

Sir: This is to inform you of the position of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on many items of national importance as stated by Jaycee resolutions now in effect. Represented are the opinions of some 200,000 young men from all walks of life in 3,500 communities throughout the entire United States, Alaska, and Hawaii.

A summary statement on each resolution is as follows:

**Federal budget control:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is mindful of the danger of ever-increasing Federal expenditures and is greatly concerned for our country's economy, the future of the American way of free enterprise, and thereby the destiny of the Federal Government to utilize every effort, to curtail the vast spending of the Federal Government, to assure us economy and efficiency in Government, and to promote the tax-saving recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

**Washington, D. C., citizens right to vote:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce urges that the Constitution of the United States be amended to grant to the American citizens resident in Washington, D. C., the opportunity to participate with their fellow American citizens in the national election of President and Vice President of these United States.

**Cordiner report:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce respectively urges the Congress of the United States to take favorable action to revise the existing pay structure now in use in the Armed Forces, incorporating therein the principles enumerated in the Defense Advisory Committee Report on Professional and Technical Compensation for Military Personnel.

**Public libraries:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce encourages the further extension, development, and promotion of public library service throughout America.

**Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce urges support for immediate statehood for the only two remaining incorporated Territories under the American flag, Alaska and Hawaii.

**Pornographic literature:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce commends the publishers and distributors who are trying to clean up their industry; supports the

United States Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and other public and private groups seeking to improve the quality of reading materials reaching American youth; and encourages local and State Jaycee organizations to determine the current status of the problems and to take positive and constructive steps to bring about their solutions.

**People to people:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce does fully endorse the principles of the People to People program as a means of breaking down the barriers of distrust and misunderstanding between the American people and their foreign neighbors. The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce calls upon its affiliated organizations throughout the United States and its Territories to pledge the full support of their initiative, effort, and resources to some phase of this worthwhile program.

**Civilian defense:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce favors further investigation and study by the Congress of the United States as to the merits of any report published by the Congressional committee, Civil Defense for National Survival, and any pending or proposed legislation concerning civil defense.

**Relation between Federal and State governments and reduction of Federal aid:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce favors continued support of reductions in Federal aid and the assumption of these services that can be adequately performed by State and local governments.

**Veterans' nonservice disability benefits:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce urges Federal Government to adopt a positive policy for meeting fully and promptly the needs of veterans resulting from military service; but that non-service-connected needs should be met when possible through programs for the general population; and that non-service-connected veterans' programs be changed only to meet minimum needs not covered by general programs.

**Operation pray:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce urges citizens everywhere to offer their prayers on July 4 for the success of our country in the role of world leadership, which has been imposed upon us.

**Hoover Commission:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce continues and expands its widespread dissemination of information on recommendations and findings of the Hoover Commission in order to stimulate interest and secure possible support for economy and efficiency in Government and adherence to constitutional principles based upon the recommendations and findings of the Second Hoover Commission.

**President's Day:** The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce favors House Joint Resolution 294, which would designate April 30, the anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States, as President's Day; and urges that the Congress pass this resolution and urges the educators of our Nation to make use of this day to promote the ideals of our country and of its democratic way of life.

**Traffic safety:** The USJCC advocates and supports a uniform vehicle code and the model traffic ordinance. This would include: national uniformity in traffic signs and devices; compulsory periodic inspection of motor vehicles; establishment of driver-education programs in all high schools; compulsory examinations of all applicants for driving licenses; use of scientific methods by all enforcement agencies to determine the degree of driver intoxication and the admission of such evidence by the courts.

**International education and student aid:** The USJCC endorses a program whereby a United States businessman, organization, or corporation may contribute to the financial support of one or more foreign students who

may desire to study in the United States, and whereby the said donor may be encouraged to make such a contribution by receiving such income-tax relief in return for the maintenance and support of a foreign student (or students) in the United States as may be afforded pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code by revision, reinterpretation, or amendment.

**Juvenile delinquency:** The USJCC adopts as their policy the encouragement of their members and chapters to promote all possible action to combat juvenile delinquency; and to cooperate with and assist all agencies and organizations combating juvenile delinquency.

**Gambling and fixing in sports:** The USJCC recognizes that the undue influence of professional gamblers and fixers in the sports field imperils the best interest of amateur and professional athletics and hereby urges the Senate of the United States of America to investigate the extent to which professional fixers and gamblers have infiltrated the fields of amateur, semipro and professional sports for the purpose of enacting legislation to remove their sordid influences from these fields of American athletic endeavor.

Copies of the complete resolutions were circulated to the Senate, Congress, and other officials last August. Additional copies are available at the national headquarters of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Box 7, Tulsa, Okla., if you should desire them.

If the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce can be of additional service, please do not hesitate to call on us. As you know, we are a national young men's organization dedicated to leadership training through effective civic service programs and projects. This is consistent with the Jaycee creed, which states:

We believe that faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life; that the brotherhood of men transcends the sovereignty of nations; that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise; that government should be of laws rather than of men; that earth's great treasure lies in human personality; and that service to humanity is the best work of life.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES E. SHEARER, Jr.,

President.

#### RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of West Virginia, memorializing Congress not to allow the passage of any legislation authorizing pay-as-you-go television, together with the certification of the resolution by the clerk of the house of delegates.

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

##### House Resolution 10

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.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that the foregoing House Resolution 10 was regularly adopted by the House of Delegates of the West Virginia Legislature on February 4, 1958.

Given under my hand, this the 4th day of February 1958.

C. A. BLANKENSHIP,  
Clerk, House of Delegates,  
West Virginia Legislature.

#### RESOLUTION OF THOMAS COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a large number of wheatgrowers in western Kansas and other sections of the wheat-producing areas planted their fall wheat prior to receiving the new interpretation of section 2, Public Law 85-203, by the Department of Agriculture.

The law penalized those wheat producers who planted fall wheat prior to receiving information concerning the law and the interpretation placed upon it.

Public Law 85-203 was passed by Congress last August, and the Department of Agriculture ruling came out late in September. Everyone familiar with wheat planting in the great wheat-producing areas of western Kansas knows that planting starts as early as August 15.

This situation is causing real hardship and I would urge the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give consideration to this at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution received from the Thomas County Farm Bureau on this matter be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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 ADOPTED BY THOMAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU

The members of the Thomas County (Kans.) Farm Bureau Association, having duly met on this 7th day of November 1957, do hereby protest the provisions and interpretations of section 2, Public Law 85-203. This protest is made to the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture.

The provisions of the law penalize those wheat producers who planted fall wheat prior to receiving information concerning the law and the interpretation placed upon it. The majority of the members of the association relied upon the previous interpretation of the

law and planted excess acres. Section 2, Public Law 85-203, was either enacted or interpreted after the 1958 wheat crop was planted.

The law works a hardship upon the members of this association and all wheat producers in this area. Because of the injustice to the wheat producer, it is the desire of the members of the association that this protest be brought emphatically to the immediate attention of the United States Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That this association urge permanent repeal of section 2, Public Law 85-203, for reason that such section takes away stabilizing privilege of the Great Plains wheat farmers to store excess wheat for the year of crop failure.

Dated this 7th day of November 1957.

THOMAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION POLICY COMMITTEE,  
JOE MOOS, Chairman.

#### MAINTENANCE OF PRESENT PRICES ON MANUFACTURED MILK—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that there is a growing recognition on the part of businessmen in my State of the close interdependence between the welfare of Wisconsin dairy farmers and the stability and progress of the rest of the community. Because of this recognition, and because all Americans believe in fair play and will favor measures to protect the incomes of farm people once they understand the facts concerned, more and more businessmen in Wisconsin have come out publicly in support of maintaining and strengthening our programs of price supports for dairy commodities.

Last week I received a letter from Mr. R. W. Mills, executive secretary of the Fond du Lac, Wis., Association of Commerce, which bears out this growing trend. I ask unanimous consent that this letter and a resolution of the agricultural committee of this organization be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

FOND DU LAC ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,  
Fond du Lac, Wis., February 7, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Our agricultural committee held a meeting last night and discussed Secretary of Agriculture Benson's plan to lower the parity rates of dairy products and milk, on April 1.

This committee of 20 members covers a good cross section of business, most of whom, of course, are close to the farmer, and are affected by the price he obtains for milk. After considerable discussion, and I might add, a very good and constructive discussion, the committee came up with a resolution which was passed unanimously.

A copy of this resolution is made part of this letter and is sent to you in accord with the request of the committee.

Cordially,

R. W. MILLS,  
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE OF THE FOND DU LAC ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE IN A MEETING HELD THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, IN FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Whereas the Congress has now before it several bills pertaining to farm legislation

and in particular pertaining to milk and dairy products; and

Whereas most Members of Congress readily admit that some form of farm legislation must be enacted in 1958 and most of them admit that they are not sure what form that legislation should take; and

Whereas this combination of Congressional attitudes will obviously produce considerable debate and controversy over farm legislation, all of which will cause considerable delay beyond April 1 in the adoption of a program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the agricultural committee of the Fond du Lac Association of Commerce believes that the present prices of manufactured milk should be maintained at not less than 82½ percent of parity until such time as a self-help-milk-price program is adopted by this session of the 85th Congress; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President D. D. Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture E. T. Benson, Senators Alexander Wiley and William Proxmire, and Congressman William K. Van Pelt.

#### GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT INVESTIGATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bismarck, N. Dak., Chamber of Commerce, relating to appropriations for use of the Garrison diversion unit investigation.

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

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed for consideration by the 85th Congress, 2d session, a reduction from about \$900,000 to \$552,000 in the amount to be appropriated for use of the Garrison diversion unit investigation; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Bismarck, although realizing that appropriations must be scrutinized and evaluated, believes that the proposed budget item ranks in value and priority so as to warrant appropriation of not less than \$850,000 for the following reasons:

1. The unusual local and statewide support of the project as evidenced by:

(a) The hearing of the House Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs held at Devils Lake, N. Dak., on October 30, 1957, attended by over 2,500 interested citizens,

(b) The organization of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District comprising 25 counties with the power, capacity, and willingness to substantially assist in the financing and development of the project,

(c) The manifest interest of landowners as shown by the creation of irrigation districts exceeding 100,000 acres, with additional irrigation districts exceeding 100,000 acres, now well along in the process of formation.

2. The additional funds are necessary to permit the orderly and most economical programming and development of the project which is of such size and magnitude that its use and benefits should not be delayed nor its costs increased.

3. A reduction of the necessary funds at this time would result in the loss of trained, experienced and technical employees.

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Bismarck, this sixth day of February 1958, recommends to the Congress of the United States that the appropriation for the use of the Garrison diversion unit investigation be not less than \$850,000; be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to all members of the Congressional delegation from North Dakota.

#### COMPENSATION OF MAIL HANDLERS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Local 45, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers, signed by Raleigh Sandall, secretary, Minneapolis, Minn., together with a resolution adopted by that organization relative to the compensation of mail handlers.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF P. O.  
AND P. T. SERVICE MAIL HANDLERS,  
WATCHMEN, AND MESSENGERS,  
Minneapolis, Minn., January 15, 1958.  
To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed resolution was adopted by Local 45, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, at their monthly meeting November 10, 1957.

It is time that mail handlers were paid the same pay for doing similar work requiring equal responsibilities, as other classifications.

In many cases mail handlers and higher paid classifications perform the same duties and work but are paid at a lower salary level than other classifications. We consider this an injustice that must be eradicated.

Promotional opportunities are limited to employees in level 4 pay grade and above, thereby denying opportunities of advancement to qualified mail handlers. Therefore if mail handlers were placed in pay level 4 of the Postal Field Service pay schedule, this injustice would be rectified.

All employees, regardless of classification status, should receive equal pay for doing equal work, which is plain ordinary fair play and justice.

Fraternally,

RALEIGH SANDALL,  
Secretary.

Whereas many mail handlers are required to perform similar duties with those within level 4 pay grades; and

Whereas many in level 4 pay grades are performing duties specifically designed as level 3 pay grades duties; and

Whereas all such duties require handling of mail matter of all types and with equal responsibility; Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That level 3 pay grades be abolished where it affects mail handlers classification; that such action be brought about by an amendment to existing Salary Re-classification Act now under consideration by Congress; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of Congress urging investigation of discriminatory practices now in effect, i. e., lack of equal opportunity for advancement, inadequate pay status for similar and responsible positions of trust, duty assignments, and many other direct causes of conflict and ill feeling existing under present policies, and, finally, that all postal employees responsible for the handling of mail matter be automatically advanced to level 4 pay grades, holding present pay step, and, with seniority as of date established by original appointment within the postal service.

#### LAKE SAKAKAWEA—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Greater North Dakota Association, at Fargo, N. Dak., relating to the designation of Lake Sakakawea.

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

Whereas the name of Sakakawea occupies a prominent place in the history and legends of the Missouri River Basin in North Dakota; and

Whereas it would be a fitting and deserved recognition of her historic role of assistance to the Lewis and Clark expedition if the name of Sakakawea were given to some structure, feature, or segment of the river above Mandan, N. Dak.: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the board of directors of the Greater North Dakota Association, meeting in Fargo, N. Dak., January 21-22, 1958*, That it respectfully urges that the impoundment or reservoir formed by the construction of the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River, North Dakota, be officially named and designated Lake Sakakawea; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy hereof be transmitted to each of Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young, Representatives Usher L. Burdick and Otto Krueger; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army; the Honorable John E. Davis, Governor of North Dakota; and to North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received from C. H. Conaway, secretary of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota, a letter enclosing two resolutions adopted by that organization, relating to support prices for grain, and the authority for issuing loading orders.

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

FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS  
ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA,  
Fargo, N. Dak., February 5, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached are copies of two resolutions passed at our 46th annual convention of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., on January 28, 29, 30, 1958. These resolutions were passed at our regular business meeting on January 30.

Your careful analysis of our position and findings will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

C. H. CONAWAY,  
Secretary.

Whereas North Dakota farmers are facing a steadily declining price on all types of grain produced in our State, and in view of the fact that everything in the way of manufactured products that the farmer has to buy is now at an alltime high price basis: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota in convention assembled petition our Senators and Congressmen to do everything possible to continue present support prices for grain; be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to Senators YOUNG and LANGER and to Congressmen BURDICK and KRUEGER.

Whereas it has come to the attention of members of this association, the Minneapolis Commodity Office will not issue a loading

order unless it is approved by the State ASC committee which in turn receives its recommendations from the county ASC committees; and

Whereas we as individual country elevator operators have invested huge sums of money in our elevators much of it to assist our customers in taking advantage of price-support programs; and

Whereas the uniform grain storage agreement we signed is an agreement between us and the Commodity Credit Corporation and not with the county and State ASC committees who, particularly at the county level, very often have very little understanding of the grain business; and

Whereas since we have invested our capital in these facilities, we do not believe the prerogatives of management should be given to people with little or no knowledge of our business: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this association go on record opposing as vigorously as possible the current procedure of allowing State and county committees the authority to say who should or should not get a loading order; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Commodity Credit Corporation and the State and county ASC committees be requested to cease issuing instructions that cut across management prerogatives and lessen the effectiveness of our terminal representatives who have in the past and who still continue to properly serve the country elevator operators in protecting their interests; and be it further

*Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption, copies of this resolution be mailed to the State ASC committee, the Minneapolis Commodity Office; the Director, Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, the Deputy Administrator for Price Supports, Commodity Stabilization Service, the Administrator Commodity Stabilization Service, the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., and to both United States Senators and United States Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

#### RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, at Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 27, providing increased compensation for postal employees.

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

Whereas the bill, S. 27, to provide a much-needed and well-earned salary increase for postal employees was reported to the Senate on July 22, 1957, and remained on the Senate Calendar when the 85th Congress reconvened on January 7; and

Whereas, on January 15, the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously approved a series of committee amendments to the bill, S. 27, which were reported to the Senate and printed on January 23; and

Whereas the Senate Majority Policy Committee, at its meeting on January 15, cleared the bill S. 27, and the Senate majority leader, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, advised the Senate on January 16 that the bill may be taken up at any time; and

Whereas as of this date, January 30, 1958, no Senate action has been taken, nor has such action been scheduled for a day certain: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, meeting in Washington, D. C., January 30, 1958, urges, requests, and implores

the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader; the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, minority leader, the majority and minority policy committees, and all Senators who indicated their support of adequate postal salary increases by their favorable votes on H. R. 2474 on August 27, 1957, to take such steps as may be necessary to secure an early vote on the bill S. 27; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the United States Senate forthwith.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Council, and the State Health Planning Committee, relating to appropriations for hospital construction.

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

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The North Dakota State Health Council and the State Health Planning Committee, in a joint meeting on January 16, 1958, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the President's proposed budget showed a decrease of \$297,547 in Hill-Burton funds under part C for hospital construction; and

"Whereas these Hill-Burton funds during the past 9 years have been well received in the State and have been instrumental in a great volume of improvement of hospital facilities; and

"Whereas there still remains a great deal of hospital improvement and construction yet to be accomplished and without allotments of comparable amounts some of this will necessarily be delayed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the State Health Council and the State Health Planning Committee urgently solicit the support and action from our North Dakota Senators and Representatives in Congress for the restoration of these funds."

#### RESEARCH IN INDUSTRIAL USES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—ARTICLE FROM ST. PAUL PIONEER PRESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been a strong advocate of increased research in the industrial uses of agricultural commodities as a means of bringing into balance the ever-increasing production of our Nation's farms and the domestic use of these farm products. Increased consumption is the long-range answer to the economic problems of our farmers.

As an illustration of what is being done in basic agricultural research at the University of Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that one of a series of articles which are appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer Press be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks, and that the article be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration along with consideration of bills to provide for expanded research in the use of agricultural products. These bills, introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, including myself, were introduced in the first session of this Congress, and I hope will be scheduled for committee

consideration before this session adjourns this year.

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

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 12, 1958]

#### SCIENCE IN MINNESOTA—UNIVERSITY STUDIES CORNSTARCH MOLECULES

Cornstarch molecules are getting a close look from scientists doing basic research in the agricultural biochemistry department at the University of Minnesota.

These molecules can't actually be seen, even with a microscope. But scientists do have ways of studying them, in starch as well as in a host of other agricultural products.

W. F. Geddes, head of the agricultural biochemistry department, said such basic investigations make up the major portion of the department's research.

Right now, for example, university biochemists are studying chemical reactions which may lead to development of plastic-type products made from cornstarch. To experiment with these reactions, however, the biochemists must first figure out the structure of many different types of carbohydrates. In this way, basic research gives fundamental information that may aid in practical findings later on.

Carbohydrate research is only one example of basic studies underway in the department of biochemistry. Other research subjects there include:

**Fats and oils:** Biochemists are studying characteristics of fat and how they affect food shortening. They are also attempting to learn what happens to the oil molecule when oil, such as in paint, dries and hardens. This information could be of extreme value to paint manufacturers.

**Nutrition:** Studies are underway to see if there are any as yet unknown growth factors in food. Vitamins were once unknown, but basic research led to their discovery. Biochemists are feeding experimental purified diets of known chemical composition to study processes by which animals and man utilize food. In one phase of the nutrition work, biochemists, in cooperation with the college of veterinary medicine, are looking for the reason why soybean meal extracted by the trichloroethylene process is toxic to certain animals. The fact that soybeans processed this way do have a poisonous effect was proven several years ago, but the actual substance that causes this toxic effect has not been isolated.

**Thyroid gland functioning:** Scientists are searching for more information on how the thyroid gland produces the hormone thyroxine, which is necessary for life in all animals. A recent finding on thyroid-gland activity led to a new and improved diagnostic test for thyroid-gland functioning.

**Legume proteins:** Biochemists are studying the phytoagglutinins in soybeans. Phytoagglutinins are plant proteins which cause red blood cells to group or clump together. Minnesota research in recent years has shown that heat treatment improves the nutritive value of these proteins. Studies now are aimed at finding whether there is any relationship between the clumping characteristic of these proteins and their nutritive value.

**Milk chemistry:** In this project, biochemists are studying the characteristics of proteins and fat in milk. They hope to learn, for example, the effects of heat on coagulation of milk by rennet, an enzyme used in cheesemaking. They are also studying effects of heat on milk salts in coagulation of casein in concentrated milk products. This information may be particularly valuable for the milk industry in developing better manufactured dairy products.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3016. A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates (Rept. No. 1290).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3281. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 in order to provide for loans to colleges and universities for science equipment and facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of professional athletes, an income-tax reduction for depletion of physical resources; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3283. A bill for the relief of Jeanne Lorraine Rognan and the estate of Roy Rognan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3284. A bill for the relief of Cecilla Lal Fook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3285. A bill for the relief of Beatrice A. Barbeau;

S. 3286. A bill for the relief of St. Cecilia's Church, Velva, N. Dak.; and

S. 3287. A bill for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3288. A bill to eliminate the \$500 million limitation in effect with respect to funds that the Secretary of Agriculture may expend in carrying out an acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops, and to provide that not less than \$275 million shall be used in carrying out an acreage reserve program for the 1958 crop of cotton; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3289. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cagnini and Erasmo D'Alba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3290. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 3291. A bill to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3292. A bill for the relief of George S. Zorbalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3293. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for free importation of book bindings and covers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3294. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3295. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SALE OF ELLIS ISLAND, N. Y., TO PERPETUATION OF THE DOORWAY TO FREEDOM, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to cancel the bids on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, and to consecrate the 27½ acres to a far more worthy purpose than simply another Coney Island.

My information is that in a special bidding the General Services Administration was offered \$200,000 by New York parties who propose a recreational development of the island for commercial purposes. I do not think an amusement park is a fitting end for the first piece of American soil on which 15 million Americans first set foot.

Through the years Europeans and others who have sought haven in the land of the free first saw their new homeland from Ellis Island. Fifteen million immigrants, whose children and grandchildren today walk American streets, first trod the soil of those 27½ acres. It is hallowed ground, the spirit of liberty and justice, which is America.

A far better plan for Ellis Island has been proposed by a group of public-spirited citizens in Wisconsin. Some weeks before bids were formally sought, this group in Wisconsin offered the General Services Administration \$100,000 for Ellis Island and made known to the agency the purpose for which they sought the land. The same group entered this offer in a bid under the name of Perpetuation of the Doorway to Freedom, Inc. The announced plan by Perpetuation of the Doorway to Freedom, Inc., was to build a monument on Ellis Island to the American republics as a lasting symbol of the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. It would be smaller than the Statue of Liberty, but no less symbolic. The Statue of Liberty has come to mean freedom to the individual. It was a magnificent gift from the people of France. I see no reason why we should not encourage the American people to build one themselves in honor of another people, particularly when it is designed as a lasting expression of appreciation to the other 20 American republics for the unity which has endured over the years in time of war and peace. The Western Hemisphere is one big fortress against the onslaught of the Old World. It is our strength and our only guaranty that we

shall never face a tyrannical world alone.

It is my opinion such a memorial of hemispheric relations is a real note in our foreign relations. Always our foreign relations have been vested in the hands of a small group of career diplomats at the Department of State. They have not always done the best job. Not always have they had the trust of the public or the Congress. I should like to see wider participation in our foreign relations by the American people.

The people of France gave us the Statue of Liberty and it became our national symbol and a shining beacon in the world. Who knows but what the efforts of those American citizens in Perpetuation of the Doorway to Freedom, Inc., may give the Western Hemisphere no less worthy a symbol and strike the light of a new beacon of fellowship in today's troubled world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received an appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 262), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was received and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine united the Western Hemisphere politically; and

Whereas the American Republics are dependent upon one another economically as well as geographically; and

Whereas the good neighbor policy is an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States; and

Whereas perfect accord and understanding among the American Republics are essential to world peace and brotherhood; and

Whereas some fitting and lasting evidence of the unity of the American Republics would appropriately recognize and perpetuate the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas public spirited citizens of the United States and the other American Republics have evidenced a laudable willingness to build a lasting tribute and memorial to these good neighbors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal property known as Ellis Island in the State of New York containing 27½ acres more or less should be sold at nominal cost to Perpetuation of the Doorway to Freedom, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, so that such corporation can utilize such island as a location for the erection, at no expense to the United States Government, of a monument dedicated to the solidarity of the American Republics.

## AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO LOANS FOR SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide loans to colleges and universities for science equipment and facilities. Although I am a co-sponsor of the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], to implement the recommendations of President Eisenhower, I feel that I must point out that my co-sponsorship on that bill was with the reservation that

it did not contain any provision for college science facilities.

My bill would simply amend the chapter of the National Housing Act which provides for loans to educational institutions for student and faculty housing, and would increase the funds available to the Housing Administrator for purposes of loans to these institutions.

Mr. President, if the Federal Government is to provide some program of scholarships for students of proven ability, then it is incumbent upon us to also provide our institutions of higher education with the means to construct and equip adequate laboratories and science buildings. I have given this problem my careful study and feel that a loan program, such as provided for in my bill, would be the most proper approach. I urge that my proposal be given careful consideration along with the study of the various scholarship programs which have been proposed. We must not disregard the physical needs of colleges and universities if we are to thrust upon them the responsibilities of training students who are eligible for national scholarships.

I might point out, Mr. President, that the College Housing Act provides that in administering college housing loans the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is to consult with the Commissioner of Education. It is proper that this provision also apply to the amendments proposed in my bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3281) to amend the Housing Act of 1950 in order to provide for loans to colleges and universities for science equipment and facilities, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES, RELATING TO DEPLETION OF PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide in the case of professional athletes an income tax deduction for depletion of physical resources. Mr. President, I think it is most timely that such a bill be considered by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3282) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of professional athletes, an income tax deduction for depletion of physical resources, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### APPLICATIONS FOR SOIL BANK BENEFITS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference to the Appropriations

Committee a bill which would provide more money for the soil bank to aid farmers who have made application and who desire to get into the soil bank but who have been turned down by the Department of Agriculture. In South Carolina hundreds of farmers made application. The Agriculture Department stated that applications would be received over a period of 3 weeks. The time for filing applications remained open for only 3 days, and then the opportunity was closed. A great many farmers now desire to get into the soil bank, but cannot do so. It is imperative that we help these farmers. They cannot understand the Government's refusal to help the farmers while it so generously renders aid to foreign governments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3288) to eliminate the \$500 million limitation in effect with respect to funds that the Secretary of Agriculture may expend in carrying out an acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops, and to provide that not less than \$275 million shall be used in carrying out an acreage reserve program for the 1958 crop of cotton, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PROPOSED EXTENSION OF FEDERAL SAFETY INSPECTION PROGRAM TO ALL COAL MINES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3290) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 48 hours, in the hope that other Senators will feel inclined to co-sponsor the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Government figures show that the rate of fatalities in title I mines, or mines with a small number of employees, is three times as high as in other mines. Moreover, the rate has shown a continuing increase for the past 3 years while the rate in federally inspected mines has remained almost constant.

Title I mines produced only about 7 percent of our coal tonnage but accounted for more than a quarter of total mine accidents in 1957. In January of this year alone, 11 of 30 coal mine fatalities occurred in title I mines.

It is evident that Federal inspection would help to save lives.

Federal inspectors would not supplant State inspectors but would work cooperatively, as they now do in inspection of the larger mines.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table comparing fatalities in Title I and Title II mines, based on U. S. Government statistics.

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

*Underground coal mine fatal accident statistics*

	1957		1956		1955	
	Fatalities	Rate	Fatalities	Rate	Fatalities	Rate
Bituminous:						
Title I.....	97	4.24	70	2.95	57	2.41
Title II.....	276	1.17	270	1.17	243	1.00
Anthracite:						
Title I.....	12	8.67	12	7.38	10	6.55
Title II.....	36	1.80	36	1.54	39	1.77
Total:						
Title I.....	109	4.49	82	3.23	67	2.66
Title II.....	312	1.22	306	1.20	282	1.06

1955: 19.2 percent of the total accidents occurred in title I mines.

1956: 21.1 percent of the total accidents occurred in title I mines.

1957: 25.9 percent of the total accidents occurred in title I mines.

NOTE.—The rate is calculated on the basis of per million man-hours of exposure.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES FOR PERSONNEL OF DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3291) to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the REC-

ORD at this point, in explanation of the bill, a letter from the Veterans' Administration to the Vice President, explaining the bill and giving the reasons for the administration's desire to have the bill enacted into law. I ask also that the material attached be printed.

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

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1958.  
Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The primary purpose of the proposed bill is to increase the basic salary rates authorized by title XIV of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (Public Law 85-56), for physicians, dentists, nurses, and certain other personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. The proposed bill would adjust the additional allowance for specialists from 25 percent to 17.5 percent of basic pay and increase by 5 the authorized statutory grades of directors of service or chiefs of division.

Salary rates for Government employees, particularly for those in scientific, professional, and managerial positions, are substantially below the rates for positions of comparable responsibility in similar areas of non-Federal employment. The ever-widening disparity between the pay of the indicated personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery and the net income of private practitioners in the medical and related fields is a marked example of this inequity.

In his annual budget message for the fiscal year 1959, the President indicated that certain revisions are needed in the statutory pay structures for civilian (and military) personnel of the Government in order to retain in the Federal service the highly skilled and able civilian employees who contribute so much to the Nation's strength. In this connection, it may be noted that surveys have disclosed that more than two-thirds of the physicians resigning from the Department of Medicine and Surgery listed "economic causes" as the reason for leaving.

The increases which would be provided by the proposed bill are consistent with the plan for comparable adjustments in the pay of civilian and military personnel of the Federal Government recently outlined to the Congress by the President. It is believed that they would lessen the continuing major problem of recruitment and retention of the physicians, dentists, nurses, and certain other staff personnel necessary to provide a complete medical and hospital service for the care and treatment of sick and disabled veterans.

There is enclosed a comparative chart showing the existing salaries of the professional personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery and the salaries proposed by the draft bill. The adjustment of the additional allowances for certified specialists (from 25 percent to 17.5 percent) provides a relatively smaller increase for specialists in certain grades but will result in an increase in their retirement benefits and will permit progressive advancement with correspondingly orderly salary increments.

It is estimated that the cost of the proposed bill would be approximately \$10,723,000 the first year. There is enclosed a breakdown of such cost, as well as the estimated cost for the second through the fifth year following enactment and the numbers, by groups, of personnel affected.

It is recognized that there is pending before the House of Representatives a bill, H. R.

6719, which is designed, in part, to accomplish a purpose similar to this proposal. However, that bill also contains certain other pay features and organizational changes that are not recommended by the Veterans' Administration at this time.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the proposed legislation be introduced and considered for enactment as soon as possible.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,  
SUMNER G. WHITTIER,  
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,  
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION  
Statutory salaries

Position	Present salary	New proposal	
		Minimum	Maximum
Chief Medical Director.....	\$17,800	\$19,500	-----
Deputy Chief Medical Director.....	16,800	18,500	-----
Assistant Chief Medical Director.....	15,800	17,500	-----
Directors of service.....	13,225 (14,300)	14,500	\$16,600
Director of Nursing Service.....	11,610	13,000	14,700
Deputy Director of Nursing.....	10,320	11,105	12,255
Chief dietitian <sup>1</sup> .....	10,320	13,000	14,700
Chief pharmacist <sup>1</sup> .....	10,320	13,000	14,700
Chief physical therapist <sup>2</sup> .....	10,320	11,105	12,255
Chief occupational therapist <sup>2</sup> .....	10,320	11,105	12,255

<sup>1</sup> Other directors of service with comparable positions in Department of Medicine and Surgery, central office, Washington, D. C., have been allocated grade 15 positions based on classification standards for these positions such as Director, Social Service; and Director, Special Services.

<sup>2</sup> Do not serve as director of service.

5-year cost analysis, increased cost of provisions of proposed bill over salaries of affected personnel, June 30, 1957

Type of personnel	Year in effect					Approximate numbers FT personnel
	1st	2d	3d	4th	5th	
Total.....	\$10,723,000	\$10,884,000	\$11,037,000	\$11,178,000	\$11,317,000	19,753
Statutory.....	153,000	155,000	158,000	158,000	158,000	41
Physicians.....	4,515,000	4,583,000	4,647,000	4,707,000	4,763,000	4,576
Dentists.....	721,000	732,000	742,000	752,000	761,000	757
Nurses.....	5,384,000	5,414,000	5,490,000	5,561,000	5,628,000	14,379

RESEARCH IN FIELD OF METEOROLOGY—INSTALLATION OF TELEPHONES IN CERTAIN RESIDENCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose of and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3294) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred

Salaries for physicians, dentists

Grade	Basic salary scales (noncertified)			
	Present		Proposed	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Chief.....	\$11,610	\$12,685	\$13,000	\$14,700
Senior.....	10,320	11,395	11,105	12,255
Intermediate.....	8,990	10,065	9,675	10,825
Full.....	7,570	8,645	8,150	9,300
Associate.....	6,390	7,465	6,880	8,030
Junior.....	5,915	6,720	6,270	7,140

Grade	Salary scales of certified specialists			
	Present 25-percent specialty allowance		Proposed 17.5-percent specialty allowance	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Chief.....	\$13,760	\$13,760	\$15,275	\$16,000
Senior.....	12,900	13,760	13,048	14,400
Intermediate.....	11,238	12,581	11,368	12,719
Full.....	9,463	10,806	9,576	10,928

Salaries for nurses

Grades	Present salaries		Proposed salaries	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Junior.....	\$4,025	\$4,885	\$4,325	\$5,195
Associate.....	4,730	5,590	5,270	6,140
Full.....	5,440	6,250	5,770	6,640
Senior.....	6,390	7,465	6,880	8,030
Assistant Director.....	7,570	8,645	8,150	9,300

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY AND TO AUTHORIZE INSTALLATION OF GOVERNMENT TELEPHONES IN CERTAIN PRIVATE RESIDENCES

Section 1 of this proposed legislation would clarify the authority of the Department to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields. At present the only specific authority for entering into such projects is contained in Section 802 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 603), which authorizes the Department to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies for the purpose of increasing the safety and efficiency of air navigation.

As a result, the Department, rather than relying upon inherent authority to enter into research contracts, places the contracts on the basis that they relate to civil aviation. It would appear to be preferable to recognize

the value of research programs in the entire field of meteorology by removing this artificial limitation on such contracts.

In many cases the most efficient method of accomplishing desired research in a particular area of meteorological science is to have all or part of the project contracted out to private agencies, such as universities, in order that their highly specialized research facilities can be utilized. If the Department were to attempt to perform all such research at its own facilities with its own personnel, substantial temporary increases in both facilities and personnel would be required. Research contracts make available the desired facilities and experienced personnel at far less cost to the Government. Enactment of the proposed legislation would constitute recognition of the value of the use of research contracts in all fields of meteorology.

Moreover, it is believed that the enactment of specific legislation authorizing such contracts would eliminate possible reluctance on the part of contractors to undertake projects not obviously related to aviation meteorology and would stimulate the interest of private organizations in securing such contracts.

Section 2 of this proposed legislation would authorize the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences for use as the Chief of Bureau may direct in carrying into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States, its Territories, and possessions. The telephone installations will be made in cases where frequent need can be shown to exist, or isolated location prevents use of public utility communication facilities to contact meteorological personnel for reports of severe storms, floods, etc., and the dissemination of emergency weather warnings, etc.

At many semi-isolated or isolated locations, Weather Bureau field facilities are not open 24 hours daily, and at these locations field employees have little or no requirements for private telephones in their residences which are often Government-owned. In cases where special weather observations are urgently needed from these stations after normal office hours, or it is urgent that storm warnings or advice be disseminated, there are no telephone facilities now available by which field personnel can be contacted and required reports obtained, or warnings issued. The installation of telephone services in private residences in these instances will insure that emergency meteorological services are available at all locations.

Section 1 of this legislation is merely clarifying in nature and no increase in expenditures would be involved.

Section 2 would involve an estimated expenditure of \$8,000 per annum from base appropriation.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WATKINS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3088) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### 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. KEFAUVER:

An address entitled "The Space Age's Challenge to Engineers," prepared for delivery before Chattanooga Engineers Club.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement by him and explanatory tables on the National Wool Act of 1954.

By Mr. CURTIS:

Statement by him on National Beauty Salon Week.

By Mr. PROXMIER:

Statement prepared by him on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence.

#### IMPORTANCE OF CORRECT ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am just as deeply concerned as any other Member of this body over the latest official reports which indicate a sharp rise in unemployment during the last month. At the same time, I share the feeling which the New York Times expressed editorially on last Friday; namely, that "correct assessment of our economic situation is too important to be left to those who are politically motivated."

As the editorial pointed out, the reports offer no justification for panic—our economy survived situations which were relatively worse, in 1949-50, and again in 1953-54, without suffering anything remotely approaching catastrophe. Our duty is to maintain intelligent concern and watchfulness, but to refrain from political attempts to cultivate national alarm.

In view of the loud cries of doom and the hysterical attacks on the administration's economic policies which have been voiced in the last few days, I believe the New York Times recently performed a valuable public service by helping to place the situation in its true perspective. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the lucid editorial entitled "Unemployment Perspective," which appeared in the February 14 issue of the New York Times, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

#### UNEMPLOYMENT PERSPECTIVE

The latest Federal data on unemployment have aroused a political storm in Washington. In this Congressional election year it

is understandable that the opposition party should scent the possibility of victory in November by confronting the voters with a bleak economic picture, responsibility for which will be put on the Eisenhower administration. However, correct assessment of our economic situation is too important to be left to those who are politically motivated. Moreover, the effort to draw the darkest possible conclusions from present data holds the serious danger of encouraging a climate of economic defeatism which could in turn become a threatening psychological factor hindering improvement. So let us seek a balanced view.

There are 3 disturbing elements in the January report. The increase of unemployment from December to January, 1,120,000 persons, was the largest since 1941. The total number of unemployed reported, 4,494,000 persons, was the largest since the peak of the 1949-50 recession. The number of workers working fewer than 35 hours a week last month was at a post-World War II high of 2 million.

Taken by themselves, however, even those disturbing elements do not provide justification for panic-mongering, since there are also important reassuring elements in the picture. Employment last month was 62,233,000 persons, within a small fraction of 1 percent of the same figure a year ago, when pessimistic forecasts such as we have been hearing recently were conspicuously absent.

Again taking account of seasonal fluctuation, unemployment last month, as a percentage of the total labor force, was smaller than at the peak of either the 1949-50 or 1953-54 recessions. This last point is particularly important, because many who are now drawing the darkest conclusions from the present figures forget that these figures must be measured against the substantially greater labor force and greater employment we have now. Finally, we are moving toward a period of the year when seasonal forces will tend to raise employment and lower unemployment, rather than the reverse, as in the present, comparison between December 1957, and January 1958.

There is no blinking the fact that for the individuals and families involved unemployment means both material and spiritual suffering. Panic and dismay in an individual who loses his job are understandable. But from the point of view of the national economy at the present time, the available data give no justification for panic, since we have been in relatively worse situations earlier in the post-war period without suffering anything remotely approaching catastrophe.

What is justified in the present situation is intelligent concern and careful watchfulness, but neither of these resembles politically motivated efforts to cultivate hysteria.

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was a great surprise and disappointment to all of us to hear that our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], will not run for reelection next fall. Senator BYRD has won such a high place in the hearts of all of us, on both sides of the aisle, that it is hard to think of this great body without his active participation. We especially appreciate the wonderful work he has done for the Senate in watching over the fiscal operations of the Government.

During the years of my service here, I have come to know HARRY BYRD intimately. I have always felt that he would raise the voice of warning whenever the Congress might go too far in the direction of Federal spending.

However, aside from his great contribution in the field of legislation, his special contribution stems from the fact that he is HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, a great national figure and a great voice in this distinguished body. He will be sorely missed. I regret that he will not be here in future years, to help guide the thinking of the United States Senate.

Mrs. Smith and I join in expressing our regrets. It is our sincere hope that Mrs. Byrd will soon be restored to her full health and strength, so that she and Senator BYRD together can enjoy the beauties of Virginia, which they love so ardently.

#### BUNGLING OF THE COTTON ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM OF THE SOIL BANK FOR 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, what little faith the farmers of Georgia might have had in the Department of Agriculture has been destroyed by the arrogant deceit and stupid bungling which have marked the sign-up for participation in the cotton acreage reserve of the soil bank for 1958.

Learning nothing from last year's unfortunate experience, the Department again this year proceeded to distribute soil-bank benefits on a first-come-first-served basis—a practice which, it goes without saying, is totally contrary to the legislative intent and spirit of the law, to say nothing of the fundamental premise of equal treatment to all under all governmental programs.

The sign-up period was announced as extending from January 13 through March 7; but after only 4 days it was arbitrarily terminated when what should have been obvious all along became painfully apparent—that on a first-come-first-served basis, there would not be enough funds to permit every interested farmer to have maximum participation in the soil bank.

This meant that those who were hardy enough to stand in line all night—and fortunate enough to arrange their affairs so that they could—were to receive the benefits, while those who had to milk the cows and do the chores before coming to town were left "holding the bag." It also meant that farmers who left the sign-up lines in good faith, at the request of local ASC officials who gave them numbers and told them there was no urgency about signing up, also were "left out in the cold."

It was at that time that I filed with Secretary Benson a vigorous protest about this shortsighted and unfair action, and appealed to him to take prompt steps to assure equal treatment to all farmers in the distribution of soil-bank benefits. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my telegram to Mr. Benson be printed herewith in the RECORD, as a portion of my remarks.

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

HON. EZRA T. BENSON,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.:

Georgia cotton farmers are angered and frustrated over the action of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture in halting prior to the March 7 closing date the signing up of cotton land for inclusion in the acreage reserve of the soil bank for 1958. Reports from Georgia cotton counties tell of block-long lines of farmers waiting overnight to qualify for participation only to be turned away due to inability of local ASC officers to process the multitude of requests. Those who in good faith left their places in line at request of local ASC officials to return at a later date now find their participation foreclosed by USDA order. This action which has its basis in the ceiling fixed by the Department of Agriculture on funds to be allocated to the cotton-acreage reserve is, in my opinion, contrary both to the spirit of the soil-bank law and the American concept of equal treatment to all under the law. The action again points up the fact that the Southeastern States are not being allotted their proportionate share of soil-bank funds. It had been my hope that, as a result of last year's unfortunate experience, the Department of Agriculture would not again seek to distribute soil-bank benefits on a first-come-first-served basis which results in unequal treatment. I do earnestly urge the taking of prompt steps to assure equal treatment of all farmers in the distribution of soil-bank benefits and to provide for the States of the Southeast their proportionate share of soil-bank funds.

I shall be grateful for a report as to the action you contemplate.

Regards.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in reply to this and other protests, the Department on January 29 extended the sign-up period until February 20; but, instead of taking bold action to assure equal treatment in the distribution of benefits, the Department passed the "buck" to the State ASC committees.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter which I received from Assistant Secretary Marvin L. McLain, along with the Department news release announcing this decision, also be printed herewith in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1958.  
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: This is in reply to your telegram of January 20, 1958, regarding farmers who could not participate in the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program of the soil bank.

The period for farmers to sign agreements to place cotton acreage in the 1958 acreage reserve program was opened on January 13. Congress appropriated \$500 million for the 1958 acreage reserve program for cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The Department allocated \$180 million of this amount for cotton. The sign-up was opened to farmers on a first-come first-served basis. No allocations were made initially to States or counties to limit participation. Furthermore, no maximum farm limits were established. The sign-up period was opened without limitations on the basis of our estimate that the \$180 million available for cotton would be sufficient to cover the acreages offered by cotton farmers.

On January 17, 4 days after the opening of the sign-up period, it was necessary to temporarily suspend the sign-up for cotton. This action was taken because of the unexpectedly heavy sign-up during the first few days.

Enclosed are copies of the Department's announcement, dated January 29. This an-

nouncement explains the present situation and the methods that may be used by State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees in proceeding with the approval of agreements with farmers under the acreage reserve program.

The \$180 million available for the 1958 acreage reserve program will result in the removal of approximately 3.4 million acres from cotton production in 1958. It is now evident that this will not permit maximum participation on the part of all farmers who may desire to place acreage in the program.

Your interest in the soil bank program is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN L. MCLAIN,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### ASC COMMITTEES WILL DETERMINE METHOD FOR ALLOCATING ACREAGE RESERVE FUNDS TO FARMERS

State agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) committees have been authorized to determine the method to be followed in each State in making allocations of available acreage reserve funds to individual farmers, when it is necessary to put a limit on participation by those who wish to take part in the program, the United States Department of Agriculture announced today.

As previously announced, greater than expected desire of producers to participate in the program made it necessary to establish a fund allocation plan. Funds available nationally for each of the five basic crops involved have been allocated to States. Each State's funds are then allocated to counties. Finally, the county allocations must be made available to individual farmers.

Because participation interest and fund conditions vary widely by States, and among eligible crops within States, Department officials felt that it was advisable to provide for local choice in assuring the best possible distribution of available funds to farmers who want to participate.

State ASC committees may choose to distribute their allocated funds to farmers on the basis of "first come first served," with agreements approved in the order they were filed. On the other hand, they may choose to make the distribution on the basis of a farm acreage limitation, in which a maximum number of acres or a maximum percentage of the farm's acreage allotment would be accepted.

In cases where applications for Acreage Reserve agreements already filed with the ASC county committee would call for payments exceeding the county allocation, one of these two methods would be used to adjust within available funds. In cases where agreements filed call for payments within the allocation of the funds available, but there are indications that the filing of additional agreements might exceed the limit, one of the two distribution methods would be used to keep participation within the county limit of funds for each crop which is included in the acreage reserve program.

Where it is determined that uncommitted funds are available, ASC committees will accept additional acreage reserve agreements within the limits of funds available. If more farmers wish to take part in the program than can be included within fund limits, the names of such farmers will be listed in order on special registers. If later reallocation of funds permits, as many as possible of these farmers will be authorized to file agreements.

Mr. TALMADGE. As of the time of that action there were 11,332 cotton farmers in Georgia on the waiting list for soil bank participation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed herewith in the RECORD a copy of the telegram which I

received from the Georgia State ASC administrative officer setting forth those figures.

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

ATHENS, GA., January 28, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

For your information, following is status of 1958 acreage reserve program as of January 24:

Cotton: State allocation \$17,205,700. Signed through cutoff date 33,279 farms for \$21,765,462. On waiting list 11,332 farms for \$5,314,421. Total farms 44,611. Total \$27,079,883.

Flue-cured tobacco: State allocation \$2,078,600. Signed through cutoff date 6,195 farms for \$2,716,094. On waiting list 209 farms for \$85,008. Total farms 6,404. Total \$2,801,102.

Corn: State allocation \$1,370,600. Signed through cutoff date 5,710 farms for \$2,413,903. On waiting list 599 farms for \$240,841. Total farms 6,309. Total \$2,654,745.

JOHN F. BRADLEY,  
State Administrative Officer.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, since it was apparent that the only result of the extended signup period without a clear-cut directive from the Department of Agriculture would be to increase the waiting list, I appealed to the Georgia State ASC Committee to make a pro rata distribution of Georgia's share of cotton soil bank acreage reserve funds.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD herewith a copy of the telegram which I sent to Hon. John F. Bradley, administrative officer of the Georgia State ASC Committee.

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

HON. JOHN F. BRADLEY,  
Administrative Officer, State ASC Committee,  
Old Post Office Building,  
Athens, Ga.:

Many Georgia cotton farmers are communicating to me their great dissatisfaction with the proposed distribution of soil-bank acreage-reserve benefits on a first-come-first served basis. Inasmuch as the theory of all governmental programs is equal treatment to all, the inequity of such an arrangement is obvious. It is particularly unfair in this instance in view of the fact that many farmers who now find there are no funds for benefits for them left the sign-up lines in good faith at the request of local ASC officials who gave them numbers and told them there was no urgency about signing up. The only fair and equitable way in which this dilemma can be resolved is to distribute Georgia's share of allocated soil-bank acreage-reserve benefits on a pro rata basis and, since the Department of Agriculture has left to the discretion of State ASC committees the determination of whether distribution shall be first come, first served or pro rata, I appeal to you and the Georgia committee, in the name of equal treatment for all Georgia cotton farmers, to make a pro rata distribution of Georgia's share of cotton soil-bank acreage-reserve funds. An announcement by you to that effect will be good news not only to Georgia cotton farmers but also to all taxpayers who believe in fair and equal treatment for all. I would be deeply grateful for a report as to the decision of the Georgia ASC Committee in this connection. Regards.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have not yet received a reply from Mr. Bradley, and I wish to renew at this time my plea that he and the Georgia State ASC Committee—in the name of equal treatment for all Georgia cotton farmers—make a pro rata distribution of soil bank benefits in Georgia.

It is only through a pro rata distribution, Mr. President, that the ends of justice can be served. Such should be the rule throughout the Nation and, in keeping with the true spirit of the American concept of equal treatment for all men, I call on the Department of Agriculture to act to restore the faith of the farmers of Georgia and all other States by so decreeing.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that hindsight will accomplish for the Department of Agriculture what foresight most assuredly did not do.

I regret that I have to agree, Mr. President, with the recent editorial of the Atlanta Constitution which stated:

Unfortunately, this administration shows a remarkable dearth of both when it comes to farm matters.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed herewith at the conclusion of my remarks a representative compilation of the protests which I have received from the farmers of Georgia about the unfairness of present Department of Agriculture cotton soil bank policies.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE  
ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,  
February 16, 1958.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We, the cotton farmers of Morgan County, are in the midst of the greatest turmoil since reconstruction days due to insufficient soil-bank funds that are available to only half of the cotton farmers who want to participate in the program—other half being left out because of not applying first. We have utmost confidence in you and we urge you to fight for additional funds to complete the program or revise it so all farmers can participate equally.

Best regards,

HOWARD TAMPLIN,  
Representative, Morgan County.

MATTHEWS, GA., February 10, 1958.  
Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to have more money appropriated for the cotton reserve retirement program. Under the present set-up of first come first served, farmers who waited to sign up have been left out all together. It is unfair to some to get in on the program to the limit and others to be left out entirely.

BARROW & PRESCOTT,  
By H. C. BARROW AND  
E. N. PRESCOTT.

WRENS, GA.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

Do what you can to get more money appropriated for the cotton reserve program. The ruling of the State board—first come, first served—will leave a lot of farmers who have signed up for the reserve program without any payment at all.

J. E. (Doc) BARROW.

MATTHEWS, GA., February 10, 1958.  
HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Senator From Georgia,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HERMAN:

(Letter following telegram.)

The State Board of ASC sent out notices to the effect that farmers had until the 7th of March to sign up for cotton reserve retirement program. I was there on Monday morning, the first day for signing up, and there were lines 200 yards each way pushing and shoving. I turned around and came home and went back in a few days and they had stopped taking applications.

Under the present set-up of first come, first served at least 30 percent of the farmers wanting to take part in the program in Jefferson County will not be able to put any of their acreage in the program. All of them are angry about it and feel that there is absolutely nothing fair about a first come, first served program when notices were made that farmers had until March 7 to sign up. If it is not possible to have additional funds appropriated it is felt that a pro-rating system should be used so that all who want to take part in the program can at least have some of their acreage in the program. Many farmers have released much of their labor expecting to put their cotton acreage in the program.

I realize that it would require some extra work on the part of the State board and the local committee to figure the program on a pro-rata basis, but I feel that it is better for these persons, already on the payroll, to put out a little extra effort than to have many of the farmers cut out of the program altogether.

A large majority of the farmers who would benefit by the first come, first served basis feel that this basis is not fair and would like to see it put on a pro-rata basis in fairness to the other farmers. It seems that the \$3,000 boys are in solid and the small farmers are being cut out.

I talked with Mr. Morgan, who I understand is chairman of the State board, and he told me that there is nothing he can do, or the Senators or Congressmen can do, about the first come, first served ruling and that the only alternative is for Congress to appropriate more money.

HERMAN, the men out here who have always supported you and your father have asked me to contact you about this and I feel that I am speaking the sentiments of 90 percent of the farmers in this area. I realize you are busy, but if there is anything you can do to help this situation all of us would appreciate it.

Yours very truly,

Doc Barrow,  
J. E. (Doc) BARROW.

SYLVESTER, GA., February 11, 1958.  
Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of Worth County very much disturbed over distribution of acreage reserve funds. There have been many to sign up that shall be left out according to USDA orders to the local ASC offices.

We call your attention to this fact, believing you have the interest of farmers in this section at heart. As you know, we can't call on Mr. Benson as he has proven farmers can find no haven of rest with him.

We want to express our thanks to you for your past favors to farmers in this section.

If we can assist you in any capacity, we stand ready.

WORTH COUNTY FARM BUREAU,  
A. A. HICKS, President.

CAMILLA, GA., February 11, 1958.  
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you use all your influence to make funds available to all those wishing to

participate in the acreage reserve program. Farm sentiment in this area is very strong for same.

Respectfully yours,  
JOHN C. AND JOE W. BUTLER.

SYLVANIA, GA., February 11, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Screven County ASC office opened Monday 10th taking first-come, first-served in soil-bank cotton and corn program. Approximately 35 percent will be taken, leaving out approximately 65 percent.

We are much dissatisfied with this, and we ask that you assist us in protesting this with all power possible.

L. L. EVANS,  
President, Newington Lions Club.

C. C. POYTRESS,  
Manager, Local Ginnery and Fertilizer Co.

WM. H. ROBBINS,  
Newington-Oliver Chapter, Farm Bureau.

HORACE WELLS,  
President, Bank of Newington.

SANDERSVILLE, GA., January 17, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers aroused over not taking applications for soil-bank payments on cotton. Your influence in reopening this program greatly appreciated.

S. G. MERCER,  
County Agent, Washington County.

CARROLLTON, GA., February 4, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

Carroll County farmers are concerned with the outcome of the 1958 cotton-acreage reserve of the soil bank. Farmers were advised that the sign-up would start without a county allocation of funds and that farmers would have from January 13 to March 7 to sign agreements. County ASC offices were advised to stop taking agreements as of the close of January 16.

This cutoff caught many farmers who had planned to place their cotton in the acreage reserve for 1958.

The economy of many Carroll County farmers will be drastically lowered if they are not able to get their cotton allotments in the soil bank, having made their farm plans to this effect.

Due to the manner in which the USDA has handled this program, we feel that Congress should make available sufficient funds to take care of all farmers who wish to place cotton in the acreage reserve for 1958.

We appreciate your interest in agriculture and the welfare of Georgia farmers.

HAROLD WALLIS,  
President, Carroll County Farm Bureau.

FRANKLIN, GA., January 30, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

All farmers who desire should be allowed to participate in renting cotton acreage rather than first come first served basis. Farmers were notified by letter that they had until March 7 to sign.

POWERS GOODSON.

MILLEN, GA., January 28, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

Soil-bank program causing farmers much trouble. Farmers don't know what action to take with all the confusion. They are not happy with changing of ruling of Department. Try to get additional appropriation to carry on original program of \$3,000 per farm with sign-up period January 13—March 7. Farmers losing faith in ASC program

with so many changes of rulings. Your immediate attention will be appreciated.

GARNETT NEWTON,  
President, Jenkins County Farm Bureau.

LOUISVILLE, GA., February 12, 1958.

Senator H. E. TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The ASC office told us farmers not to stampede them again like we did last year (1957) that we had up until March 7 to get our cotton land in the acreage reserve, etc. Now the farmer that had no faith in the words of the Agriculture Department are reaping the benefits for their mistrust in our Government and its word. A great number of our healthy farmers got in line in front of our ASC office and stayed there until they arrived at the sign-up desk sometime between 8 a. m., Monday, January 13, 1958, up to 5 p. m. that day. Since my health isn't too good and my age is stacked against me I didn't get to the desk until Tuesday, January 14, 1958. Now I am told I am out of luck because the money all gone, beside you should have any anyway for having faith in your Government, that March 7 talk was all bunk, etc. There just isn't any way for a farmer at this date to get enough seed, fertilizer, and labor to make a cotton crop. The ones that depended on the acreage reserve program are out of luck and there won't be any money to pay the mortgage coming due this fall. I know that you are against all this mess and I do hope you can do something about it.

Sincerely,

GALE S. DAVIS.

DULUTH, GA., February 13, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Farmer disappointed in way soil bank is handled. More money needed for all to participate.

G. W. FINDLEY,  
ROY ECHOLS.

GIBSON, GA., February 13, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

We are very displeased with way the Department of Agriculture is handling the money for the cotton acreage reserve. Here in our county the allocation will pay only half the farmers who signed up to rent. The Department is handling these available funds on a first come, first served basis. Before the sign-up period we were not informed by the Department that it would be handled in this manner. We understand that funds are still available in other areas. If this is to be handled on a first come, first served basis then we feel that we should be paid because we signed during the designated period that the Department would accept cotton rental agreement. We would appreciate your attention to this matter and hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

BENNETT A. HART,  
President,

OLIVER HAWKINS,  
Secretary,

Glascok County Farm Bureau.

EDISON, GA., February 11, 1958.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: Today more than half of the Calhoun County cotton farmers who signed up 1958 cotton acreage reserve contracts are being notified that the county committee will not be able to approve their contracts.

This does not mean necessarily that more than half the cotton acreage offered was not approved since many of the first to sign up had very large cotton allotments and some had as many as four work sheets.

The State committee had the choice of two methods: (1) With no maximum farm acreage limitations, and (2) with maximum farm limitations in effect. It chose the first which is manifestly unfair to the majority of cotton farmers.

The Washington ASC office should have given priority to farmers who signed 1957 cotton acreage reserve contracts. Many are excluded.

I suggest you strive to require all county ASC offices to display for 30 days and make available to the press a list of approved 1958 cotton acreage reserve contracts giving (1) order in which contract applied for, (2) farmer's name (or names if one person in his turn at the county ASC office was allowed to sign contracts on worksheets in the names of more than one person), (3) work sheet numbers, and (4) amount of money to be paid farmer under each approved contract.

Very truly yours,

L. V. DAVIS.

IIA FARM BUREAU,  
Ila, Ga., February 10, 1958.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Be it resolved that the farmers of Ila Farm Bureau passed a motion that you be informed as to our plight in this County of Madison and in the 10th Congressional District, that we go on record asking you to help get more appropriations to finance the acreage reserve program.

As it now stands, there are 1,545 farms in the county. Out of this 524 farms are signed up and there are 501 farmers wanting to put their cotton in, but due to limited funds are not able to do so. These 500 farmers signed in good faith and thought funds would be available but now find that the facts were misconstrued and the sign-up was cut off leaving some in dire need. Due to these reasons of planning their operation for 1958 and now finding themselves without seed due to weather conditions last fall, labor has decreased, certified seed not available to plant, credit not available due to debts from bad crop, also some farmers have part-time jobs due to the help from Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and therefore cannot revise their plans to plant cotton.

So if there is any chance at all that you can use your influence to get added funds to help us we would greatly appreciate it. In our fair State, there is 13 percent of us farming but 55 percent are dependent on farming so I believe you will agree that you aren't dealing with a minority but something vital to our agriculture economy and to the best interest of our State. I hope that you study the farm program carefully and vote and work for more appropriations for acreage reserve program this year and then help solve the dilemma that we are in as farmers.

I would like to hear from you as to your vote and work in this legislature. Thanking you in advance for your help and cooperation in this matter we are,

Sincerely yours,

W. H. O'KELLY,  
President.

BUFORD G. CAREY,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

Attention: Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
Congressman PAUL BROWN.

IDEAL, GA., February 11, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HERMAN: Myself and others are left out in the cold so far it seems as the 1958 cotton soil bank is concerned. My health is bad, I cannot mingle into large crowd such as was signing up in my county, Macon County, January 13, 1958, so in 3 or 4 days I go down to sign my cotton in soil bank, and was closed. They tell us we had until March 7, 1958, so as far as I know just a few farmers in Macon County get all the soil-bank money and rest of us stays out. This

first come, first served is not fair; I think it should be handled on acres basis. We thank you for what you have already done, and hope you can get this straightened out to help all us farmers.

Your friend,

PAUL CROMER.

MONROE, GA., February 12, 1958.

The Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALMADGE: Notice was received by me yesterday, that the soil-bank cotton payments were being cut off in Walton County after the first 454 contracts are paid. This is on the first-come, first-served basis. This does not mean that the first 454 people that signed will be paid, since some of the farmers signing have as many as 2 or 3 contracts covering their farms.

When the Department of Agriculture issues a statement, giving a person a specified time in which to sign up for a program, this should be done and if funds are not available, they should be prorated among those signing up rather than to those fortunate enough to sign first.

Several things prevented me from being one of the first to sign for this program. The main thing being the fact that I had been sick and it would have been impossible for me to stand outside in line on that cold, damp morning and furthermore there had been nothing mentioned about first come, first served.

Due to the fact that tenants have been leaving the farms in steady streams for the past several years due to the fact that they can get regular work without waiting from year to year for a crop income, I have lost all of my tenants and the soil-bank income was going to be my only means for meeting farm obligations such as taxes, insurance, etc.

If this situation were to happen in Russia it would be possibly considered as normal and no more than was expected, but, in this great country of ours, when the farmer, the backbone of the Nation is stomped, kicked, and pushed around by the United States Department of Agriculture some drastic action should be taken.

As your friend and loyal supporter, I am asking that you do everything in your power to see that this situation is corrected.

Yours truly,

EARL AYCOCK, JR.

HARRIS COUNTY OFFICE,  
Hamilton, Ga., February 7, 1958.  
STATE ASC COMMITTEE,  
Athens, Ga.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned members of the Harris County ASC committee strenuously object to the way in which the acreage reserve program has been handled so far.

The county office had information from the State office that the producers had from January 13 through March 7, to place their acreage in acreage reserve. After four days from the beginning of this program we were notified not to take any more applications, but to place names of farmers who came to the county office after that date on a Register of Agreements—No Funds Available.

Since the notice sent out gave producers through March 7 to comply, we hope and trust that whatever allocation comes to this county will be prorated and not paid on a first-come, first-served basis. We feel that all farmers who live up to the agreement by coming to the office within the above specified time should have equal treatment.

Since this letter was sent out, you have changed the closing date to February 20, but we cannot see where this will help one bit if you operate on a first-come, first-served basis.

When we send out information from this county office complying with instructions

from the State office, our farmers expect us to live up to what we say, and we in turn expect the State office to do the same.

Trusting you will give this immediate attention, and, if possible, give each cotton farmer in this county a fair deal.

Yours very truly,

B. W. WILLIAMS, Chairman,  
ELLIS M. STOREY, Vice Chairman,  
FELTON CHAMPION, Member.

FARRAR, GA., February 7, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Jasper County Farm Bureau at its February meeting discussed several ways in which adjustments might be made in the cotton acreage reserve soil bank program. After full discussion, a motion was made and unanimously voted that the Government should pay in full for the cotton soil bank acreage that is signed up and for those acres requested after the notice was given to the administrative officers to stop signing contracts for cotton acres into the soil bank.

The farmers of the farm bureau discussed the many disadvantages that would arise if the Government did not keep its promise of last fall of paying the farmers for putting their cotton acreage allotment into the soil bank up to \$3,000 per farmer.

We are asking you to do whatever you can to get full amount of payments for all farmers according to the promise made by the Department last fall.

With best wishes and kindest regards,

Respectfully yours,

SAM DYKES,  
President, Jasper County Farm Bureau.

JOE WHITE INSURANCE AGENCY,  
Canon, Ga., February 8, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HERMAN: We are writing you to use all your influence that you can in having the Agriculture Department do something about the cotton rental program. Many of our farmers have been really put out by the dillydallying and indecisiveness of the Agriculture Department, regarding this program.

It was the understanding of the farmers that they would have from January 13 to March 7 to sign up for this program, they were then informed a few days after January 13 that no more applications would be accepted, then the Department began putting the names of the farmers on a tentative list to sign up later, now they have been informed that the closing date for signing up would be February 20; however, when the farmers go to sign up they are informed that this notice does not mean anything, even though they received this notice this past week; one of these notices is enclosed.

Many of our farmers have made arrangements to rent under this program, and are now being denied, it is certainly confusing. They have disposed of livestock, tenants have left the farm, and arrangements have not been made to farm, this will completely demoralize the farming industry in this part of the State.

I have not seen the farmers of this section so disgruntled and disheartened since 1932. There was no indication of a first come, first served basis when the program was first put before the public for this year. It was understood that everyone would be able to get in on the program.

If there is anything that you and Senator Russell can do in this matter, it will be greatly appreciated by the writers of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

JOE F. WHITE,  
KING S. ROPER,  
CARL H. BOWERS.

CARNESVILLE, GA., February 3, 1958.

To All Cotton Producers:

This is to advise that the closing date for taking applications for cotton-acreage reserve (soil bank) has been revised from March 7, to February 20, 1958.

Please bear in mind the closing date is now February 20, 1958.

CLARENCE L. PAUL,  
County Office Manager,  
Franklin ASC County Committee.

POMONA PRODUCTS CO.,  
Griffin, Ga., February 10, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE TALMADGE: Doubtless by now, you have heard, and will continue to hear, a wall from farmers who were denied the facilities of the soil bank as far as their cotton allotments are concerned. Just this morning the local ASC office tells me that it is now a first-come, first-served basis. This is absolutely contrary to what I and other farmers were told. We were told that we had until March 7, 1958, to place our cotton in the soil bank. On this basis I placed my entire farm in the soil bank. The acreage-reserve phase of the program has been signed by me and accepted by the local ASC office. When these papers were signed by me I was assured that my cotton would be accepted and there was no hurry. In fact, several times while the acreage-reserve papers were being made up, I called them and inquired about the cotton phase of the program. They informed me there was no hurry and I could wait and sign both the acreage reserve and cotton papers at the same time.

It is a known fact that southern agriculture has suffered while other farming regions have been favored at the expense of the South through the policies of the USDA and for this reason I would like to see the entire USDA funds cut until the USDA would treat the South fairly—not favorably, but fairly.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. RITCHEY.

KAY NURSERIES,  
Royston, Ga., January 18, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Senator from Georgia,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: To a man who understands the problems of farmers as well as you, I feel that just a few lines to state the nature of our problem will be all that is necessary.

Last year, you remember, those who wished a cotton soil-bank contract and failed to buck the line on opening day were seemingly left out.

This year they told us the signup date was January 13 to March 7 and we were led to believe that all who wished a contract would be taken care of without the rush of last year.

On last Thursday, January 16, the ASC office was instructed to cease taking contracts. This left many farmers, who had planned for months to put their cotton acreage in the soil bank, out.

I know you can see the injustice of this and that we have count on you seeing that all farmers are justly treated.

If we had been told several months ago that there would be no cotton soil-bank program, we could have made other plans. But, to tell one farmer that he can put all his cotton land in the soil bank and another that he is refused is not justice.

If all who wish are allowed to soil bank their cotton acreage, we may be able to shrink the stockpile by next year so that the soil-bank plan will not be necessary.

I know that you and Congressman PAUL BROWN as well as our other Georgia Senator

and Representatives will do what you can to see that all farmers are dealt alike.

Thanking you for this and your many past favors,

I am,

Yours very truly,

T. H. KAY,  
Chairman, Legislative Committee,  
Vanna Farm Bureau.

EASTMAN, Ga., January 31, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: The soil-bank program has been administered very poorly as far as the farmers of this section are concerned.

This county, like many others, had more people to sign up for the cotton acreage allotment than money was allotted to pay off. The farmers are still coming in and signing the waiting list, hoping that they might get on and be permitted to place their cotton in the soil bank.

Since Mr. Benson and his department issued public statements that farmers had until March 7 to sign up, and then a few days later called a halt to the signing up was most unfair.

It is the wish of this County Farm Bureau that you will make every effort to have enough money transferred from some other department to this soil-bank department to cover the commitments which Mr. Benson and his associates have promoted.

Thanking you for giving this your immediate attention, and with kind regards, I am,

Yours truly,

D. C. PIERCE,  
President, Dodge County Farm Bureau.

GARDEN CENTER EVERGREEN  
LANDSCAPE SERVICE,  
Athens, Ga., January 30, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel sure you are disturbed by the handling of the soil-bank program this year.

The dates for signing up for putting cotton acreage in the soil-bank were announced publicly, allowing adequate time for all farm owners to sign up. Then, after only a few days no more applications were taken. This was many days before the expiration of the announced sign-up time.

Farmers who rushed to sign up the first 2 or 3 days were allowed to sign up. Others, who because of the announced time limit, did not sign up the first few days, were not allowed to sign. This seems very unfair.

I have talked with many people about this and without exception the feeling is that this was not handled on a fair basis and that applicants who were not allowed to sign up should be given further consideration.

I know you are aware of this situation and trust a fair basis for putting cotton acreage in the soil bank will be worked out.

With deep appreciation for the splendid way you are representing our State.

Very sincerely,

C. A. ROWLAND, Jr.

FAYETTEVILLE, Ga., January 27, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: We are writing this letter in protest to the acreage reserve situation. Most of the farmers in this county had planned their program around the cotton acreage reserve program, and according to reports in newspapers the cotton acreage reserve is going to be almost ruined. We would appreciate anything you might be able to do to help us small farmers keep the cotton acreage reserve as had been promised by the administration.

The Fayette county farmers appreciate the fine job you are doing in representing us.

Sincerely,

H. A. Peoples, J. L. Massengale, J. R. Stinchcomb, H. C. Brown, J. A. Lester, H. L. Grantham, G. H. Davis, D. A. Harp, L. A. Goodman, Joe Glass, W. E. M. Harp, H. L. Goodman, H. C. Peoples, J. G. Minter, N. Sam Jackson, H. C. Peoples, Mary C. Peoples, S. C. Burch, J. L. Griggs, W. L. Burch, J. M. Mask, R. L. Jackson, Jr., W. B. McLucas, Coleman Putnam, R. L. Jackson, Sr., H. R. Harp, Franklin J. Brown, W. L. Jackson, K. W. McElwany, Francis L. Jones, G. W. Towns, L. W. Cochran, Ted Hardy, Donald Chapman, Dan Phillips, J. B. Moody, Guy Samples, J. B. Mask, R. B. Mask, C. F. Woods, A. J. Hopton, E. C. Hardy, Marie Goodson, C. L. McEachern, Joe Jackson, A. R. Harp, G. H. Thompson, L. S. Peoples, R. H. Huddleston, Hugh Huddleston, A. M. Mitchell, O. B. Mask.

ROSEBUD, Ga., January 27, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to ask you to do something to benefit all our farmers. If you possibly can I want to ask you to use all your influence to get a full soil-bank payment for all farmers that have already signed up in this section for cotton, and also for all farmers that are yet to sign.

I know of a number of farmers who signed up early that have already gone to their bank and borrowed money on the strength of this payment from the soil bank, to cover their losses on the 1957 crop. Now if they should have to give up part of the payment this original contract called for, it would put them in another financial squeeze with their bank on account of our Government failing to carry out their contract.

I do not feel that this is either just or legal. I feel that all Government contracts and promises should be carried out to the letter. I will appreciate anything you can do in this matter and I know all farmers will. I want to express my sincere appreciation of all the things you have accomplished for the farmers in the past. With kind regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

O. E. UPSHAW.

HARLEM, Ga., January 20, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are concerned over the action of Secretary Benson in abruptly calling to a halt cotton farmers placing their lands with the Government for 1958. The closing date announced was for March 7 but on January 16 orders came in late afternoon halting any more acres being entered.

We have only 4.1 acres allowed us for cotton. We sold our tractor and it is impossible to farm those acres. We would protest the injustice and would appreciate any change in this program for 1958.

We value highly the contribution you are making to the welfare of our country.

Yours truly,

D. A. HOWARD.

LUDOWICI LUMBER Co.,  
Ludowici, Ga., January 22, 1958.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I went to the agricultural stabilization and conservation committee office in Ludowici early in January regarding the placing of my cotton acreage in the soil-bank program and I was advised that the sign-up period was between the dates of January 13, 1958, and March 7, 1958, and was asked to return after January 13.

It was necessary that I leave Ludowici on the night of January 12, and this business kept me away from Ludowici until the night of January 16, 1958.

I returned to the committee office today and was told that all money had been spent and that they had been advised by the Atlanta office by telegram on January 16 that the money was all gone and not to accept any more applications. I was told that I could sign a certain form which would get my name in the "pot" if there was any more money made available at a later date.

I feel that this is unfair to the numerous farmers that did not understand that they would have to line up on the first day and stay in line until signed up or the money was exhausted.

Can you advise me as to what steps I should take, because I don't know what to do about planting or not planting.

Yours very truly,

L. R. PHILLIPS.

FARMERS GIN Co.,

Williamson, Ga., January 22, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
United States Senator, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I saw an article in the Atlanta Constitution with reference to your protest to Secretary Benson about shutting off the soil bank program. I hope you will continue to put any pressure you can on him until he decides to live up to his agreements, whatever they are.

I, of course, was opposed to the acreage-reserve program, mostly I guess because it will probably put my gin out of operation in 1958 and maybe from now on, and also for the reason that it has caused quite a bit of unemployment in this vicinity with a general business letdown all around. Then too, I just don't believe in sitting down and doing nothing and being paid to do it, but if I must pay taxes to support the program I believe that I should be allowed to get in it whether I approve of it or not. Sometimes it is a matter of self-preservation in a business way, with no morals mixed up in it.

Just to cite you chapter and verse of this program, though I guess you have plenty of this evidence already in hand, I am enclosing some correspondence received by me recently from the Pike County office of ASC, and if you have time to look at it, you will note that the sign-up time was specifically stated as ending March 7, with no qualifications so far as I can see as to date. They actually ended it on January 17 and there are lots of farmers who trusted them as to their expiration date that didn't get in at all, and I am one of them. I had no intention of signing up any of it if enough of my customers stayed out of it for me to afford to crank up my gin, but was informed by the ASC that only one other farmer besides myself in this vicinity had not signed up, so I decided I might as well do so, for 1 or 2 crops of cotton wouldn't be enough to feed all the boll weevils that might be loose this coming season, but was informed that the sign-up ended the day before.

I hope something can be done to make them (the Department of Agriculture) stand up to, or behind their statements. It's hard enough to try to stay in business without them changing the rules during the game.

Thanking you for listening to my gripe, and with highest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

P. W. VAUGHN.

Honestly, Senator, someone has goofed regards the soil-bank idea. Everyone is talking about it. Someone is bound to be mighty unpopular before this thing gets straightened out. If I can be of help, please call on me.

BOB EVANS.

TOWNSEND, Ga.

**SOLONS TOLD SOIL BANK IRES FARMERS**

**BAMBERG, S. C.**—Cotton farmers of Bamberg County and South Carolina are rightfully indignant over soil-bank treatment, United States Senators were advised in a telegram from Bamberg County State legislators Friday.

The telegrams were sent to Senators OLIN D. JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND by Representatives P. E. Brabham, Bamberg farmer, and State Senator J. B. Ness.

Representative Brabham charged that farmers have been misled by the Soil Bank Division of the Department of Agriculture.

The telegram urged proper and immediate steps to correct this entirely uncalled for and unnecessary, confused, un-American condition.

It was also revealed here that only 355 of the 700 farmers who applied to enter the soil-bank program received funds before the county's allotment was exhausted.

**FUNDS SHORT OF NEED**

Horace Rentz, county ASC office manager, said that a policy of first come, first served, was being followed, and unless more funds are provided, more than half of the farmers will not share in the soil-bank money.

Last year, 495 county farmers drew \$232,000 in the program, which resulted in a reduction of 8,000 acres of cotton planting, Rentz said.

The ASC manager said the soil-bank money was exhausted several days ago, "but we are still accepting applications and holding them in case more money arrives. Many people in this area are dissatisfied with the setup this year," he added.

Representative Brabham said farmers in every community are stirred up.

Brabham and Senator Ness telegraphed Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND and Representatives RILEY and McMILLAN that "cotton farmers are rightfully indignant over soil-bank treatment."

**TEXT OF MESSAGE**

Text of the message follows: "Cotton farmers of Bamberg County and South Carolina are rightfully indignant over soil-bank treatment. Only applications filed here the very first day of an announced week's filing schedule have been approved.

"Minority getting all the funds allotted. Majority receiving none and left completely out. This is a deplorable situation for the many farmers who are not in position to farm all of their land through no fault of their own.

"They have previously been misinformed and consequently misled solely by the Soil Bank Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. The bureau will have to admit this fact and assume responsibility.

"Necessary funds should be appropriated to fill the legal requests of all eligible applicants.

"Each and every farmer applied or endeavored to apply should be treated alike. We earnestly request you and your colleagues to take proper immediate action to quickly correct this entirely uncalled for and unnecessary confused un-American condition."

COMMERCE, GA., February 12, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.:

I would like your opinion of the soil bank mess.

I didn't get to sign up. I thought we had until March to sign, they just worked on it 3½ days in my county, Jackson. Do you think we will be left out?

Will appreciate your opinion.  
Respectfully yours,

WILL L. WILLIAMS.

PARROTT, GA., February 11, 1958.

DEAR MR. TALMADGE: I am one of those farmers who went to sign up for the soil bank. I put my cotton in the soil bank last

year. This year I was in Dawson Terrell County, at 12 o'clock the first day that they were to sign up.

They gave me No. 335 and told me to come back to Dawson Wednesday at 1 o'clock. I went and signed up my 10 acres of cotton. It is reported that I won't get my 10 acres in the soil bank, that they did not have any money to pay it off; for they put the first ones who signed, they would pay them.

They said some of the large farmers were in Dawson at 4 or 5 o'clock Monday morning. They said some of those farmers got out last fall and rented land and got those farms in the soil bank.

I hear 1 or 3 of them get \$2,900 for 3 farms. I think it should be that all farmers get some, all the same percent. If 10 or 20 acres in Terrell County to each they have money to pay for it. Let everybody get some soil bank money, not just give it to big farmers.

I made my arrangement not to plant the cotton this year. All goes to big cotton farmers. Do you think this is fair and just?

Please try to do something about it at once. This farm program is bad. I have 510 acres with just 64 acres of peanuts when they started the allotment, 10 acres of cotton. I can't rent my farm and get enough to live on and pay taxes. I am not able to work this farm myself. So what can I do?

There are some farmers in Terrell County who can plant a large amount of cotton and peanuts. All should have same percent, based on cleared acres on the farm.

Yours truly,

J. H. LEVERETT.

TAYLORVILLE, GA., February 9, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE.

DEAR MR. TALMADGE: I am writing to you (and hope you will find time to read it) in regard to the soil-bank program.

Most farmers in this community made plans back in August to cooperate with this program for 1958 and would like to see it through 1959, if possible.

It was one statement made that I don't approve of and that is "first come, first served." Just to read that sounds like a by-line for a side show at a carnival. In this program it should be every one share alike or not be at all.

Mr. TALMADGE, we have a problem here in Stilesboro. We have some people that are hungry. I am in a position to know. I have a small grocery store and every day there someone is wanting credit or help. In our schools there are small kids that do not have any lunch. The Government just allows 10 free lunches a day.

One of our teachers wrote an item to the Barlow Tribune for donations to help feed these children. So far they have had a few to donate a few dollars.

It seems to me, and a lot others, instead of sending money for a CARE packare to feed the children across, that we had better look after our own. You know charity begins at home.

I know your time is limited. Sure appreciate you taking up this time with me.

Sincerely,

RUTH L. JACKSON.

P. S.—HERMAN, we learned today that this county is absolutely going to use first come, first served.

The PMA office received a telegram today from Athens, Ga., stating this. And this news today is sure causing an uproar in our community with the farmers.

CLAXTON, GA., February 11, 1958.

MR. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALMADGE: The first come, first served method of filing soil-bank agreements is obviously unfair to farmers for the reason that many farmers cannot get to the triple

A office on account of sickness and other causes. In this way these particular farmers are deprived of participation in the soil bank. I would like to ask you to do what you can to see that more money is appropriated in order to insure justice to all the farmers.

Very truly yours,

LESTER JONES.

BUENA VISTA, GA., February 11, 1958.

SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a line. What is the Department of Agriculture going to do about our cotton rentals? Are the farmers that didn't get out to the office in 4 days going to be cut off? That doesn't seem right after they had sent all the farmers a letter saying they had until March 7 to sign up for cotton rentals.

The larger farmers have most of their stand-in with the office here and get along very well, but the little farmer who has to make a living for his family, the Department of Agriculture certainly has him in a tight. They have cut his acres more than 50 percent on corn, cotton, and peanuts and he just does not have enough acres to make a living unless he had a big farm before. We have too much redtape in our Agriculture Department anyway. Why doesn't Congress cut down on this redtape? We are supposed to be a free country but we certainly are having all kinds of controls in these days. And these controls are not helping us. Why not guarantee the farmer a price on so many pounds of cotton, peanuts, corn, and wheat and then turn him back loose into a free country.

With best regards.

H. S. PARKER.

P. S.—The number of pounds should be checked carefully and every farmer treated right.

LEXINGTON, GA., February 11, 1958.

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you about my cotton acreage for this year. I went and put it in last fall with county office manager O. C. Dellinger and he put down the number of acres, 7 for me and 5 for the man who works my land, and said for us to come back in January 1958 and sign up for the land. I have been up there the 10th of January and went back yesterday, the 10th of February, and Mr. Dellinger didn't let us sign for the land, said the money was out and he did not know if there would be any more, and he wrote me to come and some people get what they want and others get nothing. This is the first year I have put mine in soil bank acreage. Will there be any more money or not? I would like to know, for they said it would stop the 20th of February at the office in Lexington. They send letters out to you and you go up there and then they don't do anything to help some people. I think they have pets. I don't say you have it all in your hands, but I thought you could do something about how they are going about it. I have my tax to pay every year and place to keep up and I am an old woman, will be 79 the 30th of July, and not able to work and don't get any help from the Government, and I think I need some as well as other people. They don't pay much attention to a woman and a small farm. I guess they think they don't need anything. Well, I hope you can do something about it. If you have a chance, write me a letter and tell me what to do. This is one of your old Georgia friends and was your father's, also, so I will close. Hope to hear good news.

Your friend,

Mrs. CORA ADKINS.

CARTERSVILLE, GA., February 10, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am greatly perturbed over the manner in which the soil-bank program has been handled. It seems very unfair that

only those who signed up the first 3 days in Bartow County were entitled to participate in the program. When I went down to the office, on the 4th day, I was informed I was too late. Now that my farm is unrented I will lose my income for the coming year.

Your Democratic supporters in this area will greatly appreciate anything you can do in their behalf.

Yours truly,

(Miss) NANCY IRICK.

GREENSBORO, GA., February 10, 1958.

HON. SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE.

DEAR SIR: What do you think of the State getting any more money for the soil bank for cotton; also Greene County? The money gave out before all farmers got their land rented. What they took out of cotton, I'd like to know at once, if you think it will get more for those that didn't get theirs in. If you can give me any information, please write me at once.

Yours truly,

FRANK T. HOPKINS.

KAY NURSERIES,

Royston, Ga., February 6, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,

Senator From Georgia,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: I have just heard the South Carolina State ASC committee has ruled that "first come, first served," will be the rule in that State, and I feel sure the Georgia ASC committee is going to do the same. If so, there is going to be much confusion and suffering among the 50 percent of farmers left out of the plan here in Hart County this year.

If more funds is the only solution to the problem, will you please do all you can to have it appropriated. All should be treated alike this year, and next year the whole thing should be stopped unless a more workable plan is found.

Thanking you for your many past favors to the Georgia farmer.

We remain,

Sincerely,

T. H. KAY,

Chairman, Legislative Committee,  
Vanna Farm Bureau.

MCRAE, GA., January 30, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senator.

DEAR SIR: I am a farmer, farmed all of my life. I live joining your land at Towns Schoolhouse. I put my cotton and tobacco in the soil bank last year, and was planning to put it in this year. I got sick and had to go to the hospital at the time they started signing up for the soil bank. They had only been signing up a few days and said they run out of money. At the time I was able to get there, they were not signing up any more. So I don't guess I will get my cotton in the soil bank this year. I think the whole soil-bank program, if they cannot treat them all alike ought to be done away with completely. They cut me this year to \$39 per acre if I could of got it in. It was \$45 last year. It should of been raised instead of cut. I haven't been making less than a bale of cotton to the acre for several years.

I do pray that this can be straightened out, so that everybody will be equal in the soil bank.

I voted for your father as long as he was in office, and also voted for you. I would like to see you President of the United States.

I would appreciate anything that you can do to help in this problem. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

N. A. LIVINGSTON.

BARTOW, GA., February 1, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Do you know if the Government plans to help those people whose cotton acreage was refused last month when they waited to the last of the month to register? Is there anything you can do to help me get my acreage into the soil bank. I own farm No. 57-082-24036 in this county. I had the cotton acreage in the soil bank last year. We were told the soil-bank books would not be closed until February 20. I am 89 and I did not feel equal to stand in line for days, so I waited to register until the rush was over. It will be a loss I do not feel I should suffer, if the Government refuses to register my cotton acreage.

Please let me know if the Government's decision to close the books means some of us are left out.

Yours truly,

Mrs. G. H. RATCHFORD.

EVANS, GA., January 30, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I only have a 7-acre bale of cotton on a 4-horse farm and I put in the soil bank last year and I wanted to do so this year and I went to sign up and they told me the books was closed on January 13. I was put on the waiting list the paper said we had until March 1 to sign. I was 4 days late after January 13 — open until January 1. I do not understand why some counties have longer than others, so if you can help us we sure will appreciate it as what few acres we have we can't do anything with it so there is a bunch of us in the same fix on the waiting list. So we were told that the books is closed on January 30.

Thank you.

L. C. DAVIDSON.

JANUARY 29, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: I wish you would please advise us Georgia farmers what to do. Our soil bank money has run out, so says our committeeman. We don't know just what to do. If we don't know within a very few days we all will lose our crops. It will be too late to plant. The farmers were expecting the soil bank again this year, so they could get the 10-percent raise, and have not made any arrangements to farm. Now the 17th of January they ran out of funds. I think myself this is just a trick to get the farmers to plant their cotton. Some put several farms in the bank and got \$3,000 on each farm. They had their farms cut up in smaller farms so they could get more cotton in the soil bank. While the committeemen let them do this, the small farmers with 6, 7, 8, or 10 acres had to wait and be left out completely. The small farmers are the ones to be left out, and they are the ones that need the soil bank. They don't have enough cotton to buy gasoline or hire help to plant. The money has been given out unfairly. Most large growers got a raise in their cotton rates and cotton acreage. The small farmers got a cut on rates and acreage. The county offices have hired lots of extra help where it is not needed. This uses up some of the soil bank money. Our committeemen gave themselves good raises and more acreage too. The small farmer always gets the kicking around. If they are not going to have enough money, why not cut some of the wheat farmers back, and large cotton farmers? The small farmers have a right to soil bank, or do they? It seems like they are being pushed back.

I trust you will look into this matter at once, please. We must know what to do. We have our lands to prepare and other things to get in order. I will, and the other

farmers who are on the fence will appreciate your fast and immediate action

Thank you so much, Senator TALMADGE.

Your Georgia friend,

ROGER NEWSOME.

JANUARY 30, 1958.

HON. M. T. FULLER, Sr.,

Route No. 6, Carrollton, Ga.

DEAR FRIEND FULLER: Thank you for your letter of January 27 regarding the closing of the cotton soil bank. It was indeed thoughtful of you to contact me in this regard.

As a result of the Agriculture Department's action in halting cotton soil-bank applications, I protested vigorously to the Secretary of Agriculture. I am enclosing herewith a copy of my telegram to the Secretary.

Yesterday I was notified by the Department of Agriculture that telegrams had been dispatched to all State ASC committees concerning a new procedure for the signing up of cotton land for inclusion in the acreage reserve of the soil bank. I am also enclosing copies of these telegrams. They are self-explanatory, but I wish specifically to call your attention to the fact that the ban on signups has been lifted and a new deadline of February 20 fixed. You will note that the method of allocation of available funds is to be left to the discretion of each State ASC committee.

I have heard no report that signups for tobacco and peanuts have been halted. You may be assured, however, that I shall continue to keep abreast of this situation and to make all possible representations to protect the interests of Georgia farmers.

With kindest regards and every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

CARROLLTON, GA., January 27, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALMADGE: I'm writing this asking you to investigate the closing of the cotton, tobacco, and peanut rental signups. Mr. Benson and his ASCs crowd had given us until about March 1 to sign or rent our land. As you knew they stayed open 4 or 5 days and closed down without any warning whatever. Some of the farmers camped around the ASCs officers all night enabling them to get a chance to sign. Some stood in line for hours to get signed. We old fellows that were sick and not able to stand in long lines in bad weather were left out. I hope you will investigate the matter and at least divide up those funds giving all of us a chance to rent a part of our land.

Yours truly,

M. T. FULLER, Sr.

KINGSTON, GA., January 28, 1958.

SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On January 15 I went to sign a contract with the ASC office in Cartersville, Ga., to put so much cotton in the soil bank. They gave me a number and told me to come toward the latter part of the week. When I went back Washington had stopped them from signing any more contracts. Those who didn't get signed are not getting a fair deal. I would appreciate anything you can do for all those left out.

Yours truly,

NEEL JOLLY.

CARTERSVILLE, GA., January 28, 1958.

SENATOR TALMADGE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you a few lines about this soil bank. It sure is a dirty deal for the little farmer. The big farmers sign for all the land they could get in the soil bank and the small farmer has just been left out and I for one think that something

ought to be done about it. I seen in the paper Sunday that they were not going to put no more money for the soil bank. Said it might go first come first served. I know one thing there sure ought to be something done about it. Maybe Benson can put up a soup line.

Yours truly,

A. C. TEAGUE.

NEWINGTON, GA., January 28, 1958.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At this time I know you are a very busy man. I am keeping up with your good work in the Senate. However, owing to the plight of the farmer in general, I am writing you along with many others I guess.

I put most of my allotted land in the soil bank in 1957. Most of my farming had been worked by wage hands. So I let all go except one tractor man. Not just myself, but lots of the farms in Screven County did the same thing, let their labor go. Now if our cropland is turned back to us this time or later in the season, for farms without such labor, at best it will be a disaster year.

Would appreciate any information you might be able to give me.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

C. C. POYTHRESS.

ZEBULON, GA., February 3, 1958.

The Honorable HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: Thank you for your kind letters of January 27 and January 30, for the enclosures, and for your interest and desire to help.

My sister has been permitted to sign an application. We hope this means that all those desiring to participate in the apparently bankrupt soil bank might yet share some of the benefits.

We are deeply grateful to you, not only for your efforts to secure justice in the distribution of soil-bank funds, but for your staunch stand for the right during all your years of service to Georgia.

Very sincerely,

(Mrs.) HORTENSE R. BANKSTON.

ZEBULON, GA., January 21, 1958.

The Honorable HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: Early in January we received notice from the Pike County ASC office that the acreage reserve programs for cotton would begin on January 13, 1958, closing March 7, 1958.

When my sister, Marjorie R. Moore, reported on January 17 to sign an agreement, the office had been advised by Washington to discontinue signing agreements. WSB radio later announced that the appropriation for the cotton soil bank was not sufficient to pay further agreements.

We feel that the "first come, first served" policy is most unfair—that all who care to participate should be permitted to do so. If funds are limited, it seems to us only fair—I believe I speak for many—that a smaller amount per acre should be paid, thus giving all a share.

Knowing your sympathy for farmers and your sense of justice, as evidenced on many matters in the past, we appeal to you to help us in this matter. Our farm is small—only 4.3 acres were allotted for cotton—but the small income from the soil bank means much to us, since my sister and I can no longer get help to cultivate the few acres.

Had we not thought we could participate in the cotton soil bank program, we would have set pines on the 4 acres, as we did on an allotted 16 acres.

Assuring you of our deep appreciation for any consideration given our appeal, I am,  
Very sincerely,

Mrs. HORTENSE R. BANKSTON.

CARLTON, GA., January 26, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE: Just a few lines to let you know how the people feel about the way they are being treated about the soil-bank program. As you know, these programs have been in effect a long time and when the Government goes back on what they say, that they will and then not do it, that is bad for our Government. So please get the money appropriated to complete this program for the farmers are sore about the whole thing, and they have a right to be.

Thanks,

G. P. BRIDGES.

CONCORD GA., January 26, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: Read enclosed. I was one of the first to put land in soil bank—signed and accepted. Now I let hands go. I didn't encourage to stay, and seemingly acreage is to be returned. This is the situation of hundreds in the county—as they did the same—in taking advantage of the perhaps last year of soil bank.

Put this situation up to Benson, if possible. Thanking you.

CLEMONS CATO.

#### SOIL BANK SIGNUPS END IN TYPICAL CONFUSION

The abrupt halt called in accepting farmers' applications to place cotton acreage in the soil bank resulted from the kind of bumbling at which the current leadership of the United States Department of Agriculture is so adept.

The period for signing up for the program began January 13, and was to continue until March 7. Instead, it suddenly was broken off after only 4 days. Demand to participate was about to exceed the supply of funds.

By stupidly placing the program on a first-come, first-served basis the Department had enabled those at the head of long lines, many of which began forming in the bitter cold of night, to qualify while those at the end of the line were excluded. The latter have a legitimate gripe.

Now, Department officials admit, it may be found advisable to prorate county funds among all who wish to participate. This would mean that some farmers who already had signed up would be required to cut down on their retired acres so as to share with others. This appears to be the most logical solution advanced so far.

But why in the name of commonsense wasn't that done in the first place? Why didn't they learn from past experience?

Hindsight, of course, will never accomplish as much as foresight. Unfortunately, this administration shows a remarkable dearth of both when it comes to farm matters.

ADEL, GA., January 21, 1958.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that this man Benson is holding up some of the cotton farmers' applications to get in the soil bank.

Also that he and the President want support prices on all or nearly all basic crops reduced with Benson having the power to lower or raise the support price. He already has too much power. It is possible for the Congress to prevent him from becoming a dictator to the agricultural sections of America?

It seems to me that the men and women in Congress elected by the people should have some say-so.

Every year more and more little farmers are quitting. He claims he wants to help the little farmer but his actions do not prove this in more than one case.

Sincerely,

C. T. CLAYTON.

THE FIDELITY CASUALTY CO.  
OF NEW YORK,  
LIPSCOMB AGENCY,  
Cartersville, Ga., January 22, 1958.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a Bartow County, Ga., citizens and farmers, I want to ask that you do everything in your power to see that the cotton soil bank program is continued, and that money be made available so that every cotton farmer have a part in this program if he sees fit to sign up during the sign-up period.

Very respectfully yours,

RAY LIPSCOMB.

#### FUND-RAISING DINNER HELD IN TEXAS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, at this time of the year, as we pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, we are reminded, among other things, of the effective way in which he employed humor to drive home a serious message. In much the same way, the well-known columnist, George Dixon, recently employed his trenchant wit to demonstrate with devastating effect the ability of the Democrats to make their shortcomings appear as Republican transgressions.

One of the instances dealt with in the Dixon column is the letter mailed by H. J.—Jack—Porter, Republican national committeeman, of Texas, soliciting the purchase of tickets for a fund-raising dinner held in that great State. Before reading Mr. Dixon's column, Mr. President, I should like to make it clear that I agree wholeheartedly with the position of President Eisenhower and Republican National Chairman Alcorn that neither the Republican Party nor any of its agencies should accept any part of the funds raised by this dinner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the Dixon column which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, February 13.

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

DEMOCRAT SINS, GOP SLIPS  
(By George Dixon)

How it is being accomplished would baffle a student of the occult, but the sins of the Democrats are constantly being made to appear as the transgressions of the Republicans. Whenever the Democrats do anything wrong it doesn't seem to be long before the notion spreads that it was the fault of the GOP. Let us start with the attempted natural gas gouge: The fight to slacken Federal controls so that an extra billion dollars can be jimmied out of the consumers has been led by the two Democratic leaders of Congress, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Speaker SAM RAYBURN. But now the impression is widespread that House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was up to his disheveled hair in it.

Poor JOE, who wouldn't know the natural from the laughing gas lobby, was snagged into attending a Texas fund-raising dinner in his honor. Unbeknownst to him it was being run by natural-gas people who tried to con people into buying \$100 dinner tickets by picturing JOE as the man who would swing the Congressional vote for the gas gougers.

Joe may be as innocent as a Massachusetts gas consumer, but it's going to be hard to smother the impression that the gas plot is Republican dominated because the man who sent out the come-on letters was H. J. (Jack) Porter, Republican national committeeman for Texas. Porter sent out 500 of these letters, and why he failed to foresee that at least 1 would almost certainly fall into tattling hands, should provide an interesting IQ study.

The morning the story of the GOP ineptitude broke, I ran into a prominent Democratic Senator. He was in convulsions. He finally made himself coherent enough to splutter: "Do you think Jack Porter is the smartest politician who ever came down the Texas pike?"

It reminded me, in reverse, of the old gag: "If you're so smart, why ain't you rich?" Many of these Texas Republicans are rich, but when it comes to political brains they act poverty stricken. In one stroke of brilliance they've made it appear as if the Republicans are the natural gas bandits.

Almost simultaneous with this, the impression has spread that the so-called Federal Communications Commission whitewash has been GOP maneuvered. This was brought about by talk of White House and Sherman Adams pressures. It obfuscated the fact that the investigation of regulatory agencies, which blew up with the firing of its chief counsel and the quitting of its chairman, was Democrat dominated.

The Democrats have certainly succeeded in spreading the notion that the Republicans are to blame for the missile and rocket lag. This probably should be rated as the No. 1 irony. The Democrats were in control at the close of World War II when Werner von Braun was working on the V-2 rocket. It was not until the Republicans took over that Von Braun was given the go-ahead to expand his V-2 into the Jupiter.

The GOP is being depicted as the party of the piled-up deficit, high taxes, and farm surpluses. They are just reluctant legatees. The Republicans also seem unable to counter the illusion that they're the bloated rich and the Democrats the exploited poor.

The picture now is so topsy-turvy that I hear everybody at Republican national headquarters has been ordered to quit carrying matches in case of a natural gas leak.

#### AIRPORT ECONOMICS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senators from New York [Mr. IVES and Mr. JAVITS], as well as myself, I should like to comment on the subject matter of Senate Resolution 258.

Deeply as we prize our Federal system of government, it admittedly gives rise to difficult problems. This is particularly true when the conduct of international relations, for which, of course, the executive branch is responsible under the Constitution, impinges on matters which in this country are handled by the States and municipalities or other local governmental agencies.

An important case in point occurs in the field of airport economics. In the United States and its possessions, most airports are, with the exception of the Washington National Airport, owned, operated, and controlled, not by the Federal Government, but by local governments or agencies established by them. It is these local agencies that have the responsibility, and the burden, of developing and financing our system of airports. Largely out of their own resources

and by use of their own credit, some \$4 billion have been invested in airport facilities and operation. Their aim is, of course, to make the airport systems self-supporting, and they have been making steady progress toward that goal. At the same time they face the task of providing, with only modest Federal assistance, greatly expanded and improved facilities to meet the needs of the jet age.

In the circumstances, the financial stability of our American airports and the ability of their managements to maintain their credit standing with the investing public is of critical importance. Understandably, the airport operators are deeply concerned by any action which might impair the confidence of the public, thereby threatening continued sound operation. Specifically, they are alarmed by recent activities of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the field of airport economics.

In 1956 the ICAO held a conference on airport charges which issued a final report recommending specific principles to be followed in setting charges for the use of airports and recommending particular types of charges. These recommendations have since been transmitted to the contracting States by ICAO.

There is a difference of opinion as to the authority of ICAO to prepare such recommendations. In the view of the airport operators' council such recommendations, even though nonmandatory on the contracting states, are beyond the power of ICAO as established by the convention on international civil aviation. While our Government takes a different view as to the legal power of ICAO to concern itself with this field, it has consistently taken the position that any determinations concerning the establishment of airport charges should be left to the individual contracting states of ICAO. It has opposed any formal action by ICAO designed to establish uniform levels or methods of imposing airport charges on a worldwide basis on decisions as to whether and when individual states should impose such charges.

Mr. President, it is essential that the United States maintain this position. In other countries, international airports are owned or supported by national funds. But this is not so in this country. Our airports, with the exception noted earlier, are owned and operated by units of local government, and they have been financed in large part by the sale to the public of bonds issued by and payable from airport revenues. These bonds have been purchased in confidence that our States, cities, or local governmental agencies will be able to operate their airports on a self-supporting basis. They cannot do so unless they continue to have freedom to establish fair and reasonable charges in order to produce the revenue required to support successful operation and thereby maintain their credit. The potentially adverse effect of international recommendations as to the economic policies of airports in the United States is obvious, and the airport operators are rightfully concerned.

Legal questions aside, the practical effect of any disturbance of the credit structure of our American airports must be of direct concern to all taxpayers. It cannot help but impede the efforts of our cities and States to maintain our American airports with the revenues earned through self-supporting charges, and thereby avoid burdening the general taxpayer. Indeed, the importance of assuring that airport authorities will have the power to determine charges and fees has long been recognized in statutes authorizing airport authority bonds. It is a common practice for cities and States to include in such statutes a commitment that they "will not diminish or impair the power of the authority to establish, levy, and collect tolls, rents, landing fees, charges, or other fees in connection with such air terminals or other facilities, so long as such bonds or other obligations remain outstanding."

The protection of our American system of airport ownership and operation is of primary importance. A few days ago a resolution dealing with this problem was introduced for referral to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We urge that the committee hold early hearings on it, for the problem is pressing and deserves immediate attention.

#### HUNGARIAN RESETTLEMENTS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some weeks ago the subcommittee on escapees and refugees issued a report on Hungarian resettlements in the Western Hemisphere. The report was complimentary in some aspects and mildly critical in others. After the report of the subcommittee had been widely published, I received one strange letter from Puerto Rico in which it was alleged a Hungarian, who had attained the rank of major general in the Army of the Dominican Republic, had died under mysterious circumstances.

I have here a letter directed to me from the widow of the general, in which she relates a long history of a heart condition, and the fact that he had undergone frequent examinations and treatments here in the United States. There is nothing mysterious or sinister about a heart attack. If so, hundreds die in the United States every week in sinister circumstances.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 31, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
President of the Subcommittee on the  
Refugee Problems of the Judicial  
Committee, Senate of the United  
States of America, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have just been informed on the circulation of contemptible, calumnious and absurd rumors regarding the demise of my dear husband Maj. Gen. H. E. N. Alexander Kovacs. My husband died on November 21, 1957, as a result of two strong relapses, suffering at that time of heart disorders and hypertension.

By calumnious, contemptible, and absurd rumors I mean the absolutely unfounded and

unbased rumors to the effect that my husband was eliminated. I wish to bring to your attention the fact that my husband received highest honors and expressions of high consideration for himself as well as for his family during our life in the Dominican Republic (both of us are of Hungarian origin) which we have chosen to be our homeland after Hungary fell under Communist oppression. Anyone who has incredulous mind, especially those who are unjust enemies of the Government of the Dominican Republic, may verify very easily the cause of my husband's death by consulting Dr. David Sherf, cardiologist of the Flower Hospital, 5th Avenue, New York, and Dr. Aiselberg, famous cardiologist of Vienna, Austria, both of whom have been attending my husband until his last moment. In the Dominican Republic my husband was attended by Dr. Jerome Gerendasy, famous American cardiologist, and J. A. Penzo, who was at his side from the moment the first relapse occurred until my husband passed away after suffering from cerebral hemorrhage and partial paralysis, both of which combined produced his death in the lapse of 3 days.

I also wish at this moment to bring up the unfortunate and sad matter of my ex-com patriots, Hungarian refugees, who to the great shame of Hungarian race to which I pertain, have given motives to every decent person to be mortified by their continuous acts of rebellion against the laws of Dominican Republic, Canada, Brazil, and other countries that did open their doors and admitted those refugees.

The ingratitude of those Hungarian refugees, and here I refer particularly to the situation in the Dominican Republic, is a well known fact. The Government of the Dominican Republic has provided those refugees with a new home and gave them peace and work. Each one of them was given a house, furniture and household effects together with a piece of fertile land. Any person could remake his life here with all the help received from the Government.

Since in April 1957, the Dominican Republic was the only country that had widely opened its doors to admit these unfortunate people, the Hungarian refugees in their desire to leave Austria declared to be competent farmers and have even sworn an oath to that effect. However, it was soon discovered that the majority has committed a perjury and only very small percentage were farmers in reality. These genuine farmers are prospering rapidly on their fertile tropical land with the generous help of the Government of the Dominican Republic.

It may easily be understood that these extremely unfavorable circumstances, especially to one who came from old and industrious Hungary as in case of my husband, did contribute on a large scale to the decline of his physical resistance until actually culminated in his death.

I sincerely hope that this letter satisfactorily cleared the matter of my husband's death and that you may see your way clear to publish any part thereof in order to classify the situation, and meanwhile I remain,

Very truly yours,

ROSA BATA VIUDA KOVACS.

#### FORMER PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Bar North, official magazine of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association, at Bismarck, N. Dak., has devoted the entire January issue to the North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Centennial, and I take

this opportunity to ask that the remarks by Mr. Joe Milton, president of the association, be printed in the RECORD.

Theodore Roosevelt one time publicly stated:

I never would have been President if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Joe Milton be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### OUR TEDDY

(By Joe Milton, president, North Dakota Stockmen's Association)

The North Dakota Stockmen's Association is happy and proud to dedicate this January issue of Bar North to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. No American has ever embodied so many typically American characteristics as forcefully as did Teddy Roosevelt.

Dynamic is a word often used to describe an energetic personality, a personality that convinces of the ability to act and to accomplish. Since childhood I have always thought of Theodore Roosevelt, the man, as having demonstrated the importance of the combination of ability, ambition, and personality. Separate these three characteristics then you will have weakened the individual's ability to serve his community and himself.

More has been written about Theodore Roosevelt than about any other American. There must be and is a reason. He was dynamic and colorful. He lived the language of all men and nations. He became a symbol of manhood to young and old alike, not only in America but in Europe, Asia, and Africa as well. Yes; he was a man's man.

We stockmen of North Dakota naturally think of him as our Teddy. He typifies to us the spirit of all pioneers who helped build our West; who had the ability, the foresight, and the nerve to lay upon the vast expanses of our western plains the foundation of a new economy—livestock. Pioneers they were who first dared to dream that livestock men should be and could be self-supporting; that the nature of the soil and climate would determine whether diversification of farming had to be continued. To them there lay a challenge on these plains; a challenge they welcomed and accepted. Could they battle the soils, elements, and man himself; and build for themselves and for us a livestock industry which could stand alone? They did, and we all are proud of it.

Theodore Roosevelt was a sportsman. Love of sports and active participation in it is certainly American. Our Teddy hunted on every continent and under conditions that could be dared only by the true sportsman. By this activity he accomplished at least two objectives as far as we are concerned. (1) He brought about and cemented better relations with other nations. This he did by virtue of establishing personal friendship with the monarchs and leaders of nations; the kind of friendship that only can result from the close camaraderie of extended hunting expeditions. (2) Through his reports of these expeditions he gave us, young and old, adventures into places of which we could only dream. Reading the histories of his hunting exploits has given us added pleasure because he was one of us and his language is ours.

Teddy was a diplomat. How often we shy away from diplomacy for fear of appearing less manly. Yet he, by his many examples of diplomacy, has shown us that diplomacy is only the judicious use of knowledge with the purpose of quietly achieving desired results. His many activities, his varied interests gave him a wide field of knowledge from which to

draw. I doubt that any foreign diplomat ever felt that Theodore Roosevelt came out second best in an international maneuver. His diplomatic ability was further enhanced by Roosevelt's accurate judgment of each individual. He knew when to go easy and when to show the big stick.

Teddy was a leader of men. He served us well as President of the United States. This he did because he could lead, he could direct, and he could always retain his sense of fair play. To be a good leader, one must be willing to lead, not push; one must have a definite direction and goal, not a divergence of directions and a multitude of objectives. His direction was straight ahead; his goal was to keep America strong. His knowledge of human nature served him well, for with this knowledge he could lead directly forward and never be diverted from his principles of honesty and fair play. To him, right was always right; wrong was always wrong. There could be no compromise between the two.

With all of this, Roosevelt was always American. I believe that this can be most simply established by the fact that nicknames are typically American—and here I have been calling our President Theodore Roosevelt by the name "Teddy."

May the spirit of our Teddy always ride high and straight on the plains of North Dakota.

#### SUMMARY OF GTA FAMILY FARM SURVEY FOR 1955-56

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., and a summary of the GTA family farm survey for 1955-56, which accompanies the letter.

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

#### FARMERS UNION GRAIN

TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,

St. Paul, Minn., January 29, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You will be interested in this short summary of our latest family farm survey. This study of over 4,000 farm records shows an even greater market for manufactured goods than we found 2 years ago. This market for nearly \$6,000 spending per farm could go far to restore business and jobs in our cities.

Our survey finds more and more farmers being pushed off their farms to look for city jobs, or holding part-time jobs while still farming. They will add to the unemployment now growing in industrial States.

Again we find real farm income getting lower on these better-than-average commercial family farms. Returns to farmers are far short of those to other businesses, professions, or trades. After a small return on investment, you will see there is left only 25 cents per hour for the labor of the farmer and his family, and nothing for his skilled management.

The figures from wheat farms show that the 22-cents-per-bushel—11 percent—cut now scheduled for the 1958 crop will mean about a 25-percent cut in net income. The 25-cent-per-hundredweight—8 percent—cut on milk will mean a similar cut in net income of Midwest dairy farmers.

You Senators and Congressmen from farm States must unite to stop these two cuts and any others this coming season. Nothing is more likely, in my judgment, to make this recession worse than to lower farm prices

further. A return of prosperity in farm States will take more than holding the price line, but that is the first necessary step.

Please feel free to call on us for help to halt these dangerous and needless cuts in wheat and dairy prices now ordered. Only you leaders in Congress can win farmers a reprieve from further price cutting.

Sincerely,

M. W. THATCHER,  
General Manager.

A SUMMARY OF THE GTA FAMILY FARM SURVEY FOR 1955-56

(A continuing study of family farms in Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, covering 1950 through 1956 as authorized by the stockholders of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association)

INTRODUCTION

This resurvey of some 4,079 family farms is based on the income-tax records of each farm, plus other information gained by on-the-farm interviews during 1957. The income-tax records for 1955 and 1956 were audited and added to those for 1950-54. These 2 recent years have seen increased emphasis upon accurate tax records due to the beginning of social security payments based upon these returns. As in the first GTA family farm survey, virtually complete cooperation was forthcoming from all of these thousands of families. We present some of the findings in the hope that this unique information about average commercial family farms in some of our best farming areas may help the Congress decide wise national policies.

What the survey shows

1. Summary of Farm Operations for 1956, Compared With 1954

The essential figures show that despite claims to the contrary, the lowering of farm prices between 1954 and 1956 did not improve real net income. This was in spite of a gain of some 4 percent both in acreage and investment on the farms, and with improved yields and production. Net income did go up some \$80 due to an increase in Government payments of \$125. But, this small increase was more than offset by the rise in cost of living between the two surveys. That rise was nearly 4 percent, about \$107. Real income, consequently, dropped \$27, or about 1 percent. No account has been taken in this of the \$1,848 increase in investment required to farm.

Average per farm receipts and expenses, with changes

	1954	1956	Change
Cash marketings.....	\$8,010	\$8,386	\$376
Government payments.....	66	191	125
Cash receipts.....	8,076	8,577	501
Cash expense.....	4,559	4,801	242
Depreciation.....	1,310	1,463	153
Total.....	5,869	6,264	395
Receipts less expense.....	2,207	2,313	106
Allow for food.....	324	323	-1
Allow for home.....	400	375	-25
Total home and food.....	724	698	-26
Net income before taxes.....	2,931	3,011	80

Offset by cost-of-living increase of about..... \$107  
Net change in real income from farming..... -\$27  
Percent change..... -1

Details of cash receipts and expenses are shown in table 1 of the appendix. From this can be seen how these farms have attempted to cope with lower prices by producing more, and how various expenses have risen. The

allowance for a net rental value of the farm home equal to 8 percent of the insurable value of the home is an addition to gross income not made in our original survey. The allowance for food is based on the prices farmers would get for home-used food if they sold it. This follows the usual practice in valuing such foods, although the cost to city consumers of such food in the farm they would buy it would be considerably higher. Other costs in farm living not figured in this survey offset this food benefit and then some, such as higher costs for all manufactured goods and for such important services as health and education.

2. Analysis of Return to Labor, Management, and Capital Used on Farm

Allowing only a 5 percent return (before taxes) on capital, and nothing for management, returns for the work of the farmer and his family were only 25 cents per hour, as shown below.

If these farmers and their families got the average factory wages paid in their State, their net income would have been \$6,303, more than double what it actually was. Stated another way, actual income was short \$3,293 of paying a factory wage. This is equal to an 8 percent loss on investment for the year.

If nothing is allowed for investment, then the return for labor amounts to 91 cents per hour. This is less than half the \$1.91 average factory wage for the area, a full dollar short. It is also below the Federal minimum wage of \$1. Thus, in addition to getting substandard wages, farmers are contributing over \$43,000 in capital for nothing, bringing that to their job with no recompense.

If the labor of the whole family, except the farm operator, is unpaid, and the operator's labor is figured at the very conservative figure of only 2,000 hours as worked in city employment, then the farmer still would make only \$1.151 per hour. That is nearly one-fourth less than factory labor. That would mean unpaid family labor, unpaid management, unpaid capital, and still inequality.

Investment in average farm, hours worked, average factory wages, and imputed returns to farm labor, management, and capital

	1954	1956	Change
Number of farms.....	4,321	4,079	-5.6
Acre in farm.....	613	637	4
Insurable value of home.....	\$4,999	\$4,688	
Investment in plant:			
Land and buildings.....	\$27,285	\$26,538	
Equipment.....	7,857	10,473	
Livestock.....	4,805	4,521	
Crops.....	1,701	1,964	
Total.....	41,648	43,496	\$1,848
Estimated hours worked.....	3,300	3,300	
Average factory wage.....	\$1.72	\$1.91	
Net farm income (before taxes).....	\$2,931	\$3,011	
A. Return to capital and labor:			
5 percent on investment.....	\$2,082	\$2,174	
Net to labor.....	\$849	\$836	
Net per hour.....	\$0.26	\$0.25	
B. If factory wages were paid on labor:			
Wages for operator and family.....	\$5,676	\$6,303	
Actual total net income.....	2,931	3,011	
Deficit.....	2,745	3,292	
Loss on investment (percent).....	-7	-8	
C. All returns to labor, nothing to capital and management:			
Return per hour for 3,300 hours.....	\$0.89	\$0.91	
Return for 2,000 hours.....	1.47	1.51	

3. Returns Required if Farmers To Get Parity With Labor, Business, and Management

It is of interest to calculate, if only roughly, the amount needed to give these farm families something like parity returns for their labor, management, and capital. If factory wages were earned, plus only 5 percent on investment, and nothing for management of the farm, then, as of 1956, it would have taken about 64 percent higher prices to bring such parity. Much business netted more than 5 percent after taxes, and farm management services for an average commercial farm would run at least several hundred dollars. Neither factor is counted here.

Such higher prices would bring agriculture back about to where it was in the 1946-50 period, or the 1947-49 period used by the Government as a base for statistics in all fields other than agriculture. The official parity ratio was respectively 109 and 107 for these periods. Such prices also show the average of products raised in these 5 States in 1956 was between 65 to 70 percent of parity, instead of the national average of 81 percent for that year.

Such prices would give the average family, with a \$43,000 investment, a return of about \$7,000 cash before taxes, plus \$1,500 allowance for food and housing, a total of \$8,477. The \$3,011 actually received in 1956 was only 36 percent of this needed total. Thus, after nearly 10 years of declining farm income and rising city boom, farmers were far behind their city cousins for comparable investment and labor.

Increased prices needed for parity income

	1954	1956
	Dollars	Dollars
5 percent return on investment (before taxes).....	2,082	2,174
Labor at average factory wage.....	5,676	6,303
Management.....	0	0
Total needed for parity income.....	7,758	8,477
Less actual net income.....	2,931	3,011
Deficit in parity income.....	4,827	5,466
Plus actual cash receipts.....	8,076	8,577
Equals cash receipts needed for parity.....	12,903	14,043
	Percent	Percent
Ratio of actual to parity income.....	38	36
Ratio of actual to parity cash receipts.....	63	61
Approximate increase in prices required to get parity income.....	59	64

4. Low Prices Are Forcing Commercial Farmers Into City Labor Markets

In the 2 years between early 1955 and early 1957, during which these 2 surveys were made, over 5 percent of these commercial farms which had been supporting families had been liquidated. In some cases this was due to death with no heirs to take over the farm, but in most cases the families were forced off by declining income. The actual figure was 1 farm of 18 missing in this short 2-year period.

In addition to this expanded labor supply headed for the cities, many farmers, their wives, or older children began to work at off-farm jobs, part time or even year around, in the effort to save their farm homes. In early 1957, our surveyors found this an increasing practice, but in 1956, the actual wages earned amounted to an average of only some \$200 for operators and \$100 for wives, a total of less than \$300 per family. We cite this to show that contrary to national estimates, which include many part-time farms and subsistence farmers, commercial farmers in this area were not yet able to get much help from off-farm work. Such work as was being done was concentrated nearest to the larger cities and was being done mostly

by younger farmers and their wives who have the most difficulty with present conditions. Most of these off-farm workers were GI's who deserve better from their country in their effort to make a home on the farm.

Where farmers have abandoned farming to move into city jobs, they will have the least seniority and often little resources in case of unemployment and business recession. This will tend to force them back onto farms, perhaps into farm homes of relatives, adding further troubles to our farm families. Nothing is less needed by our national economy just now than another several hundred thousand farm workers, dispossessed from the land. Nothing should be more vigorously opposed by city people, themselves having unemployment and relief, to attempt to handle.

5. Indications That Farm Depression Is Feeding City Recession

National farm income figures dropped lower in 1956 and again in 1957 in terms of their buying power, approaching the low figure of 1940, which was a bad depression year for the whole American economy. The gain in size, investment, inputs, and outputs of the family farms in our survey covers up somewhat this drop in total buying power, but some figures do show up, which indicate the important part which lower farm income is playing in the growing national recession.

Because of the great shortage in real income needed to give farmers parity with city people, and thereby give real balance to the American economy, farm buildings, homes, and equipment have never reached parity. Much needed spending has been postponed. Our survey repeated an earlier inventory of immediate farm needs. For production purposes, as of early 1957, here are the averages per farm, by each State, and for the five-State area. Amounts have grown substantially in the 2 years since our earlier survey.

	Repairs and paint	New buildings	New equipment	Total
Wisconsin.....	\$1,282	\$2,383	\$2,016	\$5,681
Minnesota.....	907	2,561	1,910	5,378
South Dakota.....	968	1,565	1,447	3,980
North Dakota.....	1,259	2,847	2,932	7,038
Montana.....	947	2,237	2,161	5,345
Average 4,079 farms..	1,075	2,418	2,164	5,658

This total of around \$6,000 per farm does not include any spending needed to repair, modernize, or replace the farm home, or for home equipment. Even without any such spending, these totals would amount to a \$12 billion to \$15 billion potential market on the commercial family farms of the Nation, if this area is at all typical.

If farm homes were all modernized, or replaced if in poor condition, this farm market might easily be double. The insurable values for the farm homes in this survey indicate that many are in need of extensive modernizing, or of replacing, just as is true in most farm areas.

Thus a great untapped market lies ready and waiting to restore American industry to usefulness, and American labor to production, if only balanced farm and city income can be restored.

This farm demand is particularly for durable goods, the products of our heavy manufacturing industries now so hard hit. Higher farm income would help at the most vital spot in the current national lack of balance between capacity and demand. This includes the farm machinery industry now severely cutting back, and the appliance industry, now cutting back. Some other facts once again indicate this great need for durable goods

in our farm homes. Although these are better-than-average commercial farms, they have a lack of modern conveniences that is a national shame in this sixth decade of the 20th century. The percentage of homes in this survey without the following facilities is astounding, but the figures would be even higher if all farm homes in these States were included:

Percent of farms without named facilities

	Wisc.	Minn.	S. D.	N. D.	Mont.
Cold running water.....	17	32	41	31	17
Hot running water.....	24	38	48	37	22
Inside toilet.....	30	46	52	42	28
Bath tub.....	31	49	53	43	29
Central heat.....	49	56	52	40	33
Deep freeze.....	44	45	45	40	19
One telephone (any age).....	23	19	32	20	49
One TV set.....	31	36	49	26	45

Note that large numbers of the homes with the highest number of children in the Nation are still without either hot or cold running water.

Note that parity in plumbing facilities is not something lacking just in foreign lands, but is right here in the heart of the richest farm lands in the world.

Note that central heat is lacking in the coldest States in this Union.

Note that those families which can use to best advantage a deep freeze are not necessarily the citizens who have them.

Note that even one telephone is lacking in the home and business that needs it above all others, for convenience at least. Other figures would show how many of these phones in farm homes are still of the horse-and-buggy type, a disgrace in this day of electronic miracles.

Note that many farm homes do not have even one TV set, considered a necessity by most city families for a good many years now.

Note that none of these needed home facilities, which supposedly make up the American way of life and the vaunted American standard of living, and indeed have been so enjoyed by most city people for a long time—none of these needs are expressed in the dollar estimates of needed spending stated above. Those estimates apply only to farm production equipment, under which even a telephone was not included, although it might well have been.

Further information was gathered on the age and number of automobiles and trucks on our farms. This is of particular value now that that industry is running at only a little more than half capacity, a fact which threatens our whole economy. Farmers need automobiles and trucks in their business as well as for family living. Farm roads are the worst, and replacements would be high if farm income allowed farmers to do so.

Number, age, and price range of automobiles on farms

[Percent]

	Wisc.	Minn.	S. D.	N. D.	Mont.
Number:					
None.....	8.9	9.0	5.4	3.2	4.8
1.....	89.7	88.4	89.9	93.9	88.3
2 or more.....	1.4	2.6	4.7	2.9	6.9
Model:					
1949 or older.....	28.9	22.9	23.9	19.2	8.2
1950 to 1955.....	64.4	67.7	67.9	65.9	68.7
1956 to 1957.....	6.7	9.4	8.2	14.9	23.1
Price range:					
Low.....	71.8	74.9	70.0	71.2	66.5
Medium.....	27.5	24.6	29.7	29.3	31.4
High.....	.7	.5	.3	.5	2.1

Contrary to statements about farmers driving expensive new cars, our survey shows,

as have others carried out in this area, that a considerable number of farms don't even have one car, and that the majority are older models of the so-called low-priced makes, with very few high-cost cars of any age.

Note the large potential market here, indicated by the large percentage of farms either with no car or with models which a year ago were 8 years old and older.

These potential markets are actually to be found not just on the commercial farms of the great Midwest, but also in the farm towns and cities which are largely dependent upon farmers for their trade and business. These areas have not shared in the national boom of the last few years in the same proportion as have industrial cities. A revival of prosperity on our farms would stimulate even greater markets in the whole rural part of the Nation, which still makes up more than a third of our population. A continuing farm depression will surely bring about a further decline in business in these same rural areas.

6. Prospects for 1958 and 1959

It is obvious that the efforts to help farm income by reducing farm prices have failed to this point. Further loss of income is now being suffered because of present weakening of farm prices, especially for feed grains. This forecast and insures a return to very low livestock prices before long. Reductions ordered in supports for dairy products and wheat will be only the forerunners of other cuts unless stopped now. Nothing is in sight which will raise farm prices or cut farming costs. Nothing will help farmers restore their purchasing to former levels.

An analysis of the figures from wheat farms in this survey shows that the 22-cent-per-bushel (11 percent) cut now scheduled for the 1958 crop, will mean about a 25 percent cut in net income. Similarly, the 25-cent-per-hundredweight (8 percent) cut on milk scheduled for this spring will bring a comparable cut in net income of Midwest dairy farmers. It is calculated that each of these two cuts will cost the respective groups of farmers \$250 million, a total of one-half billion dollars' loss in net income per year.

Further cuts in farm income will cause the farm depression to feed the national business recession, perhaps making it snowball into a depression that can't be stopped short of terrible cost. The best way to start up our factories and call back the men is to see to it that there is no further cut in farm prices or income, and instead, that good commercial family farms be restored to parity.

Statement of purpose

The GTA family farm survey has been carried on to get a true audit of conditions on commercial family farms before the Congress and the public generally. The grain farmers who own this sponsoring cooperative want to strengthen the system of family owned and operated agriculture, which has been a principal foundation of our democracy so far in our Nation's history. They are opposed to public or private policies which threaten the stability and welfare of family farming.

This report is issued in the hope that it will help make clear the facts about such farms as they are found in this great agricultural producing area, the breadbasket of the world.

Further surveys may be made, with the cooperation of participating farm families, as times demand. Thanks to the cooperative spirit of these fine families, there is now available to the public the actual receipts and expenses for typical commercial family farms in these five States. These figures for the 7 years 1950-56 are an authentic and unique grassroots record.

## APPENDIX

TABLE I.—Average receipts and expenses per farm, 1954 and 1956

	1954	1956	Change
<b>Farm receipts:</b>			
Grain sales.....	\$3,638	\$3,866	\$228
Dairy products.....	1,236	1,381	145
Livestock sales.....	1,969	1,877	-92
Beets and potatoes.....	87	127	40
Poultry and eggs.....	379	402	23
Profit on purchased livestock.....	238	204	-34
Miscellaneous.....	463	529	66
Marketings.....	8,010	8,386	376
Government payments.....	66	191	125
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>8,076</b>	<b>8,577</b>	<b>501</b>
<b>Farm expenses:</b>			
Labor hired.....	401	369	-32
Feed.....	622	687	65
Seed.....	263	275	12
Custom work and machine hire.....	201	206	5
Supplies.....	194	204	10
Repairs.....	460	491	31
Services and fees.....	72	83	11
Fertilizer and sprays.....	139	180	41
Gas, oil, and grease.....	700	751	51
Storage and warehousing.....	44	44	0
Taxes.....	378	402	24
Insurance.....	190	196	6
Interest.....	174	202	28
Utilities (light, power, phone).....	140	157	17
Rent.....	116	119	3
Farm use of auto.....	182	196	14
Purchased livestock and poultry.....	38	29	-9
Miscellaneous.....	245	210	-35
Cash expenses.....	4,559	4,801	242
Depreciation.....	1,310	1,463	153
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>5,869</b>	<b>6,264</b>	<b>395</b>
Receipts less expenses.....	2,207	2,313	106
Plus food allowance.....	324	323	-1
Plus home allowance.....	400	375	-25
<b>Total, home and food.....</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>-26</b>
Net income (before taxes).....	2,931	3,011	80

## NEED TO REFORM PROCEDURES FOR FINANCING AMERICAN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, once again, the Nation—the administration, the Congress, the public—is confronted with the age-old problem of the role of money and ethics in Government. Year after year, we may try to deal with individual situations which are flagrant or dramatic enough to force themselves to our attention; we may try to forget these situations when someone has resigned from office or gone to prison, and to continue as best we can to operate a reasonably effective and honest form of government under our present system—but whether in the spotlight or beneath the surface, the question of money and ethics in Government will always be with us so long as governmental decisions shape the economic fortunes of many men and industries.

During the last week, the question was again forced to public attention by two events which, by a coincidence, have placed into juxtaposition the two ways in which we are plagued by money in pol-

itics. One is the familiar form of conflicts of interest, involved in the present investigation of charges that licensing decisions of the Federal Communications Commission have been influenced by political favoritism or worse. The other is the increasing dominance of campaign funds in our election process, illustrated by the \$100,000 Republican fund-raising dinner in Texas last week, for which \$100-a-plate tickets were sold by an unprecedentedly blatant reference to past and future Republican support for the natural gas decontrol bill ardently desired by certain gas and oil interests.

As I have frequently said during the past several years, Mr. President, I regard the second aspect of money in politics as by far the more fundamental and dangerous evil. The problem of bribes and of confusion between private and public interests is as old as Government, and I think it is fair to say that our standards in this regard are higher today than in the past; for instance, in the 19th century. But while I believe that our demands on personal rectitude and disinterest in Government personnel are rising, the situation with respect to money in campaigns for elective office is becoming abruptly worse, with the sudden development of television campaigns and the skyrocketing costs of all means of presenting candidates to the public. This is where radical reform is needed.

## COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCING FORMED

Consequently it strikes me as an extremely happy coincidence that it was last week—just at the time of the well-publicized Texas fund-raising dinner—that the Committee on Campaign Contributions and Expenditures chose to kick off its campaign for reform legislation in this field. I was delighted to learn of the formation of this committee of leading citizens from the worlds of business, finance, publishing, law, and academic learning, to further the cause of election-finance reform; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, Mr. President, the letter which I received last week, as did other Members, from Hon. William H. Vanderbilt on behalf of the committee, along with the list of the committee's members. Mr. Vanderbilt is an ex-Governor of Rhode Island.

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

BROOKLINE, MASS.  
February 12, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
The United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The undersigned, a bipartisan citizens' committee on campaign contributions and expenditures, believe that present laws governing campaign contributions and expenditures are unrealistic and ineffective. Their ineffectiveness leads to widespread cynicism, which tends to impair public confidence in the elective system. Their lack of realism makes it almost impossible for a conscientious candidate and his supporters to comply with them, for they do not take adequate account of the high cost of legitimate campaigning under mod-

ern conditions, including our increased population and mass media of communications.

We believe that substantial improvement is possible, and necessary to foster not only the integrity of our elective system, but also the independence of public officials by freeing them from undue pressure in raising campaign funds.

We are encouraged to note that Members of Congress are already giving this subject careful consideration. A number of bills within the past 2 years—including the Hennings bill, the Johnson bill and the Gore bill—and the hearings on them give ample evidence of the need for change and widespread recognition of the need.

The extensive study already made by legislative leaders in opening up the problem gives an opportunity to work it out in a balanced, sensible, and effective way. We believe that a bipartisan citizens' group such as ours, representing a broad range of political views but agreeing on basic principles of fair elections, can help to do this, and to spread public understanding.

We believe that national legislation should be enacted to give effect to the following general principles:

First. Comprehensive and effective public disclosure, including complete reports by all candidates for Federal office (including candidates for President and Vice President), listing all campaign contributions and expenditures received or spent by them or by organizations and committees supporting them.

Second. Overall limits on campaign expenditures by all of such candidates, including expenditures by all organizations and committees supporting them.

Third. Overall limits on campaign contributions by individuals.

Fourth. Extension of the above requirements to primary and nominating campaigns.

The limits set should be high enough to take account of legitimate, modern campaign costs; but comprehensive and tight enough to be effective. Full publicity is a key factor for there may well be no better test of the propriety of a contribution or expenditure than the willingness to expose it to general public knowledge. It would also enable our citizens to know what the facts really are and to base plans for improvement on these facts, rather than guess and rumor.

Sound new legislation in accordance with these four principles could pave the way for a sustained effort, at the community level and the national level, to develop general citizen financial support for election campaigns.

We earnestly hope that you will be willing to help enact such legislation.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT.  
(For the Committee.)

(List of members attached.)

(This committee, formerly called the Committee for Fair Elections, has been changed to the Committee on Campaign Contributions and Expenditures to avoid any misunderstanding or confusion with the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc., of which Mayor Charles P. Taft is chairman. The two committees have no connection.)

## PRESENT MEMBERS, COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Winthrop W. Aldrich, New York, N. Y.  
Archibald S. Alexander, Bernardsville, N. J.  
Frank Aitschul, chairman, General American Investors Co., New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, Red Wing, Minn.  
Dana W. Atchley, M. D., Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, New York, N. Y.

George W. Ball, Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, Washington, D. C.

Arthur A. Ballantine, Dewey, Ballantine, Bushby, Palmer & Wood, New York, N. Y.

W. B. Bates, chairman of the board, Bank of the Southwest, Houston, Tex.

Barry Bingham, president, the Courier-Journal, the Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.

Frederick S. Blackall, Jr., president, the Taft-Pierce Manufacturing Co., Woonsocket, R. I.

Robert Woods Bliss, Washington, D. C.

Charles R. Blyth, president, Blyth & Co., San Francisco, Calif.

Dudley B. Bonsal, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle, New York, N. Y.

James F. Brownlee, J. H. Whitney & Co., New York, N. Y.

William L. Clayton, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

John S. Coleman, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Arthur H. Compton, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Homer D. Crotty, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, Los Angeles, Calif.

Robert G. Dodge, Palmer, Dodge, Gardner & Bradford, Boston, Mass.

T. M. Evans, chairman, H. K. Porter Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.

James A. Farley, New York, N. Y.

Thomas K. Finletter, New York, N. Y.

G. Peabody Gardner, Boston, Mass.

George A. Garrett, Washington, D. C.

Clinton S. Golden, Solebury, Bucks County, Pa.

A. Crawford Greene, McCutchen, Thomas, Matthew, Griffiths & Greene, San Francisco, Calif.

Albert M. Greenfield, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Borden Harriman, Washington, D. C.

Seymour E. Harris, chairman, department of economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Paul G. Hoffman, Pasadena, Calif.

Joseph E. Johnson, Princeton, N. J.

Dwight P. Joyce, chairman and president, the Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Milton Katz, Law School of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Grayson L. Kirk, president, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Walter Jodok Kohler, Kohler, Wis.

William L. Langer, chairman, committee on regional studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Monte M. Lemann, Monroe & Lemann, New Orleans, La.

William E. Levis, Owens-Illinois Glass Building, Toledo, Ohio.

M. Albert Linton, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Goodhue Livingston, New York, N. Y.

Glen A. Lloyd, Bell, Boyd, Marshall & Lloyd, Chicago, Ill.

Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co., Chester, Pa.

James L. McCamy, department of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N. Y.

William C. Menninger, M. D., the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

Francis Pickens Miller, Charlottesville, Va.

Charles S. Munson, chairman of the board, Air Reduction Co., New York, N. Y.

Paul H. Nitze, Washington, D. C.

Peter H. Odegard, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Joseph O'Meara, dean, the Law School University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

Henry Parkman, Parkman, Robbins & Russell, Boston, Mass.

Mundy I. Peale, president, Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, L. I., N. Y.

H. W. Prentiss, Jr., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.

Mrs. Tom Ragland, Nashville, Tenn.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York, N. Y.

Elmo Roper, Elmo Roper & Associates, New York, N. Y.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Department of History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Arthur A. Seeligson, San Antonio, Tex.

Lemolne Skinner, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.

R. E. Smith, Houston, Tex.

Carl B. Spaeth, dean, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Charles M. Spofford, Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, New York, N. Y.

Herman W. Steinkraus, chairman and president, Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss, New York, N. Y.

Benjamin Strong, chairman of the board, United States Trust Company of New York, New York, N. Y.

Herbert Bayard Swope, New York, N. Y.

Mayor Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.

William H. Vanderbilt, Englewood, Fla.

W. W. Waymack, Adel, Iowa.

W. H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

William W. Wolbach, executive vice president, Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Boston, Mass.

Henry M. Wriston, executive director, the American Assembly, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the emphasis in the program endorsed by the Committee on Campaign Contributions and Expenditures is on disclosure,

along with modernization of present limitations, controls and reporting procedures. I have long said in the Senate,

and I think many of the members of the committee know, that I think they are misguided in placing very heavy reliance

on this approach. No doubt reforms are necessary in the present laws on those subjects, but not much should be expected

from them. More than half a century ago, in a message to the Congress,

President Theodore Roosevelt said:

It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however,

always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men.

Therefore, Teddy Roosevelt went on to tell the Congress, a more radical solution was necessary:

The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that we shall eventually come to accept this approach as the only logical and effective one in making our elections truly democratic expressions of the people's choice between competing men and programs,

uninhibited by vast inequality of the candidate's campaign funds—and in assuring that the successful candidate can enter office free from any sense of obligation to large campaign contributors, past or future. I have confidence that, upon continued study, the noted members of the Committee on Campaign Contributions and Expenditures will come to recognize that substitution of reasonable amounts of public funds, in various forms, for private funds in meeting the highest election costs is the sine qua non of any effective control of undesirably large private campaign contributions and expenditures. Thus I, again, want to express the greatest gratification and satisfaction at seeing a citizens' group of this high caliber assume an active interest and leadership in this fundamental problem of democracy.

PUBLICITY ALONE DOES NOT DISPOSE OF MONEY IN POLITICS

Mr. President, that mere disclosure and publicity is not itself the whole solution is, I think, demonstrated perfectly by last week's episode in Texas, to which I have referred. Certainly there was nothing secret about the letter Mr. Porter, the Republican national committeeman from Texas, sent out to potential contributors, referring to past and future Republican support for the natural gas decontrol bill as the reason why they should buy \$100-a-plate tickets. Certainly, due to the journalistic vigilance and enterprise of Mr. Edward T. Follard and the Washington Post and Times Herald, the overt and undisguised connection made in this instance between specific special-interest legislation and campaign financing has received nationwide publicity. Certainly the publicity has been healthy and valuable—it seems to be conceded that it has ended the chances of the gas bill's passage in this session of Congress.

Yet, Mr. President, what of the money? Mr. Follard reported that close to \$100,000 was raised at the dinner in Houston. I have heard no reports that the money is being sent back to the donors. Whatever may happen to the gas bill, the money will unquestionably be spent on the election campaigns of candidates for public office—and probably not, one may guess, on candidates whose philosophy of government and public policy deviates substantially from that of the donors. The opponents of these candidates will have to meet that \$100,000 expenditure, irrespective of the fact that the manner in which this particular fund was raised happens to have received unfavorable publicity. After that publicity, the Republican National Committee stated it would not accept the money—but no such reticence has yet been displayed by the Senate and House Republican campaign committees. And in Texas itself, Mr. Porter and the other fund raisers are reported to be puzzled why they have been subjected to all this furor for doing openly and honestly what they plainly recognize is customarily done elsewhere in raising funds for political campaigns. Given our present system, it is possible to sympathize with their bewilderment even if not with

their conception of politics and public policy.

Mr. President, to illustrate the remarks I have made with respect to the Texas fund-raising dinner, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter sent by Republican National Committeeman H. J. Porter, as excerpted in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 11, 1958; and two stories entitled "Puzzler in Texas: What's Wrong With \$100,000?" and "Two GOP Chiefs Eye That Texas Money," from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 13.

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

#### THE TEXAS LETTER

Printed below is an abstract of the text of one of the letters sent by H. J. Porter, Republican national committeeman from Texas, announcing last night's appreciation dinner for House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
Houston, Tex., January 30, 1958.

DEAR SIR: We are having an appreciation dinner \* \* \* honoring the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the 80th and 83d Congresses \* \* \* at the Rice Hotel Crystal Ballroom in Houston on February 10 at 7 p. m.

JOE MARTIN \* \* \* has always been a friend of Texas, especially of the oil and gas producing industries. He mustered two-thirds of the Republican votes in the House each time the gas bill passed. \* \* \* As Speaker of the 83d Congress he led the fight for adoption of the tidelands ownership bill.

It will be up to JOE MARTIN to muster at least 65 percent of the Republican votes in order to pass the gas bill this year. \* \* \* He has to put Republican Members from northern and eastern consuming areas on the spot politically because the bill is not popular due to the distortion of facts by newspaper columnists and others.

The dinner must raise substantial amounts of money for the Republican Party as part of these will go toward the election of Republican Congressmen and Senators.

Walter Reuther is the dominant figure in the Democratic Party and will pick the Democratic nominee for President in 1960. \* \* \* Even though we may not approve of everything Eisenhower has done \* \* \* the Republican Party is the party of private enterprise and free economy.

Checks should be made out to H. J. Porter, Chairman, or Texas Republican Finance Committee, or Republican National Committee, or Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, or Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

H. J. PORTER,  
Member for Texas.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1958]

**PUZZLER IN TEXAS: WHAT'S WRONG WITH \$100,000?**

(By Edward T. Follard)

In booming Houston and elsewhere in Texas, they must be puzzled by all the excitement in the North over that \$100-a-plate appreciation dinner for JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts the other night.

One can imagine Texans saying to each other: "Well, what was wrong with that? Joe's a good friend of Texas, isn't he?"

That was the point that H. J. (Jack) Porter made in the beginning, when he was unwittingly laying a mine under himself. Porter is Republican national committeeman for Texas. It was he who conceived the idea

of the appreciation dinner in Houston for Representative MARTIN, Republican leader of the House.

In letters he sent out to Texas fat cats, asking them to buy \$100 tickets for the dinner, Porter made it very clear why JOE was a hero in the Lone Star State. JOE (as Porter said in one letter) has always been "a friend of Texas, especially the oil and gas producing industries"; lined up two-thirds of the Republicans behind the gas bill in 1952 and 1955; it would be up to him to rally 65 percent of the GOP lawmakers behind it again this year, putting northern Republicans on the spot politically because of fear of a gas-rate increase among their constituents.

The Houston dinner for MARTIN brought in \$100,000, a part of which was to be used to help elect Republicans to the House and Senate this year.

When Porter's letter was made public, President Eisenhower shied away from the hundred grand as if it were 100,000 rattlers. With his approval, Meade Alcorn, chairman of the Republican National Committee, issued a statement saying that the committee would not accept any of the money raised at the MARTIN dinner.

As for the gas bill—which opponents say would enrich producers of natural gas by \$1 billion a year, at the expense of consumers—that would seem to be dead.

To repeat, however, Texans must be wondering about all the hullabaloo, the cries about unsavory transaction, gas lobby arrogance, absolutely stupid, and so on.

The affection they have for JOE MARTIN in Texas—and why they have it—was well explained Monday afternoon by Jim Clark, a newspaperman. Jim writes a column for the Houston Post, of which Oveta Culp Hobby is president and editor. In a piece that appeared about the time MARTIN was flying into Houston, Clark referred to that evening's appreciation dinner, and said:

"Personally, I hope the house is packed. JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, is the kind of man to whom Americans should all be paying tribute. But Texans, particularly those engaged in the oil business, should go out of their way to see that he is welcomed to our city."

Columnist Clark went on to recall, as Porter had done in letters, how MARTIN got two-thirds of House Republicans to vote for the gas bill in 1952, when President Truman vetoed it, and again in 1955, after which President Eisenhower vetoed it. He said that General Eisenhower might have signed the bill instead of vetoing it except for a stupid lobbying incident.

"But JOE MARTIN had done his job well," columnist Clark wrote. "Out of 209 House votes, 123 were Republican, compared with 86 Democratic. So I hope Houston, and especially its oil men, line up in droves tonight to pay tribute to JOE MARTIN."

They did line up in droves. Something like 500 jammed the Crystal Ballroom of Houston's Rice Hotel for the dinner. It was almost impossible to ask for a salt shaker without having a millionaire pass it on to you.

But it should not be thought that appreciation for MARTIN in Texas is limited to the oil and gas men. In Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth, and elsewhere in that mighty State, if the big dealers say a thing is good, the chances are that the little fellows will agree.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1958]

**TWO GOP CHIEFS EYE THAT TEXAS MONEY**  
(By Jack Bell)

The chairman of the Senate and House Republican Campaign Committees said yesterday they will accept the \$100,000 raised by a Houston, Tex., party dinner and spurned by the GOP National Committee.

Interviewed by telephone, Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL (Republican, Kansas) and Rep-

resentative RICHARD M. SIMPSON (Republican, Pennsylvania) said Chairman Meade Alcorn's statement that the GOP National Committee will not accept funds from the dinner does not apply to their committees.

Alcorn's refusal was announced Tuesday with White House approval.

SCHOEPEL and SIMPSON joined in condemning the action of H. J. Porter, Texas GOP national committeeman, in appealing for contributions on the ground that Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., House minority leader, had helped obtain House passage of the natural gas bill in the past and was being counted on to rally support for it this year.

But SCHOEPEL and SIMPSON made it clear their indignation was not so great as to cause them—as it did Alcorn—to turn their backs on \$100,000 in campaign contributions.

At Austin, Gov. Price Daniel of Texas told a news conference Porter should return the \$100,000 to the contributors. Daniel, a Democrat, said Porter's "attempt to mix partisan politics and campaign funds with the natural gas bill" has hurt the pending legislation.

"As Governor of this State, I want the people of the Nation to know that this incident is deplored by the great majority of our people," he said. "Neither Texas nor the merits of the gas bill should be judged by Mr. Porter's actions."

At Independence, Kans., SCHOEPEL said, "I knew nothing about the Porter letter until I read portions of it in the papers. It was unfortunate and does not bespeak the attitude of the Republicans of Texas who contributed honestly to help elect Republican Senators and Congressmen."

"We are certainly not going to take the position, however, that any money forwarded to us by the Republican State Finance Committee of Texas will not be accepted."

SCHOEPEL said that while the proceeds of such \$100-a-plate dinners often are cleared through the national committee, it is not unusual for a State finance group to send the money directly to the Congressional committees. He said he assumed this would be done in this case.

SIMPSON said that thus far the House committee has received no offer of any of the money collected at the Houston dinner. But he said that so far as he is concerned, if money is forwarded by the Texas State Finance Committee to his group it will be accepted.

SIMPSON called Porter's letter crude and inexcusable. He said it put MARTIN in an unfair light.

"Everybody knows that JOE MARTIN's influence is not for sale," SIMPSON said. "Some of this money was contributed by persons who wished to get a legislative decision on a matter that I believe the Supreme Court unfortunately decided the wrong way."

"I see no reason why the contributions should not be accepted by our committee."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the alternative approach to election financing—to regard it as a legitimate and necessary public cost of democratic government, just as the cost of Government buildings and the payment of salaries to elected officials—has recently been inaugurated on a modest scale in Puerto Rico. I had occasion to bring the Puerto Rican experiment in financing political activities to the attention of the Senate last year, when the law was first passed. Now the first reports on its operation are in. The particular law in operation in Puerto Rico is not perfect or even, in my opinion, a very close model of the system we should establish in this country. In many

ways conditions are, of course, extremely different. Nevertheless, as an illustration of the principle, the Puerto Rican example is valuable and instructive, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article describing it, from the New York Times of February 9, 1958.

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

**PUERTO RICO PAYS POLITICAL PARTIES—EXPENSE FUND IS CALLED NECESSARY TO DEMOCRACY—ONE GROUP BALKS**

(By Peter Klhas)

SAN JUAN, P. R., January 30.—An experiment by which the Government provides the main financing for political parties is under way here. The law calls the payments "instruments necessary to democracy."

The Secretary of the Treasury, José Ramon Noguera, revealed today that Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín's Popular Democratic Party had drawn \$16,057 from last July 1 through January 28.

Secretary Noguera said that the opposition Statehood Party, affiliated with mainland Republicans, had obtained \$20,415 in the same period.

Both totals are preliminary. Secretary Noguera said that the Statehood leader, Senator Miguel Angel García Mendez believed his party's total was closer to \$17,000.

**MISUSE OF FUNDS CHARGED**

The Independence Party, the other opposition group led by Senator Gilberto Concepción de Gracia, has rejected the payments as a misuse of public funds. In effect, he sees the plan as a government plot against the opposition.

The payments are actually running well below the maximum rate allowable under the law. Each principal party is allowed to have certain bills paid up to \$75,000 in non-election years. In quadrennial election years each may get \$150,000 plus previously unspent balances.

The money may be used for offices, broadcasts, movies, travel, advertisements, programs, and other propaganda. Monthly reports are sent to the secretary of the treasury. The government pays vendors directly instead of having the money pass through parties.

**PRIVATE GIFTS LIMITED**

In its other phase, the law limits private contribution to parties to \$400 yearly in non-election years and \$600 in election years, with any violation a misdemeanor. It also bans the soliciting of contributions from government employees in their offices or through other government employees as a felony.

Senator Yidefonso Solo Morales, Populares Party secretary general, said that the law sought to end any practices of large contributions or levying on government employees.

The Populares have used most of government fund for a half-hour radio broadcast every night except Sunday in 3 cities, costing \$1,000 monthly, the senator said. The rest has gone chiefly for the San Juan headquarters.

Julio C. Torres, party treasurer, said that the Populares had been spending \$75,000 annually in non-election years and \$200,000 in election years.

Luis A. Ferre, 1956 Statehood candidate for governor, said he had personally opposed the law for government subsidies "because I believe it is a step toward paternalism and the giving up of citizens' rights."

However, he said he had agreed when the party majority wanted to take the fund because it needed more money and newspaper space. He asserted he got the law limited to exclude "pork barrel" salaries.

Statehood members previously had difficulty because contributors feared possible government reprisals, Mr. Ferre said. In the 1952 gubernatorial election, the party spent at least \$100,000, he said, but this sagged to \$45,000 in 1956 even though he and Mr. García Mendez each contributed \$6,000.

In non-election years, he said, his party spent up to \$25,000. Statehood members are using the new government fund chiefly for newspaper advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, it happens that, by a coincidence, I was addressing the New School Associates in New York City last week on the whole subject of money and ethics in government, just as the two current examples of the problem—in the form of conflicts of interest within regulatory agencies and of campaign fund raising—were occupying the front pages. I ask unanimous consent that the press release giving the substance of my remarks at the Eduard C. Lindeman memorial luncheon of the New School Associates, on the subject of money and ethics in government, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

**FINANCING OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, NOT OCCASIONAL GIFTS, IS GREATEST PROBLEM OF ETHICS IN DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, NEUBERGER TELLS NEW SCHOOL ASSOCIATES**

"As long as candidates for the Nation's highest elective offices must regularly seek hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from private donors, it is futile to pursue ethics in government with conflict-in-interest laws and rules about civil servants accepting small courtesy gifts at Christmas," Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, told the Eduard C. Lindeman memorial luncheon of the New School Associates in New York City today.

"The recurring fuss over occasional airplane tickets, resort visits, speaking fees or Christmas hams fades into insignificance when compared with \$30 million campaign treasuries to elect a President and \$1 million exchequers to back a Senator or governor in a big industrial State," said NEUBERGER, who was elected to the Senate in 1954 as the first Democrat from his Pacific Northwest State in 40 years. "True elimination of conflicts of interest will remain an elusive goal until an effective method is adopted to free public officials from being virtual prisoners of the huge campaign funds needed to reach the public through modern means of mass communication."

The Oregon Senator proposed that the dilemma be solved by adopting the recommendation first made by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907, for Federal financing of the Federal election campaigns of the major political parties in order to liberate candidates from dependence on large private contributions. "Teddy Roosevelt made this recommendation to the Congress half a century ago, long before the era of radio and TV and other costly modern political necessities. Yet even when election costs were only a tiny fraction of what they are today, this great and progressive Republican President spelled out the evil in a system under which officeholders must rely on donors with special interests for the wherewithal of their elections to office."

NEUBERGER described in detail legislation he has proposed in the Senate to put the Teddy Roosevelt plan into law by having the Federal Treasury underwrite certain election expenses as a "necessary cost of democratic government." This would be done by entitling major party candidates in Federal elections to Federal financial support based on a

formula of 20 cents for each voter in the district; by federally purchased broadcast time made available on equal terms to opposing candidates; by offering a tax credit of up to \$10 to every taxpayer for a legitimate individual political contribution made by him to a candidate or party of his choice; and by matching-fund grants to States for voters' pamphlets to make information about candidates and issues available free to all registered voters.

All such Federal support would be subject to two conditions, NEUBERGER explained, "(1) that the candidate's campaign keep within legally set limits all its other expenditures from private sources; and (2) that the candidate receive at least 10 percent of the total vote cast, or forfeit a bond he must deposit in the amount of one-half the Federal contribution to his campaign." The 10 percent rule is necessary to rule out splinter-party or self-starting candidates running for the purse, NEUBERGER said. "Under such a limitation, the Bull Moose candidacy of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 and the Progressives of Fighting Bob La Follette in 1924 would have passed the 10 percent qualifying level; the various Socialist, Communist, and Dixiecrat tickets we have had would have forfeited their bonds."

The Oregon Senator said that, in his opinion, present campaign reporting laws are barely worth the paper they are printed on. "Even if they were amended and modernized, they would be useless unless affirmative responsibility for investigation and enforcement of reporting requirements is placed in the hands of an independent agency, removed as far as possible from politics."

"Can politicians, no matter how honest, satisfy the public that they are enforcing the election laws against themselves? I have proposed that the Comptroller General—a nonpolitical longterm official who is also outside of the executive branch—should have authority and responsibility to audit and investigate all spending in election campaigns, not just that which appears on filed reports. Campaign financing should be subject to at least as effective scrutiny as income-tax returns are today—then maybe it would be possible to keep check on the size and sources of campaign treasuries."

"Most of the men and women I have met in Congress and in the legislature of my State are honest and trustworthy," NEUBERGER told his luncheon audience. "They would be outraged and shocked at any suggestion of taking money to influence their judgment on any policy issue which might come before them for decision. Yet to reach their own electorate, to influence the public to vote for them over their opponents, our system forces them to accept vast sums in campaign contributions from sources who have a direct stake in those policy issues."

"Moreover, this system invariably gives one candidate greater financial resources than another with which to place his program, or at least his profile, before the public—and thus actually denies the public a fair and equal choice," the Senator stated. "There is hardly an equal, democratic election between one candidate whose name has been heralded in billboards, newspaper ads, and TV spectacles and another who has been speaking from street-corner soapboxes. Only if, by equal Federal financing accompanied by limits on private spending, we help all candidates to reach the public, can we eliminate the dollar from politics and speak of 'one man, one vote.'"

NEUBERGER claimed that this approach to true democracy and ethical politics would be consistent with the ideals of the late Eduard C. Lindeman, in whose memory the luncheon lectures are held. "Professor Lindeman spent years in social work, in direct contact with the realities behind social theories, before his distinguished career as teacher and writer," he said. "He would know that the great

18th-century doctrines behind the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights are kept alive, not in the shrines of the National Archives, but by being given concrete and meaningful application under the actual conditions of our 20th century industrialized mass civilization."

Referring to Lindeman as a man of challenging intellect and great moral courage and conviction, NEUBERGER said that Mrs. Neuberger and he felt a special sense of personal association on this occasion because of their friendship with Lindeman's daughter, Mrs. George D. Leonard, of Portland, Oreg.

"Professor Lindeman would have seen the implications for our philosophy of democracy when a total of at least \$200 million was spent on all the political campaigns—Federal, State, and local—in 1956," NEUBERGER said. "The largest blocks of these campaign funds, and these are the ones politicians must largely rely on, came from a relatively small number of people. The implicit dangers to free, democratic government are obvious—and far greater than the danger from lobbying and petty favoritism—yet when election campaign costs have skyrocketed with the use of modern communications techniques, where is a candidate for elective office to get the money? Don't forget that Judge Leibowitz withdrew from a mayoralty race in New York because he said he had been advised that he would need a treasure chest of as much as a million dollars to be elected."

NEUBERGER said that the alternative of grassroots participation in political campaign financing would be encouraged by his proposal to allow each individual taxpayer one \$10 tax credit annually for a legitimate contribution to a political party or candidate. "Tax incentives have been suggested by various bills introduced in recent years, but they would have to be in the form of a small tax credit of this kind rather than \$100 deductions, as has been proposed," he said. "A credit taken directly against the tax would affect each taxpayer and voter equally. But a \$100 tax deduction could mean that the Treasury in effect would put up as much as three-fourths of the \$100 contributions of a wealthy industrialist and his wife, while it put up only about 20 percent of the smaller sum contributed by a bus driver or sawmill worker. Such an unequal policy obviously could not be sustained."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Is this not the same Jack Porter who testified before our committee?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am not certain.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the same Jack Porter who testified before the committee to the effect that everyone in Texas receiving an appointment at the hands of the Republican administration would be asked for so much money. When he appeared before the committee he justified that policy by saying that the applicants had to be screened to determine whether or not they should receive appointments as postmasters, or to sundry other positions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. In my opinion there should be no connection between campaign

funds and public policy, and there should be no connection between campaign funds and the receiving of appointments from the United States Government, or any other level of government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My reason for calling attention to that situation is that Mr. Porter ties together the making of appointments, the election of candidates, and the raising of funds. They are all in the picture at the present time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again there is demonstrated a need for drastic reform in this realm.

#### FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, marked the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. At a time when the possibility of negotiating with the Soviets over longstanding political grievances is approaching reality, it is well to remind ourselves of the nature of the adversary—and Lithuania's tragic story is a clear illustration of that nature.

When Lithuania became independent in 1918, she proceeded rapidly to embark on the course of progressive and modern statehood. In 1922, she was the first European nation to enact a land reform program—one of the most important events in her history, since three-fourths of her population was agricultural. A compulsory education program, begun in 1930, reduced illiteracy from 64 to 15 percent. Cooperatives raised the standards of commerce, agriculture and industry, and the transformation of Lithuania into an enlightened modern nation was well under way.

In 1939 Lithuania became a battleground for Russian and German forces. She revolted in 1941, but after a few days of freedom was overrun by the Germans. The Russians in 1944 dislodged the Germans and, with a reign of terror, established Russian authority, including forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Rigid Soviet censorship has tended to obscure the extent of Communist brutality in Lithuania. I doubt that we have ever heard the full truth about purges, deportations and enforced labor and about the savage Soviet campaign to obliterate all vestiges of Lithuanian nationalism.

But as the Hungarian revolution and the Polish and East German uprisings have shown, the spirit of liberty dies hard. The yeast of discontent and the longing for freedom are at work in Lithuania as they are in the other satellite nations.

When we sit down at the bargaining table with the Soviets—as we must do if mankind is to hope for a secure peace—let us remember Lithuania as an object lesson. The Soviets are single-minded, wily and tough; let us be no less.

Mr. President there was published in yesterday's New York Times an editorial entitled "When Lithuania Was Free," which summarizes in fine style the sacrifices which the wonderful people of Lithuania have made and the contribution

they are continually making in opposition to slavery, tyranny and Soviet domination.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

#### WHEN LITHUANIA WAS FREE

If it had not been for Russian aggression in 1940 Lithuania would this week be celebrating the 40th anniversary of her independence. It was on February 16, 1918, that the little republic, following the example of Latvia, and preceding Estonia by a few days, declared herself free of the ancient Russian tyranny. Twenty-two years afterward this freedom was brutally betrayed by a new tyrant, the late Josef Stalin.

Nevertheless, the memory of liberty survives in Lithuania and in the other Baltic States. The fatuous theory that Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, or any other of the captive nations of Central Europe, rejoice in their slavery to Moscow fools nobody and silences nobody who does not have to live under Russian bayonets.

These nations will not be rescued from their serfdom at the cost of a third global war. The price is one humanity cannot pay. But they will not be forgotten in the Free World. Some day, when communism's vast lie has been dethroned, they will be free again. Meanwhile, we in this country count their people, in exile or in enforced and unwilling silence at home, as our friends: We salute them for their past and future victories.

#### METHODS OF RELIEVING ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have just received a communication from Hon. Albert B. Chandler, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, enclosing a memorandum from Dr. James Martin, Commissioner of Highways for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Dr. Martin makes some excellent points which I think deserve careful consideration by my colleagues, and also by the appropriate agencies downtown.

I ask unanimous consent that both the letter to me from Governor Chandler and the memorandum from Dr. Martin to the Governor be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,

Frankfort, February 14, 1958.

Senator THURSTON B. MORTON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: Dr. James Martin, commissioner of highways, sent me the enclosed memorandum this morning. I believe this memorandum will be of interest to you in considering proposals regarding methods of relieving economic distress in certain sections of the country.

Kentucky has already completed the engineering and right-of-way acquisitions on a large number of miles of roads that are approved for Federal aid secondary money. The building of these roads will not only relieve unemployment in these distress areas but will also permit economic development that is not now possible.

Please give us your reaction to this proposal.

Sincerely,

ALBERT B. CHANDLER,  
Chairman.

## MEMORANDUM

FEBRUARY 14, 1958.

To: Hon. A. B. Chandler, Governor.

From: James W. Martin, commissioner of highways.

If the Congress of the United States should immediately make available additional Federal aid for highways, this department could effectively utilize the money. Exactly how fast we could move, and how effectively from the point of view of relieving unemployment, would depend on the terms of the grant.

Even though there is considerable unemployment in many parts of Kentucky, the greatest distress is in the eastern and southern parts of the State. The most serious problems are in the mountains and more or less southward from the inner bluegrass. If Federal aid secondary money were available in a large amount, the department could almost at once let contracts to use it—and primarily in the sections of Kentucky most in need of employment for the population. Over a long period, the engineering staff has worked up and obtained rights of way for measurably more mileage than the State could finance.

If additional support were made available but restricted to one or more of the other categories of established grants, the department could effectively use the money. Except for a few million dollars worth of Federal aid primary projects, there would be slight delay for engineering and rights-of-way acquisition. Moreover, both the Federal aid urban and Federal aid primary projects would fall more heavily in the area of the State where the interstate highways are located than would be the case as to Federal aid secondary projects.

The existing financial flexibility is possible because of the availability of bond proceeds to match Federal aid money.

If additional Federal aid is made available, more effective employment objectives could be attained. Without having made special inquiry, I am confident this would be true of other States. Greatest employment achievements of all would result from making money available for highways without any restriction as to use on the Federal-aid system. Kentucky has millions of dollars worth of projects not eligible for Federal aid under present law which could be made ready for contracting in a short time.

For a State like Kentucky which has comparatively limited interstate mileage, this year is a peculiarly unfortunate time to shift the basis of Federal aid for interstate highways as contemplated in the Federal highway aid law. In the studies recently submitted to the Congress, such a change in policy would apparently cut more than 40 percent from Kentucky's allotment in the course of 2 years.

JAMES W. MARTIN.

## PROPOSED NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the press tells us that the President's first important step to counter the recession talk came Tuesday when he proposed a stepped-up program of post-office construction and renovation to cost \$2 billion. They also tell us that the Bureau of the Budget has authorized the District to seek Congressional approval for a \$100-million borrowing program for an expanded public-works program.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss the desirability or undesirability nor the adequacy or inadequacy of these proposals. Rather would I seize this opportunity, Mr. President, since the administration now looks with favor on the

construction of Federal buildings, to address a fervent plea to the President that he put first things first and promptly authorize the construction of that one Federal building which is far more needed than any other and the construction of which is invested with an urgency more compelling and more important to the Nation than I can express. I refer, Mr. President, to the National Library of Medicine.

Two billion for post offices. One hundred million for public works in the District of Columbia. Fine. Well and good. But first let us get going on the \$7 million building which we must have to house and protect those priceless volumes collected by our National Library of Medicine which lie at the very heart of all our research endeavors in the field of health and which are daily threatened with destruction.

As I said on the floor of this Senate on March 13, 1956, Mr. President, this library holds the greatest collection of medical literature in the entire world. It is of incalculable value. Once destroyed, not all the gold in Fort Knox could restore to us this treasure. Yet, to our national shame, Mr. President, it must be said that since I spoke those words a part of the library's collection has been destroyed.

It may come as a great surprise to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to hear me make this plea. "Did we not," they may well be asking, "authorize the creation of a National Library of Medicine properly housed in a modern building just 2 years ago?" "Did we not vote the funds needed to design and draw plans for the building?" "Are we not prepared to appropriate the money needed for its construction?" Of course we did, and of course we are. With complete bipartisanship, with overwhelming approval and without a single dissent, the 84th Congress declared the construction of such a library to be vital to the national welfare and enacted Public Law 941 which created the library. The library's board of regents has agreed on a site. The plans are drawn. We are ready to go, yet we are not going. And, in the meantime, priceless manuscripts and volumes have already been destroyed and the entire collection is daily threatened with destruction.

Why? The answer appears on page 601 of the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year of 1959.

There we find the altogether inexplicable, the unbelievable, the shocking statement—and a blunt one it is—I quote: "The construction of this building is being temporarily deferred."

Mr. President, such deferment of so vitally necessary a project cannot be tolerated. I urge my colleagues, particularly those Republican colleagues of mine in the Senate who, to a man, joined in passing the bill for a National Library of Medicine, to join with me in urging the administration to give the construction of this building the very highest priority in its newly decided on construction program.

I shall not here repeat the arguments which 2 years ago persuaded us that this undertaking was of the utmost impor-

tance. I would simply remind the Congress that it was urged upon us in the most compelling terms by the Department of Defense, by the Hoover Commission, by the American Medical Association, the College of Surgeons, the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, our State health officers and just about every organization of scientists concerned with health in the land. Dr. Ravdin, to whom the President himself turned for aid when he was unfortunately stricken with ileitis, now chairman of the board of regents of the library, told us, "There can be no question but that new physical facilities are urgently needed" and that the library's 80-year-old building is a firetrap in which at any time its contents "may well be destroyed."

Since then, Mr. President, the American Medical Association, in an editorial published in its Journal for November 2, 1957, described the tragic loss of over 400 books last September when water backed up and overflowed the drains in the library's antiquated 1887 structure. Just last week, Mr. Albert Deutsch, one of the Nation's most outstanding science writers, in a letter to the New York Times and to the Washington Post, wrote, and I quote:

It should be obvious to all, in this age of large-scale man-induced radiation, faster-than-sound human travel, development of potent biological weapons, and the imminent rise of spacemen, that health and medical research are vital forces in our quest for national and world security. The National Library of Medicine \* \* \* is a signal factor in strengthening our strategic health defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association and Mr. Deutsch's letter be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I hope they will be read by every Member of the Congress and that they, my colleagues, will as one man join with me in urging the administration to immediately authorize the construction of the National Library of Medicine.

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

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association of November 2, 1957]

## NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The National Library of Medicine, established by Public Law 941, 84th Congress, has just completed its first year of operation under its new sponsor, the Public Health Service, and the first annual report of the library has just been issued. The record is an amazing one. It would appear that the renaissance of this great institution, begun through the initiative of the Army Medical Service, is now coming to full flowering.

The library has vigorously pushed its comprehensive acquisitions policy, and is receiving important medical literature from the 4 corners of the earth. Under its new loan policy this material is freely available to physicians throughout the United States, on request made through local libraries. The publications program of the library, which includes catalogs, indexes, and bibliographies of all kinds, is most impressive, and is a clear indication that the library is utilizing its full resources in offering a truly national service. Everyone who must wrestle with the vast and complicated outpouring of medical literature—and this includes, at one time or an-

other, almost all physicians—can feel only pleasure and pride in the library's achievement.

There is one somber fact to be noted: after 40 years of striving the library has not yet obtained the new building which it so desperately needs. If any doubt existed as to the reality of this need, it will be dissipated by perusal of the current issue of the National Library of Medicine News, which carries a description of how, during September, over 400 books of the early 19th century were damaged when water backed up and overflowed from faulty drain pipes in the library's present antiquated structure, built in 1887. Among the total losses were several volumes of Sir Astley Cooper's works, Abraham Colles' treatise on surgical anatomy (1811), and a hand-painted illustrated edition of Cooke's pocket anatomy. The library describes the loss as tragic, it seems to us that this is the word for the whole situation of delay in construction of a new building. It is a mystery why funds have not been obtained for a measure which is of immediate concern to every worker in the medical sciences, and indeed to the health of the Nation and the whole future of medical research and practice.

FEBRUARY 5, 1958.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The persistent reluctance of our national administration to see the scientific crisis whole is reflected in the President's failure to recommend in his budget message an appropriation needed to start building the new National Library of Medicine authorized by Congress last year.

It should be obvious to all, in this age of large-scale man-induced radiation, faster-than-sound human travel, development of potent biological weapons, and the imminent rise of spacemen, that health and medical research are vital forces in our quest for national and world security. The National Library of Medicine, formerly known as the Armed Forces Medical Library, is a signal factor in strengthening our strategic health defenses.

It is the world's largest medical library, surpassing even the great medical library in Leningrad. But it is no mere repository of medical learning; it is a dynamic source of vital information for research scientists. For many years the housing of this great institution in the aged, ramshackle, rat-ridden sium of Independence Avenue has constituted a national disgrace; its continuance there could turn into a national disaster. Overcrowding has forced the piling up of important scientific volumes in almost inaccessible places. Not long ago a break in rotting water pipes resulted in the destruction of a number of invaluable volumes. A greater catastrophe was averted only by the heroic efforts of staff members who slogged knee-deep in water to rescue shelves of precious works. Urgent appeals to transfer the library to a more suitable building went unheeded for 40 years until Congress made the step possible in 1956.

The designs and plans for the new building are now completed. Only the money is lacking. It is to be hoped that Congress will correct the administration's budgetary blindness by voting the needed appropriation.

Sincerely,

ALBERT DEUTSCH.

#### WAR OR PEACE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the February 1958 issue of the Progressive Farmer there appeared an article by its able and distinguished senior editor and chairman of the board, Dr. Clarence Poe, entitled "Peace Conferences or War Corpses—Which?"

Dr. Poe in his timely article presents his views on war or peace and forewarns us of the appalling destruction that threatens us in the nuclear age unless a lasting peace is secured by the nations of the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Dr. Poe's article.

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

#### PEACE CONFERENCES OR WAR CORPSES—WHICH?

(By Clarence Poe)

(It is indeed a gruesome thing to say that "the issue of war and peace is likely to be settled by conferences or corpses." But is it not folly to ignore the fact that nearly all scientists proclaim that nuclear warfare could make America one ghastly ruin and continental graveyard? In such a situation, is it not the very least we should consider to try to "agree with thine adversary quickly" (to use Christ's own phrase) by efforts at peace and disarmament, no matter how much patience may be required? And may we not try for disarmament and peace with some hope of success because peace will be equally good for ourselves and our opponents? The only alternative to coexistence may be no existence.)

I. "What is the outlook for world peace as 1958 begins?" War may not be a probability this year. But under present conditions it will continue to be a threat until the United States, the United Nations, and a more truly united Christianity work more zealously for world peace. This may be a year of destiny for you or your son or brother or husband. Equally, it may be a year of destiny for your wife or sister or daughter. This is true because nuclear warfare would show no distinction between men and women, children and adults, combatants and noncombatants.

Yesterday two men were talking about the possibilities of world peace. One said, "The question of world peace may be decided either by peace conferences or war corpses." That is to say, it may be decided either by conferences or agreements among nations that will insure disarmament and save us from world war III. Or it may be settled by the numbers of men, women, and children slain in battle or by intercontinental ballistic missiles.

II. "What was accomplished at the recent NATO Conference, and what leadership for peace did America display?" First of all, it is plain that America and its allies were divided not in their desire for peace, but in their opinion as to how to insure peace. One group would depend almost entirely on military preparedness. The other group does not oppose increased military preparedness, but declares we should first make every possible effort to work out with Russia some plan for peaceful coexistence.

At times President Eisenhower has seemed to take one side and then the other. He appointed Harold Stassen to help work out a great program of disarmament, and then placed Stassen under Secretary Dulles whose hostility or indifference seemingly drove Stassen from office. Just before the NATO Conference, two men of worldwide influence spoke out vigorously and hopefully about the possibility of at least making a start toward some sound disarmament agreement with Russia. One of these men, George Kennan, had long experience as an able American Ambassador in Moscow, and probably knows more about Russian conditions and attitudes than any other American. Taking the same viewpoint was Lester B. Pearson, long Minister of Canada and who recently received the 1957 Nobel peace prize for having done more than anyone else to promote world peace.

III. "What is the general feeling of other nations and their leaders about the year ahead?" Many fear, if Mr. Dulles has his way, that America will push military programs wholeheartedly and negotiate peace programs halfheartedly or not at all. "We push war programs like giants but peace programs like pygmies," says Mr. Pearson. We hope more American leaders in politics and religion will protest against such a course.

IV. "How will war change with the use of nuclear missiles and weapons?" War has become almost incredibly more disastrous than at any time in the past. In a recent appearance before a Congressional committee, it was said that one all-out bomb attack on America might kill 82 million people. There has always been danger of war when two hostile nations of almost equal power faced each other. These countries could make war and hope to survive—at least the stronger of them have such a hope. But now the nature of war has changed. As Gen. Omar Bradley and other great military experts agree, "There can be no victors in modern war—only mutual suicide by both contestants." This fact is now not only accepted in the United States, but in Russia also. Russian leaders have used virtually this same identical language.

It is this change in the ruinousness of war which makes necessary a change in methods of settling disputes between nations. Not a mere layman, but the great scientist Arthur Compton tells us: "Science has created a world in which the Christian spirit is an imperative." In other words, science has given the world's military leadership colossal new powers which may destroy mankind unless we turn to a Christian spirit to save it.

V. "Has dependence on military might saved other nations in the past when two nations of almost equal power have faced each other in war?" No greater truth was ever uttered by Christ than His declaration, "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Certainly it would seem that this has been proved abundantly in our own time. Christ did not even modify His statement by saying that nations that will take the sword will perish by the sword unless they are strong. The strong also perish. Let us consider what has happened to so-called strong nations since 1900. England was supposed to have won a great victory in World War I and again in World War II—and yet was virtually ruined. France underwent losses which have ruined it as a world power—the billions on the so-called Maginot Line, by which it had thought to make itself unconquerable, wholly wasted. Highly armed Germany, Austria, Japan, and Italy were almost or quite ruined by war. The United States, in spite of only shorter participation, registered such losses in men, materials, and in its national debt as may burden us for generations.

VI. "Suppose war should come—might not America prove itself so much more powerful than Russia in men, missiles, and weapons as to insure us a quick victory?" This is what Secretary Dulles and others have seemed to be believing for several years—while our position in nearly all foreign countries has grown progressively worse. If we fail to convince other nations that we are sincerely anxious and determined to avoid war, we may lose the wholehearted support of our European allies. Millions of people in Asia and Africa may join Russia in the struggle against us.

We too often think of Russia and America as having around 180 to 200 million people each, and that therefore the balance is about equal. But two colossal facts make the risk of war with Russia so dangerous. One is that Communist Russia's 200 million people might immediately be joined by Communist China with over 600 million people. Second the two form one solid united block, whereas the United States and its Allies are separated

both by oceans and vast distances and varying governments with varying opinions.

VII. "Secretary Dulles says in effect that we cannot trust the Russians, therefore there is no use or hope in trying to deal with them." Several answers may be made to this position. One is that we would certainly not act except after thought and study by the wisest leaders of our Western World nor have to agree to anything in advance. We could simply explore the possibilities of any program and then decide about it.

But, what is more important, is it not to the self-interest of Russia as well as our own self-interest to keep our two countries from being devastated by war, with possibly half their peoples killed and their industry and progress set back for a generation? With its vast area and great population, Russia can become for centuries a country of great prosperity and power if it does not commit suicide by war. Why should it wish to do so? Certainly there would seem to be a possibility that it might agree on some carefully thought out and wisely safeguarded formula that would start us toward peace and disarmament. In any case, who would say that it is not worth while for us to try it and find out?

VIII. "What about the costs of trying to find peace by (1) negotiations and disarmament, as compared with (2) the costs of depending on military weapons?" Any effort to win safety by military might is a desperate gamble. Of course, we should stay strong militarily and try to get other nations to join us in all sound military programs, but we in the South at least know that an all-out war effort is no guaranty of victory. Furthermore, with the enormous multi-billion-dollar cost of nuclear weapons, is there not reason to ask whether ever-increasing military expenditures and Federal taxes may spend our Nation into bankruptcy and reduce our people to comparative poverty? Of course we may agree that if necessary this would not be too great a price to pay for freedom. What we are saying is this: "Is it not folly to neglect the possibilities of conference and arbitration to see if we cannot save our freedom without resorting to either war or poverty?" And, if our people resolutely decide to try for peace through disarmament, America may indeed set an example not only of freedom but of the "peace, progress, and prosperity" for which America confidently voted in 1956. That would make both the backward nations of the world and the captive peoples of Russia likely to follow our example. They certainly will not follow us if they believe that we have no hope or plans for anything but war.

#### TEDDY ROOSEVELT AND SELF-RELIANCE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors in the observance of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial this year, I would like to call attention to an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on July 12, 1957.

Bearing the headline "Self-Reliance Keys TR's Centennial," the article points out how the Commission in charge of this observance demonstrated its own self-reliance by not asking for further Federal funds with which to carry on its work. Instead, the Commission chose to be self-sustaining in keeping with the centennial's theme of "responsible citizenship."

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

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

#### SELF-RELIANCE KEYS TR'S CENTENNIAL

(By Stafford Derby)

NEW YORK.—The old rooms in the Theodore Roosevelt house on East 20th Street seemed to echo again with TR's hearty "Bully" when applause for those handling the centennial observance of the Rough Rider President's birth came in from Washington and the White House.

This honoring of Theodore Roosevelt's life and works starts officially October 27, 1957, and goes on for a year. The Commission has Federal funds of \$150,000. It was the decision of the Commission not to seek additional dollars that drew praise from leaders of both parties in Washington and moved Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, to pen a letter.

He wrote to Oscar S. Straus, president of the association, that the action "is evidence of good citizenship, will redound to the credit of the association and will be highly effective in furthering the work of the Commission."

#### SHUNS PUBLIC FUNDS

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON said in his letter to Mr. Straus that it is noteworthy as well as newsworthy when a group of American citizens takes the course of self-reliance rather than of Government largess." Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming commented that your readiness to take up this slack (in funds) is excellent testimony to your belief in Theodore Roosevelt and his sentiments of self-reliance.

Decision not to ask for an additional appropriation was made by the Theodore Roosevelt Association, and communicated by Leslie S. Stratton, director, in a letter to Hermann Hagedorn, secretary and director of the centennial commission.

Mr. Stratton said, "The grant already received, together with additional funds the association is appropriating and raising from friends and members, would be sufficient to carry on this important activity, and we feel sure that this is the way Mr. Roosevelt would want this program financed, rather than by further public funds." Acting on Mr. Stratton's letter, Mr. Hagedorn wrote to Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN asking that if such a request had been introduced, it be withdrawn.

#### CITIZENSHIP HIGHLIGHTED

Such action is very much in step with the fast pace and rugged individualism which marked the days of the Oyster Bay citizen and went from police commissioner of the city of New York to the White House and international fame.

The commission's purpose is to recall Theodore Roosevelt's dynamic Americanism and to make his spirit again a vital factor in American life.

Theme for the observance has been announced as responsible citizenship. Three projects are planned to be the principal events, although others will take place.

These are:

1. An educational campaign to reawaken and spread the appreciation of Mr. Roosevelt's teachings of the principles of free citizenship and to restore to its rightful place in the American tradition the example of his forthrightness, his courage, and the fire in his heart for what America stands for in history.

#### PARK PROJECT CITED

2. The completion by the National Park Service of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial National Park in North Dakota, in the region where he had his cattle ranches.

3. The development and dedication of the national memorial to Theodore Roosevelt on the island which bears his name in the Po-

tomac River between the Key Bridge and the Arlington Memorial Bridge in Washington.

The many-sided life of TR—citizen, soldier, politician, statesman, naturalist, philosopher, and international authority—affords wide scope for the overall program. However, there are five facets which will be called to the attention of the public as special evidence of the responsible citizenship which he preached and lived.

These are: (1) The home and the family as the crucible of individual character; (2) the moral and spiritual imperatives of free government; (3) the citizen's participation in government; (4) the conservation of the natural resources; and (5) the national defense.

To leave no stone unturned (and how could that be in a TR centennial?) the commission plans to use all mass mediums. Radio, television, motion pictures, the press, magazines, books, pamphlets, filmstrips, lectures, and addresses will be enlisted.

#### WOMEN'S GROUP ACTIVE

Other activities, relating to family life and the home, will be in charge of a women's committee headed by Miss Chloe Gifford, vice president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

A college and university committee, headed by Dr. Arthur Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University, formerly Chairman of the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington, will present Mr. Roosevelt's teachings in relation to the citizen's participation in government. A committee of the Council of Natural Resources, an association of the leading conservation organizations in the country, is in charge of the commission's work in the field of conservation.

The opening date of the centennial year falls on a Sunday. Plans have been made, therefore, to use this calendar circumstance to its best advantage.

Emphasis will be laid on the moral and spiritual values underlying a free society. Later in the year a national conference of clergy and laymen will be held in Washington where the rotunda of the Capitol will be the stage for the event.

During these summer weeks there is much afoot in the East Side house where TR was born. All is a bustle of preparation.

#### AMERICA'S DEBT TO PIONEER WOMEN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the pages of American history are filled with stories demonstrating the determined pioneering spirit of American women since the birth of this great Nation.

Often the contributions of women, and particularly pioneer women, to the American way of life, are overlooked as we pay homage to our great forefathers. But that is not always so.

In the Black Hills of South Dakota we recognize that a great deal of credit is due Annie D. Tallent, who accompanied the Gordon party into the Black Hills and became the first county superintendent of schools in Custer County, S. Dak. Every State, I am sure, is able to point with equal pride to the accomplishments of certain distinguished women in the history of each State.

As a Nation, perhaps we owe a special tribute to that noble champion of all women, Susan B. Anthony. In true pioneering spirit, this dedicated woman spent her entire adult life laboring in behalf of humanity in general and American womanhood in particular. This

heroic figure of the 19th century brought to American women many of the rights and privileges they rightfully enjoy today.

Mrs. Rose Arnold Powell, of Minneapolis, Minn., has written an article citing the determined and dedicated accomplishments of American pioneer women since they first set foot on American soil. This article pays special tribute to the contributions of Susan B. Anthony.

Since February 15 was the birthday anniversary of Susan B. Anthony, I think it appropriate at this time to call attention to the place of her and women like her in the development of this country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

#### WHAT AMERICA OWES TO WOMEN PIONEERS

Do you find it difficult in your busy 20th century lives to sit down quietly—alone—and try to think your way through to a satisfying all-around, forward-and-backward conception of the whyness of things as they are? Do you feel the insistent drive of the present rushing you on, making it almost impossible for you to pause awhile, look back into the past—further and still further, as though you were counting the links on a long chain? Does a sense of opposition overwhelm you as you try to do this? If you have this experience, it is simply the tug of modern day momentum, the result of plodding, pioneering footsteps of the past.

As we let the world go by, let us take stock of our rich heritage of opportunity, ferreting out its sources, tracing its feeble beginnings back to the dawn of American civilization. Specifically, what do we of today owe to women pioneers? What links did they fashion in the long chain of events which make it possible for us to forge our own? Do their lives really touch ours in any vital way? Because they are dead and gone are we justified in giving all our time and thought to what we call the living present? Let us try to find a rational answer.

#### WOMAN HEARD COLUMBUS

America was discovered when it was because a sympathetic, understanding woman listened to the startling claims of Columbus and pledged her jewels to secure funds for his great adventure. His own sex turned a deaf ear and laughed him to scorn. In due time began the great exodus to the New World. During the colonization period which followed, America became a refuge for oppressed people from many lands. As Allan H. Eaton, author of *Immigrant Gifts to American Life*, has told us, "All have come bearing gifts and have laid them on the altar of America." History, however, has presented the most meager outlines of the part the feminine half of our immigrant population played in the early development of America. Courageous women—side by side with their men—bearing equal hardships in addition to child-bearing—braving all dangers—built their enduring, pioneering characteristics into the lives of their offspring. As Mary R. Beard, historian and coauthor with her husband, the late Dr. Charles R. Beard, has emphasized, "Women have always been at the heart of things."

Of all the various peoples who left a definite impression on early American life, the Anglo-Saxon stand preeminent. They were the most energetic and enterprising. Their love of home comfort made the wilderness take on something approaching civilization, if not to blossom as the rose. Why was it that the original Jamestown colony failed?

It was because the stabilizing influences of wife, home, and children were absent. With the coming of immigrant young women, taking a long chance on the prize package they might draw as husbands, the colony began to prosper. Others then dared to follow.

#### PILGRIMS' REQUEST

What did the indomitable Pilgrim mothers bequeath to posterity? Do we have a stake in their lives? Does it help us to confront our perplexing problems to read of their fortitude, their contempt of defeatism? They suffer not at all in comparison with the sterling qualities of the Pilgrim Fathers. Anne Hollingsworth Wharton in *Colonial Days and Dames*, points out that "in addition to enduring all the hardships that fell to the lot of fathers, they had to endure the Puritan father himself, who was quite often gey ill to live w!"; in other words, ornery and cantankerous.

Of the 19 immigrant mothers who came over on the *Mayflower*, the most outstanding were: Rose Standish, Priscilla Mullins, Dorothy Bradford, and Mary Chilton. Mary Allerton, one of the *Mayflower* daughters, lived to see the planting of 12 of the Thirteen Colonies which formed the nucleus of these United States. In all parts of the country we find the descendants of these dauntless, God-fearing women who sought afar for those priceless possessions we treasure today.

Was not our guaranty of freedom of worship embodied in our Constitution rooted in Pilgrim soil? Did not the *Mayflower* pact providing for the discussion of both sides of a question—differing with each other without scorn—cradle the seeds of democracy, awaiting their full fruition? Though women in that day were practically inarticulate as far as their own right to participate in government affairs was concerned, in time there was heard the voice of a daughter of New England whose immigrant foremother I am unable to name. We will consider the contribution of Abigail Adams a bit later. Before moving on to this period let us not forget that there was an Anne Hutchinson, as well as a Roger Williams in the struggle for religious freedom; that we of today owe much to the Quakers, who practiced the principle of equality of the sexes and founded the City of Brotherly Love; that the founder of the Dutch colony in this area derived many of the practical elements in his well-balanced character from his Dutch mother, Margaret Jasper; that Patrick Henry inherited his great oratorical powers from his mother, who had "the gift of tongues."

Realizing that great mothers develop great sons, let us pay grateful tribute to Mary Ball Washington, mother of George Washington, who shaped his character into her own heroic mold and thus prepared him for the great task ahead. Every boy and girl in our public schools should know of her brave struggle with adversity, widowed in early married life with a family of children to rear. The Father of his Country never lacked in loving homage to her wise counsel.

#### ABIGAIL ADAMS

Taking up the pre-Revolutionary period, how does the democratic doctrine of Abigail Adams affect our daily living? How many of us have read the story of her life? Did her thinking condition ours in any way? Let us see.

A valuable book fell into my hands some years ago entitled "Daughters of America, or Women of the Century," written by Phebe A. Hansford, an ordained minister, in 1882. In the chapter, *Women and the Revolution*, appears the following extract:

"In response to the proclamation for repressing the rebellion and sedition, as the remonstrances of our forefathers were termed, a woman, Abigail Adams in Massachusetts wrote thus in a letter to her husband, John Adams, at Philadelphia: 'This intelligence will make a plain path for you,

though a dangerous one. I could not join today in the petitions of our worthy pastor for a reconciliation between our no-longer parent state—but tyrant state—and these Colonies. Let us separate; they are unworthy to be our brethren. Let us renounce them and instead of supplications, as formerly, for their prosperity and happiness, let us beseech the Almighty to blast their councils and bring to naught all their devices.'

"Said the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley, editor, in July 1875, commenting on the above, 'Here was a declaration of independence, preceding by 7 months that which has become so famous, and it was signed by a woman.' Quoting from *Colonial Days and Dames* again, 'Well might Abigail Adams write from her home in Braintree where she lived in constant dread of hostilities, and was often in want of the ordinary comforts of life, to her husband in Philadelphia who was helping "to usher in the birth of a fine boy," as he playfully dubbed the Declaration of '76. And by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it would be necessary to make, I desire you to remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors were. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention are not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation.'"

#### WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Under the inexorable law of cause and effect that rebellion was fomented when in 1848 the first women's rights convention in all history was held in Seneca Falls, N. Y., setting forth a long list of grievances, adopting unprecedented resolutions and declaring war on the whole body of the common law as it affected women.

Leading the vanguard of this revolt against ancient custom and tradition were Elisabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, the two outraged women who returned from the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840 determined to do something about the status of women because the accredited women delegates from America were refused participation for no other reason than that they were not men.

As the woman movement progressed, 4 indomitable stalwarts stood out above all others: Lucretia Mott, the oldest, who died in 1880, Elisabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Susan B. Anthony, in order of their birth; "the great quartet—the 4 giants of the early suffrage movement," as Inez Haynes Irwin, author of *Angels and Amazons*, called them.

These dauntless pioneers inspired many other women to march under their emancipation banner but progress was slow. They had undertaken a herculean task, the difficulty of which they dimly foresaw. The "holy fire" blazed forth again in 1876 when, at the annual convention of the National Woman's Suffrage Association held in New York City in May of that year, they adopted a burning set of resolutions, quoting from the militant utterances of Abigail Adams. (*History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. III, pp. 19-20.) By the time the centennial date of the Nation arrived, three Vulcans—Anthony, Stanton and Matilda Joselyn Gage—had forged a followup thunderbolt, the Women's Declaration of Independence, in which they impeached their Government and again aired their grievances, one of which was that women had been refused all participation in the centennial celebration on July 4. Read this thrilling document and the dramatic story of its presentation by a group of NWSA officers led by Susan B. Anthony (*History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. III, pp. 17-35).

## SUFFRAGE VICTORY

By the time the early stalwarts had all passed away, a vast army of suffrage soldiers kept on the march and in 1920 were rewarded with victory. Carrie Chapman Catt and Anna Howard Shaw were the last of the suffrage leaders composing "The Old Guard" of the National-American Woman Suffrage Association, merged in 1890. At the centennial recognition of the inception of the Woman Movement in America, sparked by the indignity to women in London in 1840, Mrs. Catt said, "Where there is no opportunity, seek it; where there are barriers, break them; where there is opposition, besiege it; keep the banner of women's rights flying until every vestige of the old tradition ordering subjugation is chased from the earth."

## SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Of all the noble women who labored in our behalf and that of all humanity, Susan B. Anthony should be placed at the head of the list because she is the only woman who gave to the cause her entire adult life. Not only was she the "hewer of wood and drawer of water" of the Woman Movement, but also the tireless human dynamo that kept it functioning for half a century. Frances E. Willard, herself one of the grandest women of the 19th century, characterized her as "that heroic figure, sure to stand out in history as plainly as any of the Presidents."

Among the 43 grandchildren of John Anthony, Jr., who sailed in the ship *Hercules* from Hampstead, England, April 15, 1643, was his grandson, David Anthony, the father of Daniel Anthony, who married Lucy Read, July 13, 1817. Susan Brownell Anthony was their second child. On the maternal side, her grandfather, Daniel Read, born at Rehoboth, Mass., was said to be a lineal descendent of, and entitled to the coat of arms of, Sir Brianus De Rede, A. D. 1075. Susannah Richardson, his wife, was born at Scituate, Mass., and her family were among the most wealthy and respected in that locality during the 18th century. Daniel Read served with honor during the Revolutionary War. "It was several years after peace had been declared and he had returned home and settled down to the quiet life of a New England farmer that, on December 2, 1795, was born Lucy, the mother of Susan B. Anthony." (*Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony*, vol. I, pp. 3-4. 3-Vol.)

## PEER AMONG LEADERS

When we exercise any of the rights, opportunities, and privileges won for us by our indomitable pioneers, let us realize that had the forbears of Susan Anthony never lived and filled their niche in colonial days, this peer among world leaders would never have been born.

If this "blessed event" had never occurred, what would be the status of women today? Surely not as near her vision of equality as it is, since it required a whole lifetime of devotion to her ideal to "break the stubborn glebe." We would undoubtedly still be "crying in the wilderness" of our hopes with most of the womanhood of the world. Neither would America be what it is today.

Let us ponder the statement of the late Arthur Brisbane, noted columnist: "The world might well have wept if Susan B. Anthony had been born a boy."

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

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

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

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

## PUBLIC WORKS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] discussed public works insofar as that subject relates to the health of the country. It is in reference to public works that I wish to address myself to the Senate today. I am extremely glad that the President has at last become concerned about unemployment in the United States. However, I do not believe we must wait for legislative enactment in order to do something about unemployment. Only a few days ago the President said he would recommend legislation to construct post-office buildings throughout the country. That is a very worthy undertaking, and an ambitious one. However, I would suggest to the President that he does not have to wait until such legislation is enacted. He can do something about putting people to work before such legislation is enacted.

Congress has given the President plenty of opportunity to do so, and he could start to do something about it today, if he really wanted to do something. Several years ago Congress enacted into law the so-called Lease-Purchase Act, under which buildings were to be constructed throughout the country.

So far as the District of Columbia is concerned, where there is considerable unemployment, something could be done about it right away. Under the Lease-Purchase Act there could be constructed three office buildings in the southwest section of the city which are known as Federal Office Buildings Nos. 5, 6, and 10. Also, in Washington, the Federal Food and Drug Administration desires the construction of an office building known as Federal Office Building No. 8. The Civil Service Commission also wants an office building, which would be No. 9. The United States Geological Survey has authority, under the Lease-Purchase Act, to build a Federal office building. There is also authorized Federal Office Building No. 7, which could be constructed. This building would be located at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

Therefore, we can see how easy it would be, instead of waiting for legislation to be enacted, to construct office buildings. In addition to building post offices at Kokomo, Ind., or Santa Fe, N. Mex., we could start right away in the city of Washington, without waiting for any legislative action whatever. That is not all.

We have been reading in the local press for several months now about the Highway No. 240. Why is that highway not being built? The authority for its construction exists. Nevertheless, no action has been taken, and Highway 240 still does not enter the city of Washington.

Furthermore, Congress enacted legislation for a bridge over the Potomac. It is a bridge that is badly needed. Congress took action in that case after consideration of all the needs and the

feasibility of a new bridge. Nevertheless, we still do not have that bridge. That could be constructed right away, if only someone in Washington would act. I think the proper person to take action in this matter is the President, who is so desirous of putting people to work. That is not all, Mr. President.

We have been told that there are over 4½ million unemployed persons in our country and recently it has been reported that the President is contemplating a \$2 billion building program to stimulate business and to relieve unemployment. I certainly believe that such an unemployment condition should not prevail in the United States. Furthermore, I believe that we should have a continuing program of public-works construction—and we have authorized the projects and made money available for such construction—not only to provide gainful employment to our people, but also to perform works which would strengthen our economy.

I have on many occasions pointed out that our public-works programs have suffered because of the procedures adopted in controlling funds appropriated by Congress. There is nothing more uneconomical than a program of construction which is piecemeal or which is constantly being stopped and started.

I have had material assembled which deals with many of our public works programs. The information has to do with the following programs, all of them public-works programs.

First. Highways.

Second. Flood control, rivers and harbors.

Third. Watershed programs of Soil Conservation Service.

Fourth. Public buildings under lease-purchase. I have enumerated a few in the District of Columbia.

Fifth. Water-pollution control.

Sixth. Reclamation.

The compilation shows the magnitude of the authorized projects, the amounts of funds which could be efficiently used during the 1959 fiscal year, and the estimated man-years of employment which would result from such a program.

The interstate highway program which is now underway has been apportioned \$4.7 billion for fiscal year 1957-58 and 1959. The Federal-Aid Highway Act provides for the apportionment of \$2.2 billion of Federal funds for fiscal year 1960 to the Interstate System; however, it appears that only about \$1.6 billion would be available for apportionment to the Interstate System and \$900 million to other categories, or a total apportionment of \$2.5 billion instead of about \$3.1 billion as authorized. I believe that forest roads, public-lands roads, and other such roads should be accelerated.

If we have a program of \$1.6 billion for the Interstate System and \$900 million for the other roads, we will fall far short of the most efficient program.

In terms of man-years of employment on the highway program there could be 120 man-years of on- and off-site employment for each \$1 million of construction, or for a \$3.1 billion program there would result at least 300,000 man-

years of employment from the use of Federal funds.

There are many authorized flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors projects which should be carried forward, not only for the economy of the country, but in order to relieve unemployment, about which some persons are now shedding crocodile tears. There remains more than \$4 billion of uncompleted work on projects now under construction and another one-half billion dollars in projects could be started within 6 months. This does not include the \$1,521,554,000 projects included in Senate bill 497, which has passed the Senate and is now on the House Calendar.

I do not suggest that these projects could or should all be started in 1 year, but I do believe that instead of an appropriation of only about \$626 million, the program could very efficiently be increased to about \$875 million a year. On a program of this nature about 110,000 persons could be employed as on- and off-site labor.

That is not only the labor connected with the construction of the road system itself, but also the off-site labor. In addition many man-years of labor would be provided for those who produce the material and equipment necessary for the construction of the roads.

The watershed program which is extremely important to our country now has projects authorized and additional projects which will be submitted in fiscal year 1959 in the amount of about \$283 million. Many persons throughout the entire Nation are interested in watershed programs.

Again, I do not suggest that this program could be undertaken or initiated in 1 year but at least \$45 million could be efficiently utilized during fiscal year 1959. This is contrasted with a very meager program of \$21 million in new money which has been requested in the President's budget.

We talk about putting people to work. Authority should be asked for a program of \$45 million. The President asked for funds for only an added \$21 million program; still he desires to put people to work. A program of \$45 million would utilize 4,500 man-years of on- and off-site labor.

The Public Works Committee of the Senate and House have approved 83 post office buildings in the amount of \$69,574,000 and 67 Federal buildings in the amount of \$667,589,000. In addition to these \$737,163,000 of approved projects the agencies have worked on prospectuses for 200 additional projects, of which the Government owns 71 sites. These projects would cost an estimated \$1½ billion. The \$737 million program would utilize about 80,000 to 90,000 man-years of on- and off-site labor, and if completed over a 5-year period would employ 16,000 to 18,000 man-years per year of labor.

The Water Pollution Control Act authorized one of the most essential programs which has been undertaken. This act authorizes \$50 million each year for 10 years to provide assistance to municipalities for improvement of sewage treatment and disposal facilities. This \$50

million would stimulate the construction of about \$250 million of such facilities annually. It is estimated that the annual payroll would amount to \$75 million annually and would employ at least 13,000 man-years of on-site labor and an additional 13,000 to 14,000 man-years of off-site labor. If the program were doubled, there would, of course, be a doubling of this total man-years of labor. There is a present need for an additional 9,400 treatment works in the United States.

The President's budget message made the following recommendation with respect to the water pollution control program:

I am quoting the message in view of the fact that the President later changed his mind:

Grants-in-aid: \* \* \* A joint Federal-State action committee consisting of 10 governors and representatives of the executive branch—made initial progress report—recommends complete transfer of two programs to the States—vocational education and the construction of waste treatment facilities. Recommends increasing the degree of State responsibility in three other programs—natural disaster relief.

After recommending the legislation which Congress agreed to and passed, the President has now suggested another method of enforcing that law—that it be postponed indefinitely. Nothing is more necessary in this country than to provide improved sanitation facilities in many cities. Under the program, properly administered, hundreds—yes, thousands—of new disposal plants were constructed during the last 2 years. It is the most popular program, probably, that Congress ever passed in this particular line of endeavor. But now it is proposed that it be postponed indefinitely.

The Bureau of Reclamation has a total active program of about \$2.7 billion with a requirement of over \$1.3 billion to complete the projects. Projects under construction would require about \$1.1 billion to complete them. I do not in this case suggest that it would be practical to provide funds for or attempt to complete construction of these projects during 1 or 2 fiscal years.

The reclamation program is another of our resources development efforts which could and should be accelerated. Although the authorization of such projects is handled by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am keenly aware of the needs for moving ahead on them and feel that I should mention them because of the needs in my own and other western States. However, I do believe that instead of an allowance of \$161,662,000 of construction funds, as proposed in the 1959 budget, the total could be increased by at least sixty to seventy million dollars. Projects which should be carried forward are those such as the Nevada Dam project, in New Mexico, with funds in the amount of about three to four million during the 1959 fiscal year. In addition, projects such as Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon could be assigned funds in order to accelerate their completion.

Mr. President, as regards the Navaho Dam, in my State, I know whereof I

speak. All the upper basin States—consisting of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico—were working hard, and have been working hard for years, for the development of those States and those areas. But only 2 short years ago—in the fiscal year 1957—the Congress appropriated \$800,000 for commencement of the construction of Navaho Dam, on the San Juan River, in New Mexico. This fiscal year—in 1958—the President of the United States, through the Bureau of the Budget, requested the appropriation of an additional \$1,800,000 for continuation of the construction of Navaho Dam. The Congress agreed to that, and appropriated the money. So now there is in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation \$2,600,000 with which to commence the construction of Navaho Dam. Notwithstanding that in this fiscal year the President of the United States requested that amount of money, now he is trying to have the money used elsewhere; and the Bureau of Reclamation wants to transfer the Navaho Dam money to the Flaming Gorge project, in the State of Utah. Today, from the Washington office—not from the district office in Salt Lake City—word has been sent to Farmington, N. Mex., that all personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation in that area be transferred elsewhere.

Mr. President, whom are we to believe? We believe in the Navaho Dam. Evidently the President believed in the Navaho Dam, after he was advised by his many advisers, because he requested the appropriation of the money, and the Congress made the appropriation. But now the President wants to use the money for something else.

Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and I exchanged some remarks in the Senate Chamber. I told him that the Reclamation Bureau wanted to have transferred to the Flaming Gorge project, in Utah, the money which was earmarked for Navaho Dam. The Senator from Utah, knowing the history of the Flaming Gorge project, the history of the Navaho Dam project, the history of the Glen Canyon project, and the history of all the other dams in the West, stated here on the floor of the Senate:

I am for Flaming Gorge, but I am also for Navaho Dam, and I am against any transfer of that money elsewhere.

In addition, projects such as Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon could be assigned funds, so as to accelerate their completion. No one objects to that. We know that the Flaming Gorge project should be constructed; we know that Glen Canyon Dam should proceed. As a matter of fact, the work should be accelerated. But we do not want the funds appropriated for New Mexico projects used for those two particular projects. If more money is necessary—and I believe it is—then I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, will certainly try to help have the money appropriated.

A program of construction for the Bureau of Reclamation involving about \$235 million would provide about 30,000 man-years of labor opportunities. This would be increased if additional funds

for planning and other such funds were provided. The programs I have discussed would relieve unemployment and would produce many works which would be of great value to our Nation.

In conclusion, I summarize as follows, the estimated programs for the fiscal year 1959 and my suggested increases:

	Estimated funds, fiscal year 1959	Suggested increases for fiscal year 1959
Highways.....	\$2,500,000,000	\$600,000,000
Flood control, navigation, etc.	625,000,000	249,000,000
Watershed program.....	* 21,000,000	14,000,000
Public buildings.....	( <sup>c</sup> )	300,000,000
Water pollution.....	* 45,000,000	45,000,000
Reclamation.....	* 162,000,000	70,000,000
Total.....		1,278,000,000

<sup>1</sup> This amount would be apportionment for fiscal year 1960.

<sup>2</sup> Budget indicates about \$31,000,000; however, about \$10,000,000 is from carryover.

<sup>3</sup> Lease-purchase program is unknown; however, all approved projects should be completed within 3-year period.

<sup>4</sup> Water pollution control should be continued, and could be accelerated.

<sup>5</sup> Reclamation figure is for construction only, and increase should allow about \$60,000,000 for construction and \$10,000,000 for small projects program and planning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the case of the public-buildings program, no estimate has been given the Congress for this program for the fiscal year 1959. The administration speaks of the post offices it might build after Congress acts on legislation for that purpose. As indicated in the table, I suggest that \$300 million be obtained for public buildings.

There is a need for customs-immigration border stations and other such facilities. However, I feel certain that other committee chairmen will present information on projects for which their committees have responsibility.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. President, in order further to emphasize the unemployment situation, let me point out that, as previously stated, it has been reported that at this time approximately 4½ million persons are unemployed. That estimate has been reached on the basis of sampling; it is not possible to arrive at a reasonably accurate determination of the amount of unemployment in the various States.

However, information is currently available concerning unemployment-insurance claims which is compiled by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

The unemployment-insurance programs, which include workers covered by the State programs, and the Federal employee program cover about four-fifths of the nonfarm wage and salaried workers.

The Federal legislation as written provides for the exclusion of agricultural laborers, domestic services, employment for most State and local government, work for nonprofit organizations, unpaid family work, and self-employment. The program does not include railroad employees, since they are covered by railroad retirement programs.

The unemployment-insurance program does, however, cover a large segment of employees, and information from this source does provide an indication of the magnitude of the unemployment problem in each State and is utilized herein to illustrate the problem of unemployment confronting the various States.

I shall ask to have printed a tabulation which shows the insured unemployment for the week ending January 26, 1957, as contrasted with the week ending January 25, 1958. The rate of insured unemployment is based on the average monthly covered employment in the 12 months' period ending March 1957 and is based on 41,600,000 employment.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of insured employment figures. These figures do not include those who do not obtain unemployment insurance payments when they are not employed. I shall ask consent to have the list put in the RECORD, but first I should like to call attention to a few of the figures.

I see that my friend from the State of Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is now presiding. On the paper I have in my hand I notice that for January 26, 1957, there were 13,974 unemployment insurance applications in the State of Florida. One year later there were 24,622 unemployment insurance applications, or an increase of 10,648.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico what the compilation is for my native State of Oregon in the table from which he is reading.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to furnish that information. In 1957 there were 38,191 unemployment insurance applications in Oregon. One year to the day later there were 48,538 applications, or an increase of 10,347.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken, I believe the State of Oregon, unfortunately, is one of the top States in its rate of unemployment. I believe that the three States of the Pacific Northwest, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, are at the very top in the percentage of unemployment figures among the States of the Nation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The percentage rate for Oregon is 12.9.

Mr. NEUBERGER. For that reason I want to say, very briefly, that I have been listening to the able and outstanding speech being delivered by the Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, on which committee I have the honor to serve. Particularly because I help to represent a State that has an alarming rate of unemployment I wish to thank the Senator for calling this urgent and vital matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On January 26, 1957, California had 139,963 unemployment insurance applications. For the same day in 1958 there were 272,455 applications, or an increase in 1 year of 132,479.

On January 26, 1957, Connecticut had 25,407 unemployment insurance applications. In 1958 it had 55,504 applications, a difference of 30,097 persons.

Again I emphasize these figures do not include those who did not have unemployment insurance.

In Illinois there were on January 26, 1957, 82,332 unemployment insurance applications. In 1958 there were 152,519 applications, a difference of 70,187.

On January 26, 1957, Massachusetts had 77,495 unemployment insurance applications, and this year there were 107,788 applications, or a difference of 30,293.

Now let us go to one of the big ones, Michigan. In 1957, 82,147 persons made unemployment insurance applications in that State. In 1958 the number was 188,529, or a difference of 106,382.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have the entire list of insured unemployment printed the RECORD.

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

Insured unemployment—State and Federal employee program

State	Number Jan. 25, 1958	Number Jan. 26, 1957	Change from Jan. 26, 1957	Rate (percent)
Alabama.....	40,195	22,617	17,478	7.0
Arizona.....	11,241	6,130	5,111	5.6
Arkansas.....	26,774	22,679	4,095	10.1
California.....	272,455	139,963	132,479	7.2
Colorado.....	12,303	7,032	5,271	3.8
Connecticut.....	55,504	25,407	30,097	7.1
Delaware.....	5,853	4,064	1,799	4.4
District of Columbia.....	9,284	7,010	2,274	2.0
Florida.....	24,622	13,974	10,648	3.2
Georgia.....	45,042	28,217	16,825	5.8
Idaho.....	13,551	9,597	3,954	12.2
Illinois.....	152,519	82,332	70,187	5.5
Indiana.....	77,457	44,605	32,851	6.8
Iowa.....	19,880	15,064	4,816	4.0
Kansas.....	17,787	14,128	3,659	4.7
Kentucky.....	47,902	35,674	12,228	10.0
Louisiana.....	25,644	17,180	8,464	4.4
Maine.....	21,903	11,692	10,301	10.5
Maryland.....	43,488	18,402	25,086	5.9
Massachusetts.....	107,788	77,495	30,293	6.8
Michigan.....	188,529	82,147	106,382	9.6
Minnesota.....	82,851	37,715	45,136	8.0
Mississippi.....	23,506	18,228	5,278	9.1
Missouri.....	57,030	37,188	19,842	5.7
Montana.....	16,163	10,110	6,053	13.0
Nebraska.....	10,889	10,883	6	4.8
Nevada.....	7,149	3,991	3,158	10.1
New Hampshire.....	9,895	6,439	3,456	6.8
New Jersey.....	143,964	90,456	44,508	9.2
New Mexico.....	6,740	4,864	1,876	4.3
New York.....	346,130	228,946	117,184	6.8
North Carolina.....	61,134	42,578	18,556	7.1
North Dakota.....	6,887	5,868	1,019	10.1
Ohio.....	172,806	71,839	100,967	6.5
Oklahoma.....	21,632	15,870	5,762	5.3
Oregon.....	48,538	38,191	10,347	12.9
Pennsylvania.....	299,199	178,808	120,331	9.1
Rhode Island.....	27,211	18,943	8,268	10.6
South Carolina.....	23,780	16,098	7,682	5.7
South Dakota.....	3,969	4,370	-401	5.3
Tennessee.....	67,632	51,769	15,863	10.1
Texas.....	59,187	33,737	25,430	3.2
Utah.....	11,303	8,194	3,109	5.9
Vermont.....	6,286	2,530	3,756	5.4
Virginia.....	29,302	14,847	14,455	4.1
Washington.....	68,681	53,330	15,351	10.7
West Virginia.....	39,933	15,426	24,507	5.7
Wisconsin.....	48,985	30,019	18,966	5.7
Wyoming.....	3,869	3,463	406	6.0
Total.....	2,895,335	1,746,600	1,148,735	7.0

NOTE.—Percentages appearing under rate column apply to 1st column of figures which show number of insured unemployment applications as of Jan. 25, 1958. The national total of 7 percent represents the rate of insured unemployment, and is based on about 41,600,000 insurance-covered employment.

CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, to further emphasize and illustrate the problem, the following tabulation—only for civil functions—indicates that the Corps of Engineers has a total active program estimated to cost \$14,718,135,000 and requires \$9,089,411,000 to complete. Of

this total of \$14,718,135,000, there are \$9,946,048,000 of projects that are under construction that require \$4,340,675,000 to complete. It should be noted that the projects are broken down into State totals. Many of the projects are included in basin plans, and the distribution among the States was necessarily made in part of judgment. The annual pro-

gram of the Corps of Engineers could readily be increased to about \$875 million during fiscal year 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Current civil works program—Corps of Engineers

[In thousands of dollars]

State (estimated cost July 1957; amount to complete after fiscal year 1958)	Projects under construction	Projects not started		Total active program	State (estimated cost July 1957; amount to complete after fiscal year 1958)	Projects under construction	Projects not started		Total active program
		No planning funds available	With planning funds available				No planning funds available	With planning funds available	
<b>Alabama:</b>					<b>New Jersey:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	79,377	45,570	123,311	248,258	Estimated cost.....	90,829	6,414	97,243	
To complete.....	38,729	45,570	122,549	206,848	To complete.....	55,468	6,414	61,882	
<b>Arizona:</b>					<b>New Mexico:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	23,620		9,200	32,820	Estimated cost.....	30,320	375	36,350	67,045
To complete.....	17,034		8,987	26,021	To complete.....	23,069	375	35,624	59,068
<b>Arkansas:</b>					<b>New York:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	585,949	106,407	453,009	1,145,965	Estimated cost.....	120,254	59,559	50,268	230,081
To complete.....	237,227	106,407	452,462	796,096	To complete.....	55,735	59,559	49,392	164,686
<b>California:</b>					<b>North Carolina:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	799,114	14,652	149,646	963,412	Estimated cost.....	21,241		8,050	29,291
To complete.....	314,204	14,652	147,686	476,542	To complete.....	883		7,802	8,685
<b>Colorado:</b>					<b>North Dakota:</b>				
Estimated cost.....		672	2,060	2,732	Estimated cost.....	303,377			303,377
To complete.....		672	2,007	2,679	To complete.....	28,943			28,943
<b>Connecticut:</b>					<b>Ohio:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	27,368	1,467		28,835	Estimated cost.....	153,906	128,993	54,392	337,291
To complete.....	13,635	1,467		15,102	To complete.....	82,909	128,993	54,231	266,133
<b>Delaware:</b>					<b>Oklahoma:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	6,727	408	63,000	70,135	Estimated cost.....	345,246	155,930	167,595	668,772
To complete.....	4,275	408	62,991	67,674	To complete.....	302,888	155,930	167,239	626,027
<b>District of Columbia:</b>					<b>Oregon:</b>				
Estimated cost.....		6,274		6,274	Estimated cost.....	680,001	32,701	136,565	849,267
To complete.....		6,274		6,274	To complete.....	192,101	32,701	134,824	359,626
<b>Florida:</b>					<b>Pennsylvania:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	317,896	2,403	6,690	326,959	Estimated cost.....	240,350	61,921	113,580	415,851
To complete.....	212,389	2,403	6,486	221,278	To complete.....	158,695	61,921	112,475	333,091
<b>Georgia:</b>					<b>Rhode Island:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	195,195		11,300	206,495	Estimated cost.....	5,719	164		5,878
To complete.....	104,219		11,083	115,302	To complete.....	2,095	164		2,259
<b>Idaho:</b>					<b>South Carolina:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	53,110	2,295	12,624	68,029	Estimated cost.....	96,289			96,289
To complete.....	3,090	2,295	12,456	17,941	To complete.....	42,464			42,464
<b>Illinois:</b>					<b>South Dakota:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	291,981	50,815	77,403	420,199	Estimated cost.....	577,038	505	87,111	664,554
To complete.....	132,422	50,815	76,330	259,567	To complete.....	266,106	505	86,602	353,213
<b>Indiana:</b>					<b>Tennessee:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	85,745	99,178	34,571	219,494	Estimated cost.....	297,491	8,300	41,800	347,591
To complete.....	61,232	99,178	34,354	194,764	To complete.....	53,623	8,300	41,623	103,546
<b>Iowa:</b>					<b>Texas:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	187,605	1,936	116,486	306,027	Estimated cost.....	430,646	98,856	52,680	582,182
To complete.....	70,169	1,936	114,655	183,760	To complete.....	200,232	98,856	52,183	351,271
<b>Kansas:</b>					<b>Utah:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	212,748	78,797	159,670	451,215	Estimated cost.....	1,720		374	2,094
To complete.....	98,936	78,797	158,200	335,933	To complete.....	1,320		364	1,674
<b>Kentucky:</b>					<b>Vermont:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	493,762	126,847	74,900	695,509	Estimated cost.....	47,016	28,750	9,300	85,066
To complete.....	275,562	126,847	74,454	476,863	To complete.....	33,872	28,750	8,987	71,009
<b>Louisiana:</b>					<b>Virginia:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	513,518	4,270	116,550	634,338	Estimated cost.....	87,499	75	16,900	104,474
To complete.....	233,757	4,270	115,325	353,352	To complete.....	5,813	75	16,800	22,688
<b>Maine:</b>					<b>Washington:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	4,490			4,490	Estimated cost.....	803,900	12,644	400,063	1,216,607
To complete.....					To complete.....	392,239	12,644	398,621	803,504
<b>Maryland:</b>					<b>West Virginia:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	24,541	1,073	42,000	67,615	Estimated cost.....	68,350	117,499	118,650	304,499
To complete.....	4,346	1,073	41,994	47,413	To complete.....	33,190	117,499	117,659	268,348
<b>Massachusetts:</b>					<b>Wisconsin:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	63,415	6,715	10,410	80,540	Estimated cost.....	36,493	513		37,006
To complete.....	27,440	6,715	9,998	44,153	To complete.....	4,462	513		4,915
<b>Michigan:</b>					<b>Wyoming:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	168,476	46,973	2,784	218,233	Estimated cost.....	5,290	871		6,161
To complete.....	141,072	46,973	2,760	190,805	To complete.....	4,187	871		5,058
<b>Minnesota:</b>					<b>Alaska:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	92,442	3,055	284	95,781	Estimated cost.....	7,053	2,575	2,080	11,708
To complete.....	27,418	3,055	265	30,738	To complete.....	845	2,575	2,009	5,439
<b>Mississippi:</b>					<b>Hawaii:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	308,342	17,668	30,231	356,241	Estimated cost.....	6,480	763	4,920	12,163
To complete.....	84,537	17,668	30,181	132,386	To complete.....	1,352	763	4,783	6,903
<b>Missouri:</b>					<b>Puerto Rico:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	530,187	162,756	180,720	893,663	Estimated cost.....				
To complete.....	183,971	162,756	178,913	525,640	To complete.....				
<b>Montana:</b>					<b>Wake Island:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	162,996	2,015	289,290	454,301	Estimated cost.....		3,950		3,950
To complete.....	24,366	2,015	288,723	315,104	To complete.....		3,950		3,950
<b>Nebraska:</b>					<b>Virgin Islands:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	199,668	590		200,258	Estimated cost.....				
To complete.....	54,210	590		54,800	To complete.....				
<b>Nevada:</b>					<b>Total:</b>				
Estimated cost.....	1,700		505	2,205	Estimated cost.....	9,946,048	1,504,194	3,267,893	14,718,135
To complete.....			480	480	To complete.....	4,340,675	1,504,194	3,214,542	9,089,411
<b>New Hampshire:</b>									
Estimated cost.....	39,658			39,658					
To complete.....	34,033			34,033					

**WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD-PREVENTION PROGRAM**

Mr. CHAVEZ. Further emphasizing and giving details on the watershed protection and flood-prevention program, the following tabulation indicates that for fiscal years 1960-61 and remainder to complete, there would be required a total of \$790,898,722. This is an estimate of the cost of completing all projects which have been authorized to date and those for which applications have

been made by local interests and approved by the States to date. The estimated cost to complete all projects now authorized and those which could be submitted during fiscal year 1959 under the provisions of the budget would involve a total of about \$283,000,000.

The fiscal year 1959 program of \$31,659,000 could be increased to \$45,723,069 without difficulty. It should be noted that of the \$31 million about \$10 million would come from carryover from

fiscal year 1958; therefore, the new money for fiscal year 1959 would amount to about \$21 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the breakdown by States on the watershed protection and flood-prevention programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

*Potential employment — Watershed-protection and flood-prevention programs, U. S. Department of Agriculture*

	Fiscal year 1959			Fiscal year 1960			Fiscal year 1961			Remaining		
	Total Federal cost	Man-years employment		Total Federal cost	Man-years employment		Total Federal cost	Man-years employment		Total Federal cost	Man-years employment	
		On site	Off site									
Alabama.....	\$282,742	14	14	\$512,564	25	25	\$419,662	21	21	\$6,661,000	333	333
Arizona.....				25,000	1	1	150,000	8	8	3,046,200	152	152
Arkansas.....	125,360	6	6	369,419	18	18	654,169	33	33	37,605,800	1,880	1,880
California.....	2,241,087	112	112	2,894,030	145	145	3,001,870	150	150	33,678,500	1,684	1,684
Colorado.....	238,780	12	12	438,780	22	22	460,464	23	23	4,604,500	230	230
Connecticut and Rhode Island.....	35,693	2	2	160,693	8	8	375,000	19	19	2,948,300	147	147
Delaware.....	4,000			129,000	6	6	477,500	24	24	4,084,000	204	204
Florida.....	1,557			231,857	12	12	231,856	12	12	17,119,500	856	856
Georgia.....	1,234,490	62	62	1,547,790	77	77	1,340,489	67	67	29,108,300	1,455	1,454
Idaho.....				106,700	5	5	206,700	10	10	7,488,000	374	375
Illinois.....	185,650	9	9	351,650	18	18	466,084	23	23	1,628,000	81	81
Indiana.....	151,240	7	7	755,120	38	38	848,883	42	42	7,908,900	395	395
Iowa.....	754,262	38	38	1,229,262	61	61	1,354,985	68	68	20,510,000	1,025	1,025
Kansas.....	134,409	6	6	716,809	36	36	1,076,551	54	54	7,162,600	358	358
Kentucky.....	66,197	3	3	1,448,292	72	72	1,545,652	77	77	17,174,300	859	859
Louisiana.....	457,308	23	23	676,308	34	34	684,143	34	34	9,815,100	491	491
Maine.....												
Maryland.....	345,753	17	17	490,453	24	24	504,502	25	25	3,116,600	156	156
Massachusetts.....				75,000	4	4	200,000	10	10	7,513,500	376	376
Michigan.....				50,000	2	2	150,000	7	7	1,190,500	59	59
Minnesota.....	415,561	21	21	614,561	31	31	841,003	42	42	16,785,300	839	839
Mississippi.....	3,078,544	154	154	3,696,144	185	185	3,731,199	186	186	39,026,300	1,951	1,951
Missouri.....	61,735	3	3	273,535	14	14	264,983	13	13	6,360,000	318	318
Montana.....				125,000	6	6	175,000	9	9	2,669,800	133	133
Nebraska.....	707,099	35	35	932,499	47	47	999,327	50	50	11,407,100	570	570
Nevada.....				193,470	10	10	225,000	11	11	4,539,500	227	227
New Hampshire.....	99,434	5	5	124,434	6	6	131,027	6	6	5,739,600	287	287
New Jersey.....	15,798	1	1	90,798	4	4	165,857	8	8	2,209,700	110	110
New Mexico.....	806,766	25	25	897,566	45	45	1,065,635	53	53	9,084,800	454	454
New York.....	791,953	39	39	941,953	47	47	972,397	49	49	5,613,600	281	281
North Carolina.....	359,947	40	40	609,947	30	30	1,104,935	55	55	7,479,200	374	374
North Dakota.....	1,102,895	55	55	1,405,195	73	73	1,384,316	69	69	58,743,000	2,937	2,937
Ohio.....	255,262	13	13	352,162	18	18	394,142	20	20	5,490,000	274	274
Oklahoma.....	6,289,914	314	314	7,005,714	350	350	7,649,223	382	382	59,949,900	2,997	2,997
Oregon.....	426,716	21	21	625,716	31	31	819,563	41	41	5,794,700	290	290
Pennsylvania.....				729,800	36	36	904,800	45	45	9,731,300	486	486
South Carolina.....	343,396	17	17	645,696	32	32	796,981	40	40	7,397,900	370	370
South Dakota.....	45,195	2	2	353,495	18	18	540,229	27	27	10,018,900	501	501
Tennessee.....	173,521	9	9	298,521	15	15	568,799	28	28	3,690,900	184	184
Texas.....	9,583,702	479	479	11,201,002	560	560	10,417,200	521	521	142,417,700	7,121	7,121
Utah.....	10,955			185,955	9	9	376,815	19	19	7,841,300	392	392
Vermont.....				126,100	6	6	226,100	11	11	17,124,000	856	856
Virginia.....	384,830	19	19	726,830	36	36	726,830	36	36	10,542,000	527	527
Washington.....	128,044	6	6	403,044	20	20	486,999	24	24	10,519,900	526	526
West Virginia.....	497,881	25	25	597,881	30	30	677,188	34	34	8,740,900	437	437
Wisconsin.....	102,877	5	5	277,877	14	14	290,505	14	14	1,601,700	80	80
Wyoming.....	19,447	1	1	19,447	1	1	25,600	1	1	1,607,800	80	80
Alaska.....												
Hawaii.....							75,000			500,000	25	25
Puerto Rico.....												
Total.....	31,659,000	1,600	1,600	45,723,069	2,282	2,282	50,185,253	2,501	2,501	694,990,400	34,742	34,742

1 Based on applications received to date.

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS CONTRACT ACT OF 1954 (LEASE-PURCHASE)**

Mr. CHAVEZ. Next I should like to discuss the Public Buildings Contract Act of 1954, which covers lease-purchase.

There have been a total of 150 public buildings approved by Congress, and agencies have worked on prospectuses for 200 additional projects, with respect to which the Government owns 71 sites. The approved projects would cost about \$737 million and the additional projects would cost about \$1.5 billion. The authorized projects could be completed within a period of 3 to 4 years if financing can be arranged and construction plans expedited.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in my remarks a list of the public buildings involved.

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

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACT ACT OF 1954 (TITLE I)—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PROPERTY ACT OF 1954 (TITLE II)**

Public Law 519 of the 83d Congress provides for the acquisition of title to real property and construction of public buildings by the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General through lease-purchase agreements, and also provides an expansion of authority for term-leasing agree-

ments for the accommodation of activities of the Post Office Department.

Under the provisions of the law, installment payments on the purchase price will be made in lieu of rent and title to the improved property will be vested in the United States at the end of the agreement, usually for terms of 10 to 25 years, depending on the amount of amortization required for the property.

Local taxes will be paid on the property until title is vested in the Government.

During the 84th Congress the committee approved 83 post-office projects, having an estimated cost of \$69,573,565, and 67 Federal-building projects, with an estimated cost of \$667,588,830.

The following lease-purchase projects were approved by the Public Works Committee.

Location	Project	Estimated cost	Date approved	Location	Project	Estimated cost	Date approved
Point Pleasant, N. J.	Post office	\$68,750	Dec. 14, 1954	Victoria, Tex.	Post office and courthouse	\$1,563,000	July 20, 1956
St. Marys, Ohio	do.	82,500	Do.	Martinsburg, W. Va.	do.	1,400,000	Do.
Seranton, Pa.	Branch post office	60,000	Do.	Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 5	25,250,000	Do.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	East New York Station Post Office	270,000	Do.	Do.	Federal Office Building No. 6	16,275,000	Do.
Oxford, Pa.	Post office	65,000	Do.	Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 8	12,190,000	Do.
Atlanta, Ga.	Post-office-garage facilities	465,000	Do.	Washington, D. C.	(Food and Drug Administration)		
Council Bluffs, Iowa	Post office and courthouse	1,630,000	Mar. 15, 1955	Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 9	22,115,000	Do.
Green Bay, Wis.	Post office and Federal building	1,615,000	Do.	Washington, D. C.	(Civil Service Commission)		
Lake Charles, La.	Post office and courthouse	2,075,000	Do.	Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 10	40,900,000	Do.
Rock Island, Ill.	do.	2,000,000	Do.	Livingston, Ala.	Post office, etc.	279,000	July 23, 1956
Denver, Colo.	Post-office terminal annex	4,335,000	May 23, 1955	Miami, Fla.	Federal office building	8,875,000	Do.
Hudson, Mass.	Post office	90,000	Do.	Jonesboro, La.	Post office, etc.	265,000	Do.
Two Harbors, Minn.	do.	66,250	Do.	Laurel, Miss.	do.	820,000	Do.
Garland, Tex.	do.	143,750	Do.	McKinney, Tex.	do.	480,000	Do.
Grand Prairie, Tex.	do.	175,000	Do.	Terrell, Tex.	do.	392,000	Do.
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Federal office building	6,227,300	Do.	Dallas, Tex.	Courthouse and Federal office building	25,490,000	July 24, 1956
St. Paul, Minn.	Post office and customhouse	5,235,000	June 15, 1955	National City, Calif.	Post-office building	345,000	Do.
Jamestown, N. Y.	Post office and courthouse	1,840,135	Do.	Newark, N. J., Roseville station	do.	206,025	Do.
Kingsport, Tenn.	Post office and office building	1,013,000	Do.	Jersey City, N. J., Bergen station	do.	234,220	Do.
Abingdon, Va.	Post office and courthouse	543,210	June 15, 1954	Waukesha, Wis.	do.	408,000	Do.
Huntington, W. Va.	Federal office building	3,298,280	Do.	Rittman, Ohio	do.	126,775	Do.
Kansas City, Kans.	Post office and courthouse	2,393,303	Do.	Detroit, Mich., North End Station	do.	451,077	Do.
Grundy, Va.	Post office	50,000	July 27, 1955	Washington, D. C.	Federal office building	22,260,000	Do.
Refugio, Tex.	do.	78,125	Do.	Washington, D. C.	(U. S. Geological Survey)		
West Memphis, Ark.	do.	93,750	Do.	Washington, D. C. (17th St. and Pennsylvania Ave.)	Federal Office Building No. 7	27,450,000	Do.
Cashmere, Wash.	do.	54,687	Do.	St. Marys, Ohio (revised)	Post-office building	132,900	Do.
Madison, Tenn.	do.	78,125	Do.	Point Pleasant, N. J. (revised)	do.	136,500	Do.
Jefferson, Ohio	do.	78,125	Do.	Oxford, Pa. (revised)	do.	109,000	Do.
Camden, N. Y.	do.	86,250	Do.	Brooklyn, N. Y. (East New York Station) (revised)	do.	491,300	Do.
Houston, Tex.	do.	7,100,000	Do.	Denver, Colo., Terminal Annex (revised)	Post-office annex	8,209,000	Do.
Fort Mill, S. C.	do.	49,800	Do.	Seranton, Pa., Dunmore Branch (revised)	Post-office building	94,300	July 24, 1956
New Richmond, Wis.	do.	85,200	Do.	Garland, Tex. (revised)	do.	183,450	Do.
Toronto, Ohio	do.	53,125	Do.	Grand Prairie, Tex. (revised)	do.	245,000	Do.
Newtown, Pa.	do.	53,125	Do.	Two Harbors, Minn. (revised)	do.	107,000	Do.
Skaneateles, N. Y.	do.	79,875	Do.	Ontonagon, Mich. (revised)	do.	106,000	Do.
Maplewood, N. J.	do.	246,450	Do.	Grundy, Va. (revised)	do.	106,000	Do.
Burlington, Vt.	Post office and courthouse	2,830,000	Do.	Newkirk, Okla. (revised)	do.	98,100	Do.
Burlington, Iowa	Post office and Federal building	1,328,987	Do.	Refugio, Tex. (revised)	do.	117,700	Do.
New York, N. Y.	United Nations Bldg.	3,300,000	Do.	West Memphis, Ark. (revised)	do.	138,045	Do.
Richmond, Va.	Federal office building	7,410,000	July 27, 1955	Cashmere, Wash. (revised)	do.	97,200	Do.
Minneapolis, Minn.	Courthouse and Federal building	5,877,815	Do.	Madison, Tenn. (revised)	do.	138,040	Do.
New Orleans, La.	Post office and Federal building	14,200,000	Do.	Camden, N. Y. (revised)	do.	147,300	Do.
Ontonagon, Mich.	Post office	61,500	Do.	Maplewood, N. J. (revised)	do.	357,600	Do.
Newkirk, Okla.	do.	56,250	Do.	Skaneateles, N. Y. (revised)	do.	103,500	Do.
Atlanta, Ga.	Communicable Diseases Research Bldg.	12,330,000	Do.	Newton, Pa. (revised)	do.	150,915	Do.
Omaha, Nebr.	Post office and courthouse	9,579,823	Do.	New Richmond, Wis. (revised)	do.	147,600	Do.
Brunswick, Ga.	do.	1,431,000	Do.	Prince Georges County, Md. (revised)	do.	994,935	Do.
Carthage, Tenn.	Post office and Federal building	1,272,000	Do.	Hartford, Conn.	Federal office building	8,350,000	July 25, 1956
Durham, N. H.	do.	433,600	Do.	Monticello, Fla.	Post office building	310,000	Do.
Biloxi, Miss.	Post office and courthouse	1,110,000	Do.	Ocala, Fla.	Post office and courthouse	1,580,000	Do.
Lafayette, La.	Post office and Federal building	1,095,000	July 29, 1955	Milledgeville, Ga.	Post office, etc.	502,000	Do.
Parkersburg, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal building	1,722,841	Do.	Breese, Ill.	do.	271,000	Do.
Gainesville, Tex.	Post office and Federal building	645,036	Do.	Fort Dodge, Iowa	Post office and courthouse	1,980,000	Do.
San Francisco, Calif.	Courthouse and Federal office building	45,300,000	Mar. 7, 1956	Baltimore, Md.	Federal office building	19,170,000	Do.
Parkersburg, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal building (revised)	3,045,000	June 4, 1956	Denton, Md.	Post office, etc.	415,000	Do.
Kingsport, Tenn.	Post-office building, etc.	1,146,000	June 6, 1956	Bemidji, Minn.	do.	1,200,000	Do.
Hudson, Mass. (revised)	Post-office building	198,789	Do.	Brainerd, Minn.	do.	612,000	Do.
Bellflower, Calif.	do.	297,500	Do.	Moberly, Mo.	do.	487,000	Do.
Sparta, Mich.	do.	103,400	Do.	St. Louis, Mo.	Federal office building	13,760,000	Do.
Lansford, Pa.	do.	94,000	Do.	Do.	Federal Records Center	6,740,000	Do.
Tupper Lake, N. Y.	do.	107,554	Do.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Federal office building	21,700,000	Do.
Wayland, N. Y.	do.	56,250	Do.	Portland, Oreg.	do.	5,092,500	Do.
Prince Georges County, Md.	do.	745,100	Do.	Sharon, Pa.	Post office, etc.	898,000	Do.
Sioux City, Iowa	do.	85,500	Do.	Lafayette, Tenn.	do.	275,000	Do.
Shelbygan Falls, Wis.	do.	105,000	Do.	Daingerfield, Tex.	do.	216,000	Do.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Post-office garage	1,808,000	Do.	Orange, Tex.	do.	620,000	Do.
Los Angeles, Calif.	Customhouse and Federal office building	30,800,000	June 22, 1956	San Marcos, Tex.	do.	576,000	Do.
Sacramento, Calif.	Courthouse and Federal office building	10,210,000	Do.	Salt Lake City, Utah	Federal office building	7,600,000	Do.
Minden, La.	Post-office building, etc.	412,000	Do.	Portsmouth, Va.	Post office, etc.	3,575,000	Do.
Oklahoma City, Okla.	Courthouse and Federal office building	7,140,000	Do.	Waynesboro, Va.	do.	380,000	Do.
Houston, Tex.	do.	15,300,000	Do.	Franconia, Va.	Warehouse building	7,500,000	Do.
Greenville, Miss.	Post office and courthouse	1,200,000	June 28, 1956	Denver, Colo.	Courthouse	6,420,000	July 26, 1956
Homewood Station, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Post-office building	238,500	July 13, 1956	Benton, Ill.	Post-office building	1,100,000	Do.
Gulford, Conn.	do.	154,600	Do.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Courthouse and Federal office building	15,200,000	Do.
Gering, Nebr.	Post-office building, etc.	136,915	Do.	Manhattan, N. Y.	Customs court and Federal office building	65,100,000	Do.
Pittsford, N. Y.	do.	135,395	Do.	Toledo, Ohio	Post-office building	4,950,000	Do.
Teaneck, N. J.	do.	404,740	Do.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Federal office building	23,960,000	Do.
Winnetka, Ill.	do.	326,000	Do.	Charleston, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal office building	3,820,000	Do.
Camden, Ala.	Post-office building, etc.	272,000	Do.	Walluku, T. H.	Post-office building	757,000	Do.
Phoenix, Ariz.	Courthouse and Federal office building	8,600,000	Do.				
Little Rock, Ark.	Federal office building	9,150,000	Do.				
Helena, Ark.	Post office and courthouse	1,020,000	Do.				
Marshfield, Mo.	Post-office building, etc.	324,000	Do.				
Ronceverte, W. Va.	do.	255,000	Do.				
Boston, Mass.	Federal office building	28,150,000	Do.				
Emporia, Kans.	Post-office building, etc.	600,000	Do.				
Leavenworth, Kans.	Post office and courthouse	968,000	Do.				
Siseton, S. Dak.	Post-office building, etc.	530,000	Do.				
Mount Hope, W. Va.	Bureau of Mines building	700,000	Do.				
Hot Springs, Ark.	Post office and courthouse	1,729,000	July 20, 1956				
Sedan, Kans.	Post office, etc.	218,000	Do.				
New Orleans, La.	do.	19,670,000	Do.				
Redwood Falls, Minn.	do.	440,000	Do.				
Moorhead, Minn.	do.	555,000	Do.				
Greenwich, N. Y.	Post-office building	112,890	Do.				
Beaver, Pa.	Post office, etc.	310,000	Do.				
Manning, S. O.	do.	364,000	Do.				
Smithville, Tenn.	do.	263,000	Do.				

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to discuss further the Water Pollution Control Act, which I discussed heretofore.

The Water Pollution Control Act authorizes \$50 million annually for 10 years to provide aid to cities and towns in the construction of sewage treatment and disposal facilities.

On January 31, 1958, a total of 875 projects had been approved having a total cost of \$367,064,915, of which \$72,543,848.36 represents Federal grants. Additional applications for 245 projects are being processed in the regional offices of the Public Health Service. The total estimated project costs are \$136,369,970, of which \$23,939,912 would represent Federal grants. Applications are currently being processed in State agencies for 392 projects having an estimated cost of \$458,715,818, of which \$42,808,783 would represent Federal grants. It is reported that applications are being prepared for 285 projects which would have an estimated cost of \$102,840,793, of

which \$20,872,733 would be the estimated Federal grant. Senators will remember that the bulk of the money used in this program comes from the cities and States.

The total projects approved and on which applications are either being prepared or contemplated amount to 1,797. The total cost of these projects is estimated at \$1,064,991,486. The Federal grant for the projects is estimated to be \$160,165,276.36. There are a total of 9,377 treatments works listed among the treatment works needs. This is contrasted with 9,480 for 1956.

If an allotment of \$50 million of Federal funds is made for sewage-treatment plants there would be stimulated a total of \$250 million in total plant construction.

Obviously, since a \$50 million expenditure of Federal funds brings about a \$250 million expenditure by the people in the individual cities and States, if the Federal grants were doubled there would be a proportionate increase in the total plant construction.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly to Senators the idea of providing the proper type sanitation facilities for the people of the United States. I know that a lot of folks think this work should not be done, but we have growing cities in America, and they have many problems of this nature.

In my own State, there is a little city of Farmington, which today has more school children in the public schools than it had in total population a few years ago. There are better than 5,000 people living in the trailer camps. The problem is exactly the same at Grants. We can multiply that situation many more times, to cover the needs of the other States of the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the breakdown by States in connection with the water pollution control program be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE I.—Estimated impact of sewage treatment plant construction grant program under Public Law 660 based upon \$50 million appropriation

States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated <sup>1</sup>	Estimated payroll <sup>2</sup>	Estimated man-years of labor <sup>3</sup>	States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated <sup>1</sup>	Estimated payroll <sup>2</sup>	Estimated man-years of labor <sup>3</sup>
Totals <sup>4</sup>	\$50,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$75,000,013	13,111.9	Nevada	\$335,325	\$1,676,625	\$502,988	87.9
Alabama	1,144,725	5,723,625	1,717,088	300.2	New Hampshire	521,925	2,609,625	782,888	136.9
Arizona	576,450	2,882,250	864,675	151.2	New Jersey	1,109,775	5,548,875	1,664,663	291.0
Arkansas	1,024,975	5,124,875	1,537,463	268.8	New Mexico	631,350	3,156,750	947,025	165.6
California	2,048,825	10,244,125	3,073,238	537.3	New York	2,744,325	13,721,625	4,116,488	719.6
Colorado	635,700	3,178,500	953,550	166.7	North Carolina	1,280,950	6,304,750	1,891,425	330.7
Connecticut	624,100	3,120,500	936,150	163.7	North Dakota	671,725	3,358,625	1,007,588	176.2
Delaware	336,325	1,681,625	504,488	88.2	Ohio	1,653,600	8,293,000	2,487,900	434.9
District of Columbia	454,575	2,272,875	681,863	119.2	Oklahoma	862,175	4,310,875	1,293,263	226.1
Florida	899,575	4,497,875	1,349,362	235.9	Oregon	657,300	3,286,500	985,950	172.4
Georgia	1,128,600	5,643,000	1,682,900	296.0	Pennsylvania	2,102,975	10,514,875	3,154,463	551.5
Idaho	502,125	2,510,625	753,188	132.2	Rhode Island	514,475	2,572,375	771,713	134.9
Illinois	1,749,450	8,747,250	2,624,175	458.8	South Carolina	1,022,525	5,112,625	1,533,788	268.1
Indiana	1,039,850	5,199,250	1,559,775	272.7	South Dakota	676,700	3,383,500	1,015,050	177.5
Iowa	883,875	4,419,375	1,325,812	231.8	Tennessee	1,129,400	5,647,000	1,694,100	296.2
Kansas	758,325	3,791,625	1,137,488	198.9	Texas	1,714,800	8,574,000	2,572,200	449.6
Kentucky	1,073,825	5,369,125	1,610,788	281.6	Utah	591,875	2,959,375	887,813	155.2
Louisiana	986,350	4,931,750	1,479,525	258.7	Vermont	545,600	2,728,000	818,400	143.1
Maine	625,725	3,128,625	938,588	164.1	Virginia	1,019,100	5,095,500	1,528,650	267.2
Maryland	754,525	3,772,625	1,131,788	197.8	Washington	762,825	3,814,125	1,144,238	200.0
Massachusetts	1,123,575	5,617,875	1,685,303	294.6	West Virginia	900,000	4,500,000	1,350,000	236.0
Michigan	1,394,550	6,972,750	2,091,825	365.7	Wisconsin	981,025	4,905,125	1,471,538	257.0
Minnesota	929,175	4,645,875	1,393,763	243.7	Wyoming	458,050	2,290,250	687,075	120.1
Mississippi	1,162,925	5,814,625	1,744,388	305.0	Alaska	425,275	2,126,375	637,913	111.5
Missouri	1,063,350	5,316,750	1,595,025	278.8	Hawaii	513,475	2,567,375	770,213	134.6
Montana	512,475	2,562,375	768,713	134.4	Puerto Rico	1,168,100	5,840,500	1,752,150	306.3
Nebraska	683,850	3,419,250	1,025,775	179.3	Virgin Islands	812,550	4,062,750	1,218,825	213.1

TABLE II.—Estimated impact of sewage treatment plant construction grant program under Public Law 660 based upon \$100 million appropriation

States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated <sup>1</sup>	Estimated payroll <sup>2</sup>	Estimated man-years of labor <sup>3</sup>	States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated <sup>1</sup>	Estimated payroll <sup>2</sup>	Estimated man-years of labor <sup>3</sup>
Totals <sup>4</sup>	\$100,000,000	\$500,000,000	\$150,000,000	26,223.5	District of Columbia	\$909,150	\$4,545,750	\$1,363,725	238.4
Alabama	2,289,450	11,447,250	3,434,175	600.4	Florida	1,799,150	8,995,750	2,698,725	471.8
Arizona	1,152,900	5,764,500	1,729,350	302.3	Georgia	2,257,200	11,286,000	3,385,800	591.9
Arkansas	2,049,950	10,249,750	3,074,925	537.6	Idaho	1,184,250	5,921,250	1,776,375	310.6
California	4,097,650	20,488,250	6,146,475	1,074.6	Illinois	3,498,900	17,494,500	5,248,350	917.5
Colorado	1,271,400	6,357,000	1,907,100	333.4	Indiana	2,079,700	10,398,500	3,119,550	545.4
Connecticut	1,248,200	6,241,000	1,872,300	327.3	Iowa	1,767,750	8,838,750	2,651,625	463.6
Delaware	672,650	3,363,250	1,008,975	176.4	Kansas	1,516,650	7,583,250	2,274,975	397.7
					Kentucky	2,147,650	10,738,250	3,221,475	563.2

<sup>1</sup> A factor of 5 was used to increase State allotments to "Estimated total project cost," based upon the experience of the construction grants program through Jan. 31, 1958. This shows that Federal participation is only 20 percent plus or minus of the total project cost.

<sup>2</sup> "Estimated payroll" equals 30 percent of total project cost based upon information obtained from the Departments of Labor and Commerce which was substantiated by an analysis of projects under the construction grants program.

<sup>3</sup> "Estimated man-years" equals "Estimated payroll" divided by \$5,720. The

dollar value of the average labor cost per man-year was determined on the basis of 52 weeks per year, 40 hours per week, and an average hourly rate of \$2.75. The average hourly rate was derived from national average figures for skilled and common labor as reported in the Oct. 17, 1957, issue of the Engineering News Record. No specific data was available on this matter from the Departments of Labor or Commerce.

<sup>4</sup> Totals will not check accurately due to rounding.

TABLE II.—Estimated impact of sewage treatment plant construction grant program under Public Law 860 based upon \$100 million appropriation—Continued

States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated	Estimated payroll	Estimated man-years of labor	States	Allotment	Estimated total cost of projects stimulated	Estimated payroll	Estimated man-years of labor
Louisiana.....	\$1,972,700	\$9,863,500	\$2,959,050	517.3	Oregon.....	\$1,314,600	\$6,573,000	\$1,971,900	344.7
Maine.....	1,251,450	6,257,250	1,877,175	328.2	Pennsylvania.....	4,205,950	21,029,750	6,308,925	1,103.0
Maryland.....	1,509,050	7,545,250	2,263,575	395.7	Rhode Island.....	1,028,950	5,144,750	1,543,425	269.8
Massachusetts.....	2,247,150	11,235,750	3,370,725	589.3	South Carolina.....	2,045,050	10,225,250	3,067,575	536.3
Michigan.....	2,789,100	13,945,500	4,183,650	731.4	South Dakota.....	1,353,400	6,767,000	2,030,100	354.9
Minnesota.....	1,858,350	9,291,750	2,787,525	487.3	Tennessee.....	2,258,800	11,294,000	3,388,200	592.3
Mississippi.....	2,325,850	11,629,250	3,488,775	609.9	Texas.....	3,429,600	17,148,000	5,144,400	896.4
Missouri.....	2,126,700	10,633,500	3,190,050	557.7	Utah.....	1,183,750	5,918,750	1,775,625	310.4
Montana.....	1,024,950	5,124,750	1,537,425	268.8	Vermont.....	1,091,200	5,456,000	1,636,800	286.1
Nebraska.....	1,367,700	6,838,500	2,051,550	358.7	Virginia.....	2,038,200	10,191,000	3,057,300	534.5
Nevada.....	670,650	3,353,250	1,005,975	175.9	Washington.....	1,525,650	7,628,250	2,288,475	400.1
New Hampshire.....	1,043,850	5,219,250	1,565,775	273.7	West Virginia.....	1,800,000	9,000,000	2,700,000	472.0
New Jersey.....	2,219,550	11,097,750	3,329,325	582.1	Wisconsin.....	1,962,050	9,810,250	2,943,075	514.5
New Mexico.....	1,262,700	6,313,500	1,894,050	331.1	Wyoming.....	916,100	4,580,500	1,374,150	240.2
New York.....	5,488,650	27,443,250	8,232,975	1,439.3	Alaska.....	850,550	4,252,750	1,275,825	223.0
North Carolina.....	2,521,900	12,609,500	3,782,850	661.3	Hawaii.....	1,026,950	5,134,750	1,540,425	269.3
North Dakota.....	1,343,450	6,717,250	2,015,175	352.3	Puerto Rico.....	2,336,200	11,681,000	3,504,300	612.6
Ohio.....	3,317,200	16,586,000	4,975,800	869.9	Virgin Islands.....	1,625,100	8,125,500	2,437,650	426.2
Oklahoma.....	1,724,350	8,621,750	2,586,525	452.2					

Water supply and water pollution control program, sewage treatment works construction grants—Status of applications as of Jan. 31, 1958

State	A Projects approved			B Additional applications being processed in regional offices			C Additional applications being processed in State agencies			D Other applications reported to be in preparation		
	1. Number	2. Estimated project costs	3. Grant offers	1. Number	2. Estimated project costs	3. Grant funds requested	1. Number	2. Estimated project costs	3. Grant funds requested	1. Number	2. Estimated project costs	3. Estimated grant funds
Alabama.....	12	\$13,799,108	\$2,125,549.17				18	\$7,925,837	\$1,656,500			
Arizona.....	12	3,710,262	1,040,398.68				1	75,000	22,500	1	\$50,888	\$15,200
Arkansas.....	24	6,280,580	1,343,605.98	3	\$190,004	\$55,448				13	6,689,200	1,287,000
California.....	24	9,046,225	2,275,333.00	1	2,446,030	250,000	61	72,813,808	7,615,789			
Colorado.....	18	5,136,978	1,260,916.33	2	788,436	233,530	4	2,199,527	568,707	18	10,707,000	912,100
Connecticut.....	5	4,157,230	933,265.24	2	1,622,000	486,600						
Delaware.....	4	2,294,547	574,695.00	1	267,338	80,201	1	267,338	80,201	3	500,000	150,000
District of Columbia.....	2	7,200,179	362,500.00				2	3,273,000	320,650	7	1,343,000	331,000
Florida.....	17	7,137,174	1,761,379.44	24	20,942,042	3,944,695						
Georgia.....	14	6,501,143	1,547,848.50	1	333,330	100,000				2		500,000
Idaho.....	8	4,240,636	958,879.73	1	236,751	71,025				2	617,000	155,000
Illinois.....	19	13,245,734	2,118,623.51	3	774,000	236,000	45	6,831,126	3,061,515			
Indiana.....	17	11,976,923	2,057,125.00	18	15,215,237	2,772,810	2	1,256,000	332,295			
Iowa.....	29	9,084,679	1,702,910.70	33	5,850,214	1,545,477						
Kansas.....	28	7,050,577	1,482,700.00									
Kentucky.....	17	8,651,850	1,590,386.00	1	670,000	201,000	11	7,327,909	1,154,016	10	6,009,000	1,352,700
Louisiana.....	18	6,348,944	1,611,528.72	5	1,300,108	390,032				1	750,000	225,000
Maine.....	3	980,430	294,069.00				8			1	2,010,000	603,000
Maryland.....	12	4,854,685	1,137,406.02	1	990,000	198,000	4	3,601,642	678,578	11	6,050,000	1,210,000
Massachusetts.....	10	5,417,276	1,097,667.76	2	1,622,000	477,100				10	4,649,000	1,110,000
Michigan.....	25	9,151,210	2,558,708.89	3	889,543	266,863	28	58,462,600	3,856,458			
Minnesota.....	20	7,216,722	1,849,376.00				47	16,937,100	4,197,283			
Mississippi.....	11	3,313,581	646,059.88							6	2,283,000	584,900
Missouri.....	39	12,027,462	2,111,046.71	1			23	13,937,100	2,747,245			
Montana.....	12	2,297,607	583,709.74							9	5,375,000	854,900
Nebraska.....	24	5,995,701	1,315,086.88	1	43,790	13,137				1	87,420	26,226
Nevada.....	2	491,000	147,300.00							4	1,150,000	345,000
New Hampshire.....	6	1,252,649	375,794.80	2	1,085,000	275,500				4	1,185,500	250,000
New Jersey.....	13	16,049,119	2,216,268.86							7	533,000	160,000
New Mexico.....	30	27,217,634	3,517,729.59	1	6,000	1,800	9	1,426,334	428,000			
New York.....	25	11,821,131	2,526,540.00	21	336,633	3,173,985	27	159,772,000	4,258,100			
North Carolina.....	35	2,133,730	544,622.55	3	1,059,800	253,018	9	5,590,022	1,150,960	19	14,929,630	2,427,619
North Dakota.....	31	15,720,341	3,196,836.77	2	3,615,806	276,102	4	132,090	39,627	7	1,300,000	390,000
Ohio.....	22	7,455,772	1,611,269.65	9	2,131,634	639,480	27	56,428,987	4,167,980			
Oklahoma.....	19	4,423,061	1,079,382.54	7	1,044,420	313,126	2	327,247	98,173	2	170,000	56,000
Oregon.....	17	15,469,174	2,804,798.97	4	3,175,315	722,595	19	13,324,685	3,027,405	11	953,000	285,900
Pennsylvania.....	6	1,978,680	581,177.50							12	4,430,000	
Rhode Island.....	17	4,608,319	1,306,467.98	1	1,500,000	250,000	1			9	350,000	105,000
South Carolina.....	24	2,613,082	542,417.87	1	125,975	37,792	1	19,471	5,841	16	2,791,087	777,426
South Dakota.....	15	11,970,991	2,252,799.21	11	3,087,840	866,112	5	1,095,675	228,996	3	361,833	115,350
Tennessee.....	41	13,976,963	3,355,178.51	19	8,914,182	1,654,739	1	200,000	60,000	5	1,430,000	429,000
Texas.....	5	10,926,318	1,019,786.86				12	3,851,448	788,655	2	6,000,000	500,000
Utah.....	2	667,700	200,310.00	2	1,770,000	400,000				2	1,000,000	300,000
Vermont.....	26	9,999,083	1,451,808.00	6	1,720,477	186,161	14	2,496,017	417,996	14	7,058,401	1,962,762
Virginia.....	27	6,074,416	1,400,837.82	6	7,032,569	942,033	20	20,291,958	2,191,587	32	4,307,000	1,092,100
Washington.....	6	3,626,262	858,305.00	3	407,177	122,153						
West Virginia.....	35	8,044,815	1,946,349.80	42	11,620,876	2,431,782						
Wisconsin.....	17	2,851,849	699,874.83	2	106,720	32,016	2	97,150	29,145	5	649,000	192,900
Wyoming.....	2	1,001,964	294,791.97							6	2,327,500	698,250
Alaska.....	10	5,580,880	1,088,400.00	1	132,000	39,600	1	135,000	40,500	4	3,468,000	1,040,400
Hawaii.....												
Puerto Rico.....												
Total.....	875	367,064,915	72,543,848.36	245	136,369,970	23,939,912	392	458,715,818	42,808,783	265	102,840,793	20,872,736

Number of projects listed on comprehensive list of treatment works needs

Estimated allocations to States—Construction grants, W. S. and W. P. C.—Continued

State	1956 total	Present total
Alabama	123	120
Arizona	59	76
Arkansas	167	163
California	1,034	1,060
Colorado	217	203
Connecticut	70	56
Delaware	15	10
District of Columbia	1	1
Florida	117	132
Georgia	232	231
Idaho	161	161
Illinois	328	278
Indiana	214	199
Iowa	235	262
Kansas	228	227
Kentucky	161	158
Louisiana	141	117
Maine	139	137
Maryland	77	72
Massachusetts	139	153
Michigan	189	149
Minnesota	264	285
Mississippi	106	107
Missouri	185	195
Montana	119	117
Nebraska	232	246
Nevada	30	25
New Hampshire	84	89
New Jersey	71	71
New Mexico	52	104
New York	342	357
North Carolina	260	246
North Dakota	156	162
Ohio	246	208
Oklahoma	380	199
Oregon	95	115
Pennsylvania	372	490
Rhode Island	27	27
South Carolina	86	94
South Dakota	172	178
Tennessee	110	107
Texas	626	814
Utah	72	70
Vermont	276	276
Virginia	142	147
Washington	192	112
West Virginia	233	230
Wisconsin	175	156
Wyoming	74	40
Subtotal	9,256	9,232
Alaska	83	48
Hawaii	58	18
Puerto Rico	75	75
Virgin Islands	8	4
Total	9,480	9,377

	Based on appropriation of—	
33. North Dakota	\$671,725	\$1,343,450
34. Ohio	1,658,600	3,317,200
35. Oklahoma	862,175	1,724,350
36. Oregon	657,300	1,314,600
37. Pennsylvania	2,102,975	4,205,950
38. Rhode Island	514,475	1,028,950
39. South Carolina	1,022,525	2,045,050
40. South Dakota	676,700	1,353,400
41. Tennessee	1,129,400	2,258,800
42. Texas	1,714,800	3,429,600
43. Utah	591,875	1,183,750
44. Vermont	545,600	1,091,200
45. Virginia	1,019,100	2,038,200
46. Washington	762,825	1,525,650
47. West Virginia	900,000	1,800,000
48. Wisconsin	981,025	1,962,050
49. Wyoming	468,050	936,100
50. Alaska	425,275	850,550
51. Hawaii	513,475	1,026,950
52. Puerto Rico	1,168,100	2,336,200
53. Virgin Islands	812,550	1,625,100

\$1,338,500,000 to complete. Projects now under construction have a total cost of \$2,479,500,000 and require about \$1,103,800,000 to complete.

The 1959 budget request is for \$161,662,000 of construction funds which is far below the amount required to carry out an efficient construction program. This could reasonably be increased by about \$60 million to \$70 million for many projects such as the Navaho Dam, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and many others in our Western States.

Instead of doing this work piecemeal, and waiting until costs go up 3 or 4 years from now, why should we not take care of those people who are unemployed by having the work done now at a lesser cost?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the breakdown by States as to the reclamation program be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Bureau of Reclamation has a total active program involving a total cost of about \$2,714,200,000, which requires about

Active reclamation construction program

[Millions of dollars]

State	Projects under construction		Projects not under construction		Total active program	
	Total cost	Required to complete	Total cost	Required to complete	Total cost	Required to complete
Arizona	302.4	296.0			302.4	296.0
California	829.4	259.5			829.4	259.5
Colorado	13.8	10.7	7.8	7.8	21.6	18.5
Idaho	43.1	8.0			43.1	8.0
Kansas			15.2	15.2	15.2	15.2
Montana	103.1	98.0			122.8	117.7
Nebraska			59.9	59.9	59.9	59.9
Nevada						
New Mexico	65.4	39.2			65.4	39.2
North Dakota			.2	.2	.2	.2
Oklahoma	40.3	36.3			40.3	36.3
Oregon	27.3	16.1			27.3	16.1
South Dakota	3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0
Texas			125.0	125.0	125.0	125.0
Utah	68.8	30.9	6.9	6.9	75.7	37.8
Washington	765.7	237.7			765.7	237.7
Wyoming	127.2	68.4			127.2	68.4
Total	2,479.5	1,103.8	234.7	234.7	2,714.2	1,338.5

Estimated allocations to States—Construction grants, W. S. and W. P. C.

Total	Based on appropriation of—	
	\$50,000,000	\$100,000,000
1. Alabama	1,144,725	2,289,450
2. Arizona	576,450	1,152,900
3. Arkansas	1,024,975	2,049,950
4. California	2,048,825	4,097,650
5. Colorado	635,700	1,271,400
6. Connecticut	624,100	1,248,200
7. Delaware	336,325	672,650
8. District of Columbia	454,575	909,150
9. Florida	890,575	1,781,150
10. Georgia	1,128,600	2,257,200
11. Idaho	592,125	1,184,250
12. Illinois	1,749,450	3,498,900
13. Indiana	1,039,850	2,079,700
14. Iowa	883,875	1,767,750
15. Kansas	758,325	1,516,650
16. Kentucky	1,073,825	2,147,650
17. Louisiana	986,350	1,972,700
18. Maine	625,725	1,251,450
19. Maryland	754,525	1,509,050
20. Massachusetts	1,123,575	2,247,150
21. Michigan	1,394,550	2,789,100
22. Minnesota	929,175	1,858,350
23. Mississippi	1,162,925	2,325,850
24. Missouri	1,063,350	2,126,700
25. Montana	512,475	1,024,950
26. Nebraska	683,890	1,367,780
27. Nevada	335,325	670,650
28. New Hampshire	521,925	1,043,850
29. New Jersey	1,109,775	2,219,550
30. New Mexico	631,350	1,262,700
31. New York	2,744,325	5,488,650
32. North Carolina	1,260,950	2,521,900

<sup>1</sup> Based on 1950 population and 1954-56 per capita income.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have talked about projects which mean work for the people. The President has indicated of late that he is very much concerned about the problems of the unemployed. As I stated heretofore, the President is recommending the enactment into law of a big program of post-office construction. I am not against that; I am very much in favor of that. However, as every Senator knows, legislation takes time, and people cannot wait 4 or 5 months when their children are hungry.

The President has it within his power to proceed this very day with many of the projects I have mentioned. The administration has the money, but it is not using it.

Are we in favor of putting people to work, or do we wish merely to talk about it? We can put people to work, if the President will only direct the Budget Bureau to release the money and allow people to work and feed their children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARRETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S LETTER TO PREMIER BULGANIN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of the letter which President Eisenhower sent to Nicolai A. Bulganin, chairman of the Council of Ministers, U. S. S. R.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Thomasville, Ga., February 15, 1958.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am in receipt of your communication of February 1. I note that it is a slightly abbreviated and moderated edition of the lengthy and rather bitter speech which Mr. Khrushchev made at Minsk on January 22.

I begin to wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we shall get anywhere by continuing to write speeches to each other? As I read your successive lengthy missives of December 10, January 8, and February 1, I cannot avoid the feeling that if our two countries are to move ahead to the establishment of better relations, we must find some ways other than mere prolongation of repetitive public debate. In this connection, I have some thoughts to offer.

But first I comment briefly on your latest note.

II

I tried in my letter to you of January 12 to put forward some new ideas. For example, I proposed strengthening the United Nations by rededication of our nations to its purposes and principles, with the accompaniment of some reduction in the use of the veto power in the Security Council.

That proposal you reject, alleging that it would give to the Security Council a power to "adopt decisions that would be binding on all states" and make it in effect a "world government." That argument is directed to a misrepresentation of my proposal. I suggested that our two nations should, as a matter of policy, avoid vetoing Security Council recommendations as to how nations might proceed toward the peaceful solution of their disputes. Surely authority to recommend, and that only as to procedures, is not to impose binding decisions. Already, the General Assembly can, free of veto, recommend procedures for peaceful settlement. Would it really be catastrophic for the Security Council to exercise that same facility?

III

Another new idea was that outer space should be perpetually dedicated to peaceful purposes. You belittle this proposal as one made to gain strategic advantages for the United States. Mr. Khrushchev in his Minsk speech said, "This means they want to prohibit that which they do not possess."

Since the record completely disproves that uncalled for statement, may we now hope between us to consider and devise cooperative international procedures to give reality to the idea of use of outer space for peace only.

When the United States alone possessed atomic weapons and the Soviet Union possessed none, the United States proposed to forgo its monopoly in the interest of world peace and security. We are prepared to take the same attitude now in relation to outer space. If this peaceful purpose is not realized, and the worse than useless race of weapons goes on, the world will have only the Soviet Union to blame, just as it has only the Soviet Union to blame for the fact that atomic and nuclear power are now used increasingly for weapons purposes instead of being dedicated wholly to peaceful uses as the United States proposed a decade ago.

The Soviet Union refused to cooperate in tackling the problem of international control of atomic energy when that problem was in its infancy. Consequently, it has now become too late to achieve totally effective control although there can be, as we propose, a controlled cessation of further weapons testing and of the manufacture of fissionable material for weapons purposes. But, as your Government said on May 10, 1955, a total ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons could not now be enforced because "the pos-

sibility would be open to a potential aggressor to accumulate stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons for a surprise atomic attack on peace-loving states."

A terrible new menace can be seen to be in the making. That menace is to be found in the use of outer space for war purposes. The time to deal with that menace is now. It would be tragic if the Soviet leaders were blind or indifferent toward this menace as they were apparently blind or indifferent to the atomic and nuclear menace at its inception a decade ago.

If there is a genuine desire on the part of the Soviet leaders to do something more than merely to talk about the menace resulting from what you described as "the production of ever newer types of weapons," let us actually do what even now would importantly reduce the scope of nuclear warfare, both in terms of checking the use of fissionable material for weapons purposes and in wholly eliminating the newest types of weapons which use outer space for human destruction.

IV

With respect to the meeting of heads of government, the cumulative effect of your last three missives is to leave considerable puzzlement as to what you think another such meeting could contribute to a genuine settlement of our problems.

You have proposed, and insisted on, about 10 topics which you want to have discussed at such a meeting. I, in turn, suggested some eight topics which I thought should be discussed—strengthening the United Nations, dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes, the reunification of Germany, the right of the peoples of Eastern Europe to choose the form of government under which they would live, and a number of specific proposals in the disarmament field.

I wrote that, if there were to be a top-level meeting, I would be willing to discuss your proposals in good faith if you would so discuss mine. Your answer is that I must be prepared to discuss your proposals but that as regards mine there must, you said "be unanimous agreement of all participants as to the necessity for considering such proposals." In other words, you demand the right to veto discussion of the matters I believe to be vital to peace.

I noted that Mr. Khrushchev devoted a considerable part of his Minsk speech to a discussion of conditions in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. Does the Soviet Union claim such a proprietary interest in these lands and people that to discuss them is solely a matter of Soviet domestic concern? If not, and if these lands and people can be discussed by Soviet leaders as an international problem, why cannot we both discuss them?

If indeed a top-level conference were to apply the formula that no one is to say anything except what all the rest agree they would like to hear, we would, as I said in my last press conference, end up in the ludicrous posture of our just glaring silently at each other across the table.

Perhaps the impasse to which we seem to have come can be broken by less formal and less publicized contacts through which we would continue to seek to find out whether there can be a top-level meeting which, in the words of my letter to you of January 12, 1958, "would hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world." Exchanges of views effected through our ambassadors or foreign ministers may serve better than what Mr. Khrushchev referred to at Minsk as "polemics" between heads of government. The United States is accordingly consulting with some other interested nations as to the desirability of exploring, through more normal channels, the prospects of a top-level meeting which would be adequate as to subjects, and as to which pre-

liminary exchanges would indicate good prospect of an accord. You will understand, of course, that, whatever be the preparatory procedures, these would, as far as the United States was concerned, require the participation of our Secretary of State.

V

"Polemics" will not, I fear, advance us along the path of better relations which is my Nation's goal. Indeed, I deplore the constantly mounting accusations within the Soviet Union that the United States is a nation ruled by aggressive war-minded imperialists. Mr. Khrushchev's speech of January 22 is an outstanding example of such charges and indeed they are to be found in your February 1 note.

What is the explanation of such charges? They seem to fly in the face of established history.

Until the end of the First World War, war was generally accepted as a lawful means of conducting foreign policy. But after World War I showed the terrible consequences of such toleration of war, the United States took the initiative in bringing about the Pact of Paris whereby the nations of the world renounced war as an instrument of national policy. An even broader renunciation of force is now found in the United Nations Charter. The United States, which initiated the concept of the international renunciation of force, has sought to adhere scrupulously to that concept.

I am really amazed now to be told by Soviet leaders, who have never even been near this country, that there are in the United States those who, in your words, "utter the dangerous call for preventive war"; and conduct "unrestrained propaganda for war." If any such persons exist in the United States, I do not know of them; nor do I know of any "imperialist ruling circles" that are supposedly eager to plunge the world into war in order to make financial gains.

These allegations do not provide the real facts of American life. The real facts are the intense longing of the American people for peace; the working of the American constitutional system which assures that government shall be responsive to the peaceful will of the people; our "built-in" guaranties against the possibility of any United States Government suddenly initiating war; our national dedication to the international renunciation of force as an instrument of national policy; the decisive influence for peace of American religious, labor, intellectual and political leaders and of their organizations.

It is, of course, quite true that our people are flatly opposed to regimes which hold people against their will and which deny the principle on which our Nation was founded, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and can never rightly deprive the governed of their inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our people's rejection of many foreign and domestic aspects of Soviet methods and policies is, however, demonstrably not a moving cause to war. Otherwise we would have struck when we had atomic weapons and the Soviet Union had none; or when we had thermonuclear bombs and the Soviet Union had none.

VI

When I contrast the actual facts of American life with such portrayals as those of Mr. Khrushchev at Minsk, and indeed of your latest communication to me, I am impressed more than ever before with the enormous difficulties besetting us in attempting to move toward better relations and with the greater necessity than ever before of doing so.

It is possible that Soviet leadership feels it necessary deliberately to misrepresent the American viewpoint. If so, one effect would be to confuse their own people and the people of those eastern European countries under

their domination, who are denied access to world information except as the Soviet leaders permit. Another effect would be to make true cooperation more difficult. Possibly also these misrepresentations constitute blind adherence to what was one of the early tenets of orthodox communism, namely, that capitalist societies are by their very nature warlike.

I prefer, however, to assume that these misrepresentations are not willful but result from genuine misconceptions which could be done away with.

## VII

Our two nations are both now exploring and seeking to learn the truth about outer space. But is it not more important to learn the truth about each other? The ambassadorial agreement concluded between our Governments on January 27, 1958, points in this direction. It contemplates exchanges that, it is said, will contribute significantly to the betterment of relations between the two countries, thereby contributing to a lessening of international tension. I hope that we shall make full use of that agreement. But, for the most part, it deals with exchanges of technicians and specialists in various fields. Would it not be well if, in addition, leaders of thought and influential citizens within the Soviet Union should come to visit the United States, not to acquire technical knowledge but rather to learn at first hand the feeling of our people toward peace and the working of our popular institutions as they affect our conduct of foreign relations. Most of the Soviet citizens who exert an influence are strangers to this country with, I fear, totally false conceptions. These misconceptions I should like to see corrected in the interests of better relations. I can assure you that groups of qualified citizens of the U. S. S. R. coming here for the purpose I describe would receive every facility to learn about our country and our people and the working of our political institutions.

I feel also that we need particularly to be thinking not only of the present but also of the future and of those, now young, who in a few years will be carrying heavy responsibilities that our generation will pass on to them. I think our young people should get to know more about each other. I strongly feel that the recent agreement for the exchange of 20 to 30 students a year is a small step in the right direction, but woefully inadequate. I may write you further on this topic.

## VIII

In the meantime, I reaffirm what has been so often said by Secretary Dulles and by myself. The American Nation wants nothing more than to cooperate wholeheartedly with any Soviet Government which is genuinely dedicated to advancing, by peaceful means, the welfare of the people of the Soviet Union. It should, however, be appreciated how difficult it is to generate here the good will which the Soviet leaders claim they want, so long as there remains between our two countries the vast gulf of misunderstanding and misrepresentation that is again revealed by both speeches and written communications of Soviet leaders. If the Soviet leaders sincerely desire better relations with us, can they truly think it helpful for the Soviet Union to continue to pursue the objectives of international communism, which include the overthrow of other governments? The Moscow Manifesto made last November by the representatives of Communist Parties from 64 nations, and the Soviet Government's official endorsement of the results of the recent Afro-Asian Conference in Cairo could not fail to raise in the minds of our people the question of the real purposes of the Soviet leaders.

We shall nevertheless go on seeking such good relations. And I hope that, if there is a positive response to the concrete sugges-

tion here made, we may perhaps do something toward ushering in a new and better era.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

#### A UNITED STATES SENATOR'S LOOK AT LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the United States today is immensely proud of the fact that it has launched its first earth satellite the Explorer into outer space. There is no doubt this scientific achievement has recaptured some of the prestige which was lost by America when the Soviets set up their sputniks. There is large concentration today to regain and maintain our superiority in the scientific field. As a Nation we feel confident that we shall catch up and go ahead in the field of missiles and space phenomena if only we will devote enough of our time and talents to the task. This is as it should be. But while approving of such a course of concentration and dedication to master the new problems of the heavens, still we must not lose sight of the more troublesome problems of the earth.

Too often there is a tendency to concentrate on problems away from home rather than on those close at hand. Distance lends enchantment, particularly in the field of foreign relations.

The importance of home problems frequently is ignored in the rush to take care of those which grow greater in our minds in proportion to the increased distance from our shores. The mounting problems of Latin America—our neighbors—here on our Western Hemisphere, seem to receive less and less attention as developments tie them closer and closer to our future—our welfare, our destiny.

Today Latin America is seething with political, economic, and social unrest. Because of Latin America's importance to us from the standpoint of trade, strategy, and raw materials, it is essential that we assist it in solving its problems. It is in our own enlightened self-interest that we do so immediately. If we fail to assume this responsibility, we must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

It has been said many times before but it needs repeating—"The 20 Latin American Republics are our stalwart friends." They have stood by us during war and peace. Ours is a friendship which has stood the test of time.

Recently, I have returned from one of my periodic trips to Central and South America which afforded me an opportunity to again study at first hand some of their current problems. I must be frank to say that the trend of developments in Latin America, the seriousness of the economic problems confronting these countries, and the audacity of a Soviet economic offensive in that area, bring me to the conclusion that now is the time for good intentions to be replaced with good deeds in implementing our so-called good-neighbor policy. In fact this may be our last chance to exercise influence and participate in the promotion of the welfare of these Latin countries. For the hour is growing late. Let me tell you why.

Most of us have a shallow understanding of the civilization that lies to the south. In reality Latin America consists of a group of states firmly devoted to principles that the United States seeks to uphold. Down through the years they have struggled valiantly to promote democratic principles. In some areas great progress has been made. In others, only small beginnings. We have two recent examples of the democratic processes functioning in Latin America. Recently there was an election in Costa Rica where the outgoing President, José Figueres, was succeeded by Señor Mario Echandi. The Costa Rican Government invited a United Nations team to witness the election. The election was conducted without disorder, bloodshed, or even the appearance of the military. The new administration comes in even though it was opposed by President Figueres, and the people of Costa Rica are to be complimented on having made this change in government in a typically democratic fashion.

Another example of the democratic processes coming to the front, in Latin America, was the recent election in Guatemala. Some one-half million people voted in an honest ballot, and Ydigoras Fuentes received the largest vote. Señor Cruz Salazar was second, and the left-wing candidate was last. Because neither of the top men was able to obtain a majority, the Guatemalan Congress was called upon to make the selection. In spite of the fact that Cruz Salazar's party held a substantial majority in Congress, these legislators chose the rival candidate—the real choice of the Guatemalan people. This they did without violence or bloodshed, and in the truest democratic traditions. These are definite indications that progress is being made. All over Central and South America there is an ever-brightening light and an increasing hope.

There also exists a strong historical tie between the Latins and ourselves. As subjugated colonies of Spain and Portugal, they were inspired by our efforts for freedom and independence to make the try for themselves, and the history of freedom's progress has been greatly enriched by the names of Simón Bolívar, who helped free the countries of Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, Panama, and some of the other Central American countries; the priest Hidalgo, who did so much in Mexico; San Martín, who prepared the way for freedom in Argentina; O'Higgins, who helped free Chile; José Martí, in Cuba, and many others who led the way to Latin American independence. Many of those countries even modeled their original constitutions after our own.

Physically the 20 Republics comprise an area of almost 8 million square miles. This is 15 percent of the world's land area, and an area 2½ times larger than the United States. The Republics vary in size from Brazil, which is considerably larger than the United States, to Haiti, which is about the size of Maryland.

Latin America has a population of over 183 million people, compared to that of 172 million in the United States. It has the fastest growing population of any area on earth. It is increasing at the rate of 2½ percent a year. This means that

by 1975, the area will have 56 million more people than the United States. By the turn of the century, its total population is expected to be in the neighborhood of 500 million. It is an area rich in natural resources. The largest unexplored areas with great possibilities of petroleum development are today in South America. The largest forests outside Siberia are found in Latin America. It is almost the richest area on earth in mineral deposits of all kinds. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico encompass the finest grazing land to be found anywhere on earth.

With such richness in people and resources the eventual economic well-being of the area is only a question of time and direction. It is in this area of economic development where we, the United States, can and should, play a prominent part. Not just because of our friendship for our southern friends, but in our own enlightened self-interest.

Latin American countries for many years subsisted on supplying raw materials and food stuffs to the United States and other countries. Since the end of World War II, however, they have been urgently seeking to diversify their economies, to industrialize and to raise the living standards of their peoples.

In the postwar years great strides have been made in Latin America in which we have participated by such means as private investments, Export-Import Bank loans, and technical assistance.

Since the end of the war, Latin American manufacturing production has increased by 60 percent. The production of basic industrial minerals has increased by 27 percent. Per capita real income has risen at the rate of 3½ percent a year. Its gross production increased from \$32.2 billion in 1947 to \$47.2 billion in 1955. This means that the annual growth rate has been 5 percent a year compared to 3.6 percent of the United States during the same period.

Impressive as these figures are, it must be borne in mind that they represent improvements from primitive economies to only the first stage of modern economies. The Latin American people, having tasted the first sweet fruits of economic progress, are eager and impatient for more.

Herein lies the danger. Our mutual enemies, the Communists, seized upon the fierce longing of our neighbors for more rapid fulfillment of their aspirations. With deceptive promises, the Communists are seeking to infiltrate Latin America both economically and politically.

Moscow is now bombarding the Latin American countries with all sorts of proposals for economic and financial aid, trade deals, promises of machinery of all kinds, including vital oil-drilling equipment. In fact, the Communists are offering economic deals that are tailor-made to the problems of each of the Latin American countries approached. Why are they doing this? Obviously because they are most anxious to establish a foothold in Latin America into which they can pour their agents and their propaganda. These are the same tactics the

Commies have already used so successfully in the Middle East.

Here are some of the steps the Soviets are taking in their drive to infiltrate and win away from us our Latin American friends. It has persuaded an official Argentine mission to go to Moscow to buy \$8 million worth of goods, including oil-drilling equipment.

In Rio de Janeiro a Soviet trading agency—Torgbras—is offering to supply Brazil with oil-drilling equipment in exchange for raw materials.

A Soviet delegation has gone to Colombia with glowing offers to trade industrial equipment for coffee, though the Russians drink little coffee. It has also been reported that Russia seeks to purchase 20,000 tons of copper from Chile, at a price admittedly unprofitable to the Soviets.

Russia will trade oil machinery for Brazilian coffee for the purpose of strengthening her already powerful 60,000-strong Brazilian Communist Party. In the same way, Russia has just bought a large sum of Chilean copper, and thus hopes to gain a foothold in one of the rich copper regions of this hemisphere.

The Soviet offensive is not limited to these countries alone but includes others in South and Central America as well. The Latin American Republics are vital to our defense, and our security depends in great measure upon the support we receive from them. Obviously if the Communists are allowed to infiltrate in this area while we sit and watch, then our security will be seriously endangered.

It is self-defeating for the United States to be exerting itself economically and financially toward other more distant areas of the world if at the same time we do not render the type of assistance needed and asked for by our neighbors in our own hemisphere. We cannot say that we need not help Latin America because Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East are the immediate danger areas in the cold war. The fact is that any Soviet penetration in Latin America could do us incalculable harm.

#### LATIN AMERICA'S IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

I say this because we are greatly dependent upon Latin America. The region is a principal source of raw materials. We require their military and political assistance. They comprise a great bulk of our foreign trade upon which our economy depends, and then, of course, because of the simple geographical fact that Latin America forms the southern flank of our national military defenses.

More specifically, at present our two-way trade with that area is running at a rate of \$8 billion annually. Latin America buys 22 percent of our exports and supplies us with 30 percent of all our imports. The raw materials which the area supplies us are needed in peacetime for our industries, and for our own military programs. For example, Venezuela now supplies 48 percent of our petroleum imports. Brazil supplies 78 percent of our imports of quartz crystals. Venezuela, Peru, and Brazil furnish us with

37 percent of our imports of iron ore. Brazil furnishes 10 percent of our manganese ore imports. Bolivia, Argentina, and Brazil supply 34 percent of our tungsten imports. Peru supplies 100 percent of our vanadium imports. Brazil and Argentina supply us with 47 percent of our illium imports. Chile, Mexico, and Peru 60 percent of our copper imports. Mexico and Peru, 39 percent of lead imports. Cuba, 10 percent of nickel imports. Mexico and Peru, 41 percent of zinc imports, and Mexico 25 percent of antimony. Most of our coffee, all of our bananas, and more than 70 percent of our sugar imports come to us from Latin America. Our requirements of these and many other materials necessary to our own economy are available in increasing quantities from the still untapped resources of our neighbors to the south.

During World War II, the Latin American Republics not only supplied us with needed bases, but helped guard vital sea lanes, while Brazil and Mexico contributed fighting forces. During the Korean conflict, Colombia sent troops. Today, all the American Republics cooperate for the defense of the hemisphere through the Inter-American Defense Board.

#### COMMUNIST ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

The current Communist moves in Latin America have real prospects of succeeding if we do not act with resolution and foresight in helping these nations solve the serious economic problems which now plague the area.

It is a sad commentary that those who are closest to us, who mean the most to us, and on whom we depend the most are the last to receive the minimum assistance they so urgently require. Certainly, I do not pretend to say that the interests of the United States in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia are not vital. Nor do I mean to imply that we should place our interests in Latin America ahead of those in other areas of the world. I do mean to say quite emphatically that unless we give equal attention and assistance to the problems which our Latin American neighbors are facing, we stand in real danger of opening the area to eager Communist economic and political penetration.

I do not speak idly when I say this. Nor do I seek to exaggerate in order to emphasize the point. The facts of United States relations with Latin America speak for themselves. They tell us a story that every American should have at his fingertips; namely, that any vacuum created or left in Latin America can be filled by the pernicious actions of the Communists who are only too alert to probe where weakness develops.

The challenge presented by the Soviets demands that the problems of our neighbors to the south be given a top spot on the priority list, and that no time be lost in meeting this new threat.

Where are some of the areas in which we can be of direct and immediate assistance? Let me briefly touch on some of them.

PROBLEMS IN BASIC FIELDS OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND SANITATION

Although Latin America has many valuable assets in population, natural resources, and political and cultural similarity with the United States, still some liabilities and shortcomings remain.

There is a great deal of poverty, disease, and illiteracy in the area today.

Great strides have already been made in the fields of health, education, and sanitation, but a great deal more needs to be done. These are basic problems that remain to be solved. This administration has talked a great deal about "trade not aid." Surely we would all agree that trade is much to be desired over aid. The Latins recognize and approve of the idea.

But a level of health, literacy, and basic economic and political development is needed before private capital will risk moving into an area. There have to be reasonable grounds to believe a profit can be made before the private capitalist will invest money and time. Areas ridden with disease, pestilence, and illiteracy hardly provide the incentive necessary to encourage the flow of private investment. It is highly improbable, therefore, that private investment would do anything about health, education, and sanitation projects, for there is no immediate and direct monetary return in promoting them. Private investment today is attracted only to those countries in Latin America where at least minimum standards have already been achieved in these basic fields.

Unfortunately, there are few such countries. As a matter of fact, over 68 percent of American private investment which amounts to over \$7 billion is located in 5 Latin American countries, namely, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, and Venezuela. Most of this private capital investment is in oil. Remember that there are 15 other Republics, many of which have not been able to develop an atmosphere or conditions which would attract private capital.

They need assistance in the development of their basic fundamental economy such as health, education, sanitation, roads, farms, and the like, before private capital will be attracted to their countries.

Many of my colleagues will recall that in July 1956 I introduced, and the Congress passed, a bill making an appropriation for a special fund aimed at developing our sister republics in these vital basic fields. The appropriation was in a relatively small amount, namely \$15 million, 75 percent of which was on a loan basis. While the State Department did not approve of the idea at the time, the resounding support given by the Congress for this regional development fund and the general approval by the recipient countries of this type of development-loan program planted the seed of the development-loan type of program in the minds of those in the State Department, and I think had something to do with their subsequent presentation of an overall development-type program for the various countries around the globe that we aid. In any event, when the Latin American countries found out about this

Congressional program, designed for them, they literally ran over each other in their efforts to get this limited help. After much delay on the part of the administrative branch of our Government, the fund was finally allocated in the following manner:

Two grants, totalling \$2 million, were made. One was to the Organization of American States, for agricultural research, in the amount of \$500,000; the other went to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, in the amount of \$1½ million, to be used in the battle to eradicate dreaded malaria from this hemisphere.

This was in anticipation of the President's state of the Union message of January 9, 1958, when he offered to cooperate with the Soviet Union in battling malaria.

I must say that I think the Senate and the House of Representatives should take particular notice of the splendid work which Dr. Rollin S. Atwood, of the ICA, did in administering the development-loan program for Latin America. Although too much time was taken in getting the program started, nevertheless, when Dr. Atwood was put in charge, he took hold of the program promptly, and made loans which I believe everyone would approve; and thereafter he carried on the program with considerable dispatch.

The following loans were made:

Panama was granted a loan of \$2 million, for the construction of water and sewage works in the city of Panama. Panama has agreed to repay the loan in 20 years, with 3 percent interest.

Mr. President, last fall it was my privilege to see what was being done in Panama with this type of program. I am sure that every Member of the Senate would have been heartened to see the great and beneficial use which the people of Panama were making of the money which the Congress had provided to them on a loan basis.

Costa Rica received a loan of \$2 million, payable on the same terms as those of the loan to Panama. The money is being utilized by Costa Rica to rejuvenate the Children's Hospital in San José.

A loan of \$850,000 was made to Chile, to help seven Chilean universities establish a central library and equip their laboratories for the training of youth in the technical and scientific fields.

Peru received a loan of \$2 million, to be used to open for settlement rich agricultural lands.

Ecuador received a loan of \$2 million, to finance a land-resettlement project.

I saw both of the plans which the governments of those countries had for the use of this money. Once again I am certain that the Congress would heartily approve of the action those governments were taking. The Congress would be greatly gratified to know of the enthusiasm with which the programs were received by the peoples of those countries, not just by the government officials.

Paraguay received a loan of \$1 million, for agricultural and industrial development.

Honduras received a loan of \$3 million, for water and sewage systems and for area resettlement development.

A United States Embassy dispatch characterized the loan to Costa Rica as follows:

It is doubtful whether it would have been possible to find any other cooperative project which would create more good will than this one.

The ICA mission in Chile considered the loan made to that country a brilliant opportunity of furthering good relations among Chilean institutions of higher learning, the United States Government and other agencies thus helping to counteract the Marxist influence that has been in evidence in some of the Chilean universities.

Loans to other areas under this program were hailed with equal enthusiasm. It was a modest program, benefiting only seven Latin American countries, but was one which Latin America had long desired. It was no handout. It was a program which helped those countries maintain their self-respect. The tremendous impact it has had on fostering our good-neighbor relations has been inestimable. It gave to them the special attention which should be given to a trusted friend. Latin America and her friends are most anxious to have it continued, for it gave to that area just recognition in connection with our overall foreign-aid program. Although it fell short of the actual needs, it was a start in the right direction. It is the judgment of the students of Latin America that this type of a program will go far toward offsetting the overtures of the Communist offensive now occurring in Latin America.

Last year, although the Senate desired to continue the program on a separate basis, unfortunately, when the foreign-aid appropriations bill went to conference, the Latin American section became lost in the shuffle. It was my understanding, however, that many of the conferees thought there was no necessity to have a separate program for this area alone, believing that in the creation of the Development Loan Fund, Latin America would receive the same benefits, except on a larger scale, in implementing the type of assistance contemplated by the amendment which I proposed in 1956. This fund, as will be recalled, was set up and money was appropriated, to be loaned for the purpose of increasing the productive capacity and economic resources of free peoples throughout the world.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Congress set up the fund, and made it available almost 6 months ago, I regret to report that the ICA has not yet made one single loan from the fund. Furthermore, it was not until early last month that a manager was appointed to direct the fund. The Government agency which is to make financing from this fund available on a loan basis to nations, private firms, and individuals is just getting organized. The development loan fund, which was announced last year with so much fanfare by the administration, and which has been the subject of so many self-adulatory statements by administration spokesmen since that time, has had a long count down—too long, in fact.

The Congress, in effecting the necessary legislation and in appropriating the funds for the establishment and operation of the development fund, carried out its responsibilities quickly and effectively. I recommend and strongly urge that the executive branch take immediate steps to expedite the handling of loans under this fund.

As all of us know, there are many worthwhile projects which will stimulate economic growth and development in Latin America. For various reasons, some of these projects cannot receive favorable consideration for financing from the Export-Import Bank or from any source other than the development loan fund. Therefore, I express the hope that the fund will provide adequate monies for Latin America, in continuing and implementing the proposal adopted by the Congress in 1956.

Mr. President, in that connection let me say that I think it is gratifying that finally there has been appointed, as manager of the fund, a very able man, Mr. Dempster McIntosh. It was my pleasure to meet him in 1955, as I recall, when he was the Ambassador of the United States to Paraguay. He was an outstanding Ambassador. Later I saw him when he was moved to Venezuela, where he became our Ambassador. He has now been brought here, to administer this fund. He has indicated to me that he is anxious to get the work started. I hope the ICA and the State Department will cooperate with Manager McIntosh. He has had great experience in private business. He was an executive of the Philco Corp. before he joined the Foreign Service of this country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to my able colleague, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is meeting this afternoon to further study the cotton situation. Therefore, it will not be possible for me to stay in the Chamber, to hear the remainder of the splendid address being made by the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, I have seen an outline of his address.

As a citizen of a State which is very much interested in South America, as the Senator from Florida knows, I should like to express my appreciation of all the splendid work he has done over the years in order to further good relations between the United States and our Central American and South American neighbors. In my opinion his work has been of great service to the people of the United States. So I congratulate him, not only for the splendid address he is making today, but also for the effective, beneficial work he has done over the years in this connection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri very much. I particularly appreciate his remarks, which come from an outstanding Senator who most ably represents his State.

As he has previously pointed out, the mayor of Kansas City, who is a good friend of the Senator from Missouri, has long been interested in this problem and has exercised considerable leadership in building up better relations between Central America and South America and not only Missouri, but also the entire United States.

I believe it was only last month that Kansas City evidenced in a very tangible way its interest in South America by giving to Ecuador a plane called the Spirit of Kansas City. I know of no better demonstration of good will than that one, which has been made by the people of Kansas City.

So I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, what the Senator from Florida has said is correct. Representatives of Kansas City, under the leadership of their great mayor, the Honorable H. Roe Bartle, have made two visits to South America in the last 2 years. In their visits with our neighbors to the south, Kansas City's leaders have always been encouraged by the efforts, activities, and fine constructive work of the distinguished junior Senator from Florida. He has been an inspiration to them in this important work.

So I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his generosity in those remarks, but I do hope the State Department and the ICA will give to Ambassador Dempster McIntosh the assistance which he needs. He cannot operate this enormously important and tremendously large program unless he has sufficient clerical help. While he made no complaints to me, it is my understanding, and it was my observation in my visits, that he did not have the type of setup which would enable him to administer the program as the Congress would like him to administer it.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Florida is making this address. I am glad he feels the new administrator needs help. The trouble throughout the years has been that someone is given the job of aiding Latin America; then his hands are tied. I know the trials and tribulations we had throughout the years in constructing a little, two-by-four road through Central America, down to Panama. It was not the Bureau of Public Roads or the other agencies of Government that were responsible, but we were handicapped from the so-called political angle, through the State Department.

I know from my own knowledge that our prestige is about as low as it can get. Of course, the people in those countries accept the situation, because they cannot do anything about it.

In my opinion, our interest in the future is south of the border. We cannot depend on European nations, because they have been fighting over the real estate of that area for thousands of years. If we want to progress or grow,

we shall have to help Latin America to help itself, and in that way we shall help ourselves.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for that observation. I know of no one who has greater knowledge of Central or South American affairs than does the Senator from New Mexico. He always speaks vigorously in behalf of those countries. I think we should seriously take heed of his warning words. We must do something for our South American neighbors before it is too late.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating the junior Senator from Florida on the very fine speech he is making, in which he is pointing out in detail the historic, geographic, cultural, and economic factors which make our relations with the countries of Latin America of great importance. And also, he speaks correctly of the importance of Latin America in world affairs.

He is doing a service in bringing to the attention of the Congress, the administration, and to our people, the danger of Soviet penetration in Latin America by economic means. As the Senator has pointed out so well, when the people and governments of Latin America are struggling to advance their economies, assistance offered, even from Soviet Russia, has its attraction, although I think he would say, and the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico would agree, that the people of Latin America do not prefer that kind of assistance. Our great friends are in Latin America, and the Senator's suggestions regarding trade, loans, and economic assistance should bear great weight.

I am also happy that the Senator has pointed out the historic ties that bind us and our sister republics. Those ties do derive initially from our Revolution and their revolutions.

As a delegate to the United Nations, I remember that although delegates from Latin America demanded, as they properly should, equality and independence on their positions, yet our common purposes nearly always brought us in union.

The dean of the diplomatic corps in Washington is His Excellency, Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, and he and his fellow Ambassadors from Latin America represent nations which are friends of the United States.

Although our dangers throughout the world are great, our greatest and dearest friends are those nearest to us in Latin America and they have demonstrated their friendship.

I applaud the Senator for his long-time efforts to promote closer relationships between the United States and our sister republics of Latin America.

Mr. SMATHERS. I must hasten to thank the able Senator from Kentucky, knowing of his vast experience as a delegate to the United Nations and as an Ambassador representing our country, and now as a member of the Committee

on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate. His expression of friendship, which I know is most sincere, for the Latin American countries, will be greatly appreciated by them.

Now let us turn briefly to another area in which the United States can be, and should be helpful to our friends to the south.

#### TRADE POTENTIAL

Of great importance to all Latin American countries is the need for a stable trade policy with the United States. Why? Because trade with the United States is the source from which these countries gain the necessary dollars to buy American machinery, vehicles, and supplies which they need for their industrialization and expansion programs. Their development programs in many cases are actually pegged to the volume of dollars which they earn through the sale of their mineral and agricultural products to the United States.

Latin America's dependence on the United States market is very great. For example, Colombia, Mexico, and Cuba sell two-thirds of their total exports to the United States. The United States is the major market for 10 coffee exporting countries of Latin America. Cuba supplies 73 percent of our imports of sugar. Peru's export of lead and zinc to the United States represents 31 percent of her total sales to our country. Mexico's exports of lead and zinc equal about 25 percent of her total sales to this country.

Cuba's economy is dependent on its sale of sugar to the United States. It represents 50 percent of Cuba's total income. Two out of three Cubans depend on sugar for their paycheck. Now, when we change our program and decrease the amount of sugar we allow Cuba to sell in the United States, we obviously upset Cuba's economy, create unemployment, uncertainty, and havoc.

This sudden change in the situation in Cuba is naturally of concern to us. They are our friends. But also important to us, and a point which we frequently overlook, is that 98 percent of the dollars which they get for selling sugar to us, returns to the United States for purchases of machinery, farm equipment, farm products, and so forth.

This is substantially true with reference to the other Latin American countries.

Neither Cuba, nor any other Latin American country can buy goods in the United States unless they have dollars. Our sellers do not take pesos. So, when we close our ports to Latin imports we cut the supply of dollars to these countries and, in turn, it means we reduce their purchases in the United States and at the same time drive them into the Communist's trade programs, with all the sinister results that go with that.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I dislike to interrupt, but I should like to emphasize a point at this particular time.

A little while ago I discussed the matter of roads through Central America. Does the Senator realize what happens as a result of construction of such roads?

Manufacturers of American automobiles, American tubing, and other machinery get dollars as a result of the buying of American equipment for the building of such roads, so that there will be employment in Cleveland, Detroit, and Dayton.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from New Mexico for that observation.

Mexico is one of our best customers. She asks little from us, except some trade. She needs machinery to develop her roads, her farms, her mines, and other resources. She buys it mostly in the United States. Last year Mexico spent over a half-billion dollars here. United States auto workers, whose industry we know is presently depressed, would cheer the fact that Mexico spent \$117 million on automobiles, parts, and accessories last year. She has to have dollars to buy. Where does she get dollars? From the sale of her coffee, copper, lead, and zinc primarily. The money realized from the sale of these items is practically all spent in the United States, providing employment in steel, railroads, lumber, and other industries, as the Senator from New Mexico indicated. Now, if we raise tariffs on lead and zinc and build walls against Mexico's imports, we lose their purchases—\$840 million—which mean much to us, but at the same time we drive them into trade with others—primarily the Soviets.

Is this a wise policy? I do not believe it to be, and I do not believe any thoughtful person could believe it to be. Therefore, it is disturbing to see the administration actually recommend to the Congress an excise tax on imports of lead and zinc.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished and able friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has mentioned the imports from Mexico. I do not believe the Senator made reference to sugar. I wish to say that the State of Louisiana, somewhat like the State of Florida—except much more so—has a great interest in cane sugar. We have been willing to share some of our market with the Mexicans. It seems to me that if we are willing to share a considerable portion of our market with Mexico, Cuba, and the other nations to the south of us, other parts of this Nation ought to be willing to share some of their markets.

As a matter of fact, our friends to the south of us sell to the United States as imports almost half of the sugar consumed in this Nation. We are not complaining about that. However, if we are willing to make room for imports in the sugar industry, some of the other industries ought to make room for imports also.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for that observation. I hasten to agree with the Senator, and say that as a member of the Committee on Finance the Senator from Louisiana has ably represented his sugar constituents of Louisiana. The Senator was not only diligent in seeing that the rights of his constituents were protected, but I think he exercised considerable leadership in

having his people realize the importance of permitting Mexico to make some sugar sales in the United States.

I might say to the Senator from Louisiana that I was in Mexico this past fall. While visiting there, I was taken to some of the large sugar plantations. The sugar industry, as a matter of fact, gave a party for me after we had seen some of the sugar plantations.

The people of Mexico made the argument to us, "As a matter of fact, we recognize that domestic sugar is grown in the United States and that you must look after your own producers first. However, if you will look at every one of the machines which we have in every one of our sugar plants"—and I saw many of them—"you will see it is stamped 'Made in Cincinnati, Ohio,' or 'Made in Springfield, Ill.,' or something like that. Every one of the manufactured items in each of these plants was bought in the United States."

Therefore, purchase of such machines has provided employment for people in the Midwest, and particularly in the northern area of the United States.

The people in Mexico said, "Actually, if we are not permitted to sell some sugar in the United States, we will not get enough dollars so that we may turn around and spend them in the United States. All we ask at the present time with respect to sugar is that we have the right to sell sufficient sugar in the United States so we can get a sufficient number of dollars so that we may turn around and spend them in the United States to modernize and rehabilitate our sugar plantations. All the money we realize from the sugar sales goes back to the United States."

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that some of the representatives from the States of the North and the Midwest, particularly, where great industry is situated, should be very strongly in favor of this program of permitting the Latin American countries to trade with the United States.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. The fact of the matter is that the Senator knows, as I do, those people can produce sugar more cheaply than we can. That is a point which so many people complain about. People say that, after all, the foreign country has a cheaper labor supply. Perhaps certain foreign countries do have certain advantages over us.

I am one of those who says we should not undertake any program which will drive American industry out of business in any significant fashion, but we should recognize the advantage of reciprocal trade, when we sell something to the other man that we can produce more cheaply.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. And we should permit him to sell to us those things he can produce more cheaply.

Mr. SMATHERS. I completely agree with the Senator, and I thank him for his observation. These programs must be by nature reciprocal. It does not mean anything if we trade only with a country

which in turn does not buy anything from us.

There were undoubtedly good domestic reasons which may have prompted this action but there were equally good international reasons which should have given the administration cause to reflect upon the damage it would do to our relations and trade with Mexico and Peru and even Canada. Now this does not mean that we should turn our backs on our own producers of lead and zinc. They are experiencing great difficulty and they need some help. Perhaps the answer lies in greater depletion allowances for lead and zinc deposits or possibly consideration should be given as to the wisdom of establishing a Metal Credit Corporation which would render assistance to our domestic lead and zinc mines whenever prices do not cover costs of production. There is good reason to believe that such a corporation could be operated at limited expense to the taxpayers and would have a stabilizing effect upon our lead and zinc producing mines. In my opinion, the creation of a Metal Credit Corporation would be far better than cutting ourselves off from our neighbors and upsetting the intricate balance of their economies which can only result in a worsening relationship with the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. May I once again make reference to the Sugar Act. Under that act, as the Senator I am sure recalls, there is provided a tariff and a processing charge for sugar. There is a tariff on imported sugar and a processing tax upon sugar imported from foreign countries, as well as upon sugar produced in this Nation. The tax is in turn used to help maintain the domestic sugar industry, because this Nation feels in the event of war we might be cut off from foreign supplies.

Without such a subsidy, if we tried to have the local industry supply sugar to the United States consumers, and protected our local industry behind a high tariff wall, the Senator from Florida knows as well as I do that the American people would pay far more for sugar than they pay even when there is included the so-called subsidy.

Mr. SMATHERS. I completely agree with the Senator from Louisiana in that observation.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, we should not consider the lead and zinc situation as an isolated matter. In Latin America the administration's recommendation for an excise tax on lead and zinc imports was regarded, rightly or wrongly, as the first step in a series of moves to build a wall around ourselves at the expense and harm of Latin American producers. It was taken to mean that the United States was embarking on a policy of tariff protection and that the reciprocal trade program was a device to maintain tariffs at a low rate when it was convenient for us to do so and as something to be bypassed when it did not suit us.

While I was in Lima, Peru, last December, the Peruvian Congress, out of their disappointment over our recommending increased tariffs on importation of lead and zinc, passed a law taxing United States-owned businesses operating in Peru. This was most unfortunate. Our Ambassador, Mr. Achilles, an able and dedicated man, and I remonstrated with Peru's able Finance Minister, Juan Pardo, about this, but it availed nothing. The Peruvian Congress felt we had hit them a low blow, and they were hitting us back, even though it meant cutting off their nose to spite their face. These are the kinds of acts that we must stop. I believe we want to be good neighbors. I think we are good neighbors and we must be good neighbors in fact, as well as in word. A good trade policy becomes a good foreign policy.

In 1956 our exports to Latin America amounted to \$3.9 billion. Our purchases from this area fell below this figure by more than \$100 million, giving us a favorable balance of trade of over \$100 million. The most recent figures show that in the first 7 months of 1957 Venezuela, our best customer in Latin America, purchased \$535 million worth of our products; Mexico bought \$505 million; Cuba bought \$348 million; Brazil bought \$263 million and Argentina bought \$177 million. These amounts could well be increased as I will explain just a bit later, but we must be ever mindful that these figures can only be increased by making it possible for our Latin friends to get dollars, and they can only get dollars by selling their goods in the United States for dollars.

Let me illustrate what I mean by citing the case of our best customer, Canada. With a population of 16 million people, it purchased almost \$4 billion worth of our products in 1956. This means that every man, woman, and child in Canada bought \$248 worth of goods from the United States in that year. Latin America, with a population of 183 million, purchased \$3.9 billion of our products in 1956. This amounts to only \$20 per capita. By using Canada as an example, I do not mean to say that Latin America can be suddenly propelled to a level equal to Canada. What I do mean to say is that even a small increase in the purchasing power of the people of Latin America would unquestionably result in a tremendous stimulant to our own economy.

#### PRIVATE CAPITAL IN LATIN AMERICA

Increased trade means an increased flow of United States private capital into Latin America. The investments of private companies in this area in petroleum, mining, manufacturing, agriculture, public utilities, and in other fields are larger than in any other area of the world. American direct investments in Latin America had a book value of \$7 billion in 1956, and account for one-third of our total foreign investments. However, as stated earlier, half of these investments are in Venezuela, Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico. In 1956 these investments produced \$2.8 billion of goods and services for use in Latin America and accounted

for \$2.1 billion of the area's total dollar exports. Yet these investments are only a small amount of the total of Latin American investment needs.

The volume of our trade and investments in Latin America is impressive but the real significance of this situation lies not so much in the present volume, but in future prospects.

The stakes in inter-American trade are high. If we choose to restrict their trade with us, we will narrow our own industrial base, curtail our best markets, and drive them to greater intercourse and trade with Communist-bloc countries.

#### UNITED STATES NEEDS LATIN AMERICAN MARKETS

A point that has always puzzled me is why it is that we, as a nation, so indifferently accept Latin American friendship and look upon it as a matter of course.

The indisputable fact is that we need the Latin Americans, and particularly do we need their markets.

Within the past week the President of the United States stated on two occasions that if the present recession continues it will be necessary for this administration to undertake somewhat drastic economy measures in order to stop the downward trend. He has even had the Postmaster General announce what amounts to a large public works program with a statement of the need to build and rehabilitate over 1,200 post offices around the country.

The unemployment figure was announced last week to have now risen to over 4 million people. We now have greater unemployment than we have had at any time since 1941. The economic indicators prepared and published by the Department of Commerce indicate that the steel industry is producing at about 56 percent of its capacity, that the automobile industry is producing at less than 70 percent of its capacity, that general heavy machinery is producing at much less than 60 percent of its capacity. There are continued and steady cutbacks in most every line of production with very little plant expansion because of already great unused capacity.

It is obviously wasteful to our economy to have idle plant capacity. The markets here in the United States have greatly contracted in the past 2½ years.

In the past the general United States market has not been sufficient to utilize and consume all the items which we were able to manufacture. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce figures show that export trade represents a large part of our income. One out of every eight employed people are working in industries producing for export. Therefore, as our export markets decrease, obviously unemployment increases and the deterioration of our economy is accelerated. We can well ask the questions: Where are the producers in the United States to find an outlet for their goods? Where will labor find a salable market for the products of its labor?

In the past, much of that which we made and produced has gone to Latin America. About 33 percent of all United

States exports have gone to the 20 republics to the south of us. I have already made note of the fact that the list of our best customers consists primarily of the Latin American countries.

However, our best customers—Canada, Japan, the United Kingdom, and West Germany—prove that industrially advanced nations generate a greater purchasing capacity than underdeveloped countries. In Latin America, this is also demonstrated. Venezuela and Mexico, the two American Republics which have best succeeded in diversifying their productivity, are our top customers south of the Rio Grande. Logically, then, as Latin American standards of living rise, their purchasing power likewise mounts—and the United States economy stands to gain.

A good illustration of what Latin America means to our labor forces, to our plant capacity, and to our economy, is revealed in the example of just one country. In 1956, Venezuela bought from us \$142 million worth of machinery, and that machinery came from 26 of our States. They bought from us \$45 million worth of food, and that money was distributed in 24 of our States. Venezuela bought from us in 1956 \$19 million worth of wood and paper products and that came from 31 of our States. They spent \$38 million on textiles which came from 11 of our States. They spent \$14 million on minerals which came from 17 of our States.

So it is clear that, from the farmers in Wisconsin to Pittsburgh's steelworkers to the millhands in Mississippi, all of them have a great stake in Latin America.

Because of the record population growth and the rapid rate of economic development, markets in Latin America are increasing at amazing speeds. Growth of Latin American cities and towns is astonishing. Some of these metropolitan cities are growing faster than our own. Anybody who has seen the skyscrapers, the new modernistic office buildings, the new highways, the modern efficient new industries and the bustling airports will share my admiration for the energy and intelligence of these people carrying out an economic revolution that is a pacemaker in the world.

The cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Lima, Peru; Caracas, Venezuela; Cali, Medellin and Barranquilla, Colombia; and Mexico City are examples of this dynamic urban development in Latin America.

Perhaps I can better illustrate the extent of the urban growth in Latin America if I compare it to our own.

During the period from 1946 to 1955 urban population in the United States increased at a rate of 1.8 percent. This 1.8 percent represents the sum total of expansion in our cities and towns, which has been indeed remarkable. But if we compare it to the rate of growth in some of the Latin American countries we can realize immediately that the development of cities and towns in Latin America has been truly fantastic. In Brazil during this same period, urban popula-

tion increased by 3.8 percent, Mexico by 4.8 percent, Peru and Chile by 3.2 percent, Colombia and Argentina by 3.8 percent, and Venezuela by an incredible 6.8 percent.

This urbanization indicates an accelerated industrial activity, with its consequent stimulus to purchasing power.

This development is of real importance to our country because these friendly peoples prefer to buy and use American machinery, American appliances, American consumer goods, and in fact anything that has the label on it "Made in U. S. A." American-made products in Latin America have a reputation for quality and integrity. The Latin American people know that when they buy American products they are buying something reliable. Furthermore, they are psychologically attached to our country and share a pride with us when they use American goods.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It occurs to me that if we could persuade all the countries behind the Iron Curtain to allow us to ship more American products to those countries, a great deal would be accomplished which the so-called Voice of America broadcasts never seem to accomplish. When I had the opportunity of going to Russia, I noted that the Russians were greatly interested in seeing the things which we produce in this country.

I passed through a small town on the way to Yalta. Someone from our State Department, in passing through that town, had stopped on the roadside with an American Cadillac. From all over the entire area people were racing to take a look at the American Cadillac.

At another place behind the Iron Curtain, in Czechoslovakia, on the streets of Prague, I noticed enormous crowds milling around something. I could not see what it was. I joined the crowd and pushed my way through a crowd of people 15 deep. They were trying to get a look at the new model Fairlane Ford automobile.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Louisiana. I may say to him that we should consider—as I am sure all of us in the Senate should begin to consider—how much longer we should continue the trade embargo between ourselves and the people of the Soviet Union. There may have been some reason for it in the past, and certainly I would agree, as I am sure the Senator does, that we should not send strategic items to Russia which could possibly be used in the military machine of the Soviet Union, and used against us. On the other hand, as the able Senator has pointed out, the goods which we make, and the things which we can do, are actually the very best goods sold, and when the people of foreign countries have an opportunity to get our goods they always want them above every other kind that is being manufactured. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that it may be that we can do something to lower the curtain which now exists with respect to trade of nonstrategic items between ourselves and the Soviet Union.

We have a strong foothold in the way of trade in the Latin American market but unless we buy from these people so that they can buy from us we stand in danger of losing these markets which we have won through many years of hard work.

It is significant to realize that the Soviet Communists have studied the situation well in Latin America and are now trying to infiltrate the area through the Trojan Horse technique of trade. It is important to resolve the trade problems which Latin America is facing nowadays with the United States because this is the very weakness that the Communists are now trying to exploit.

That carries out exactly the idea which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has expressed.

#### EFFECTIVE UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE ESSENTIAL

The solution of the economic problems of Latin America rests on more loans, a stable trade policy, and inducements to American private enterprise to invest in these countries on an increasingly larger scale.

With regard to loans, the Export-Import Bank has recently been doing a better job in this matter. It stepped up its lending to Latin America. For the fiscal year 1957 loans totaling \$396 million were made. In the first half of this year loans totaling \$159 million have been made. While the record of the bank is showing improvement, it is still far short of supplying even the minimum needs of Latin America for capital. I noted with some satisfaction that the President in his budget message requested an increase in the capitalization of the Export-Import Bank in the amount of \$2 billion. I believe this added authorization will result in more help to Latin America.

Let us remember this help is not a giveaway. These are loans at reasonable interest rates, and the performance on the repayment of loans granted by the Export-Import Bank by the Latin Americas has been excellent. Of the \$1.7 billion actually disbursed by the bank since its inception in 1934 to June 30, 1957, \$800 million has already been repaid. There has been no failure of repayments on any of the loans made to Latin American countries. On the contrary, our Government through the Export-Import Bank has made over a quarter of a billion dollars in interest payments from the Latin American countries. I emphasize that we have made \$250,699,000 from these loans made to Latin America. So we realize a financial benefit from the loans while at the same time we strengthen the earnings of our Latin neighbors so that they can buy more from our manufacturers and producers.

One of the most pressing problems for American private enterprise in the Latin American area is the difficulty of securing local currency funds for working capital.

One of the methods devised to assist American private enterprise in this regard was in making available local currencies generated as a result of our surplus agricultural sales under Public Law 480.

Numerous sales of surplus agricultural commodities have been made under this law. A major part of the proceeds of such sales have been loaned back to the purchasing nations. Private investors in Latin America previously had not had access to such local currency funds, badly needed for working capital, and as a hedge against serious foreign exchange losses. However, under the terms of the Cooley amendment to Public Law 480, Congress last year indicated its desire that up to 25 percent of such local currency funds be made available to foreign private investors, including those of United States nationality.

If this provision is carried out practically, it should be of great help to United States investors already there, and encourage new investments to be made in these Latin American countries. But it will be necessary for the United States to insist upon vigorous implementation of this amendment in the sales contracts.

Greater vigor will have to be exercised if the ICA investment guaranty program is to serve as a definite stimulant for United States private investments in Latin America. To date only nine Latin American countries have signed an investment guaranty agreement. They are Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Paraguay, and Peru. The remaining 11 republics, which include some of the major Latin American countries, do not yet participate in the program, which causes some prospective investors to hold back.

Renewed efforts must be made to persuade the remaining Latin American countries to join in the investment guaranty program.

#### UNITED STATES NEGATIVE ATTITUDE

Inter-American economic problems have been explored to death in the last 5 years. But the United States has yet to come up with a bold plan to make the hemisphere a real stronghold of the free world.

Although we do not have a plan, we reject virtually all proposals made by Latin America for effective cooperation in inter-American affairs. I would agree that not all their proposals would be completely practical for us, but the point is—we are not coming up with any good alternatives.

For example, Latin America proposed the creation of an Inter-American Bank. We replied that the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank could provide all the capital for the worthwhile projects that Latin America needed. Now it may be that this could be the answer, but the fact is it has not answered the needs of the Latin Americas and that is why the pleas for assistance continue to be made.

Latin American countries proposed the establishment of an organization to control the price of coffee. While it is true we do not grow coffee in the United States, nevertheless, we have a direct and indirect concern in the price stabilization of coffee. Nevertheless, we turned down their proposal.

They subsequently proposed the creation of an organization to promote consumption of coffee and provide better

economic and statistical information on its production. We said we were not interested in participating in the organization, although we finally consented to send an observer to the sessions in Rio de Janeiro, at which the Latin American countries had already agreed to set up an organization of their own.

The 20 Latin American Republics are anxious to help themselves. They have been endeavoring to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. They seek no handouts. They are anxious to become self-reliant and independent, and certainly they insist on maintaining their independence and own self-respect.

But they do need assistance on a loan basis and that is what they seek from us. They want the United States to sit down with them and discuss their mutual problems and seek solutions thereto on a man-to-man basis—not like a rich uncle telling a poor relative that if he would just stop squandering his money his troubles would be over.

They do not want lectures. They want a lift.

They do not need advice. They need assistance.

They do not need another study, for all students of the problems of Latin America know that what they need are sources for getting dollars for the purpose of strengthening themselves.

They want to be assured of stable, consistent trade policies with the United States so they can plan for the years ahead without fear that our doors will be opened wide one moment, then summarily slammed the next. A swinging-door policy will do us no good in Latin America. We need long-range, consistent, trade policies upon which we all can rely.

#### LATIN AMERICANS ARE OUR PROVEN FRIENDS

The Latin American countries have stood side by side with us for many years. During the last war they broke relations with the Axis countries and many of them declared war on our mutual enemies. Some of them gave us active military support. Others provided us with air and naval bases. All of them made available to us the strategic raw materials which our war industries urgently required and which they could get no place else.

The Latin American countries have been stalwart supporters of the same objectives as have been fought for by the United States on cold war measures in the United Nations. They have shown, too, a great sense of responsibility in helping to make the United Nations an effective organization for peace.

In the Organization of American States, the United States and the Latin American countries have made an outstanding contribution to world peace and harmony by giving a vivid demonstration to the rest of the world how a regional organization can maintain peace and work effectively toward the economic, social, and cultural advancement of its peoples.

At this time I would like to pay tribute to the Organization of American States. It has done an effective job in maintaining peace in Latin America. It has

proved to be the most successful international agency in the world today.

We are indeed fortunate to be a member of this organization which is composed of all of the 20 Republics of Latin America and ourselves.

It has been extremely successful in preventing possible causes of difficulties and insuring peaceful settlements of disputes that have arisen among its membership.

It has demonstrated that where men of sincere purpose and good will sit down together around a conference table to settle problems and disputes good results can be obtained.

The Organization of American States has demonstrated that the conference table can be a more effective settler of conflicts than an arsenal of ballistic missiles or a fleet of battleships.

#### UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN DISARMAMENT

This brings me to another point where leadership can be supplied.

The people of the United States know almost better than many other people of the heavy drag on an economy of large military appropriations. Think of the blessings that could have accrued to the American people if all the money we have spent on arms, munitions, and the military had been used instead for schools, hospitals, research clinics, homes, roads, teachers, and so forth. Our standard of living would have been higher than anyone would even dare to dream. Poverty for our people could have been completely eliminated. Sickness and suffering could have been materially reduced, we could have almost a millennium here on earth. Unfortunately, we could not divert these enormous sums which we have spent for the military because we have had to defend ourselves against the threat of Communist aggression, and we have had to assist much of the free world to do the same. Because of the many new discoveries recently made in weapons of destruction most of the billions we have spent in the past few years on military hardware are now gone, for those weapons, and even those systems, have become obsolete.

As Secretary of the Air Force Douglas said just the other day, we are moving so fast in this area of military-weapons development that if a weapon is operational today, it is already obsolete. We can only be thankful that we have been able to afford this enormous expenditure on nonproductive items. We can be grateful, indeed, that we have been the richest nation on earth.

However, there are few, if any, of our neighbors which can afford this expense for nonproductive items. None of them have a sufficiently strong economy to enable them to carry a big burden of modern military equipment. Therefore, we should give great consideration to the question of whether we are helping them or hurting them by including them in our defense plans which require the expenditure by them of comparatively large sums for military equipment and military training.

I do not believe anyone would contend that the equipment which we turn over to our Latin American neighbors would

have any practical benefit if a large war occurred between the Communist dictatorship and the free world. Should we not ask ourselves, Will the next war be fought in the same manner and in a like fashion as was the last one? If not—and I think most of us will agree it will not—then why do we press up on our Latin American neighbors responsibilities and obligations designed to meet the demands of a war similar to the last one? Obviously, no practical good can result from such unrealistic and anachronistic thinking. As a matter of fact we do injury to our friends by requiring them to spend sums of money in the operation and upkeep of obsolescent equipment. Their economies are such that they actually cannot afford to spend money on this type of nonproductive outlays.

How much more useful that money would be if it were put into the development of their economy through improved roads, more schools, better sanitation, more hospitals, and the like. The military hardware which we give them, and the plans for joint defense which we make with them, require that much of their ablest manpower be diverted from income-producing activities to these programs designed to cope with a war which, if it comes, will bypass them in a matter of minutes.

Then, too, we should not lose sight of the fact that, unfortunately, in the past some of the military equipment which we have given these countries has been used—but not as intended. Regrettably, it has been turned against the people whom it was supposed to be used to protect.

It would seem to me, therefore, that the time has come when our Government's policy of assistance to our friends, the Latin Americans, should be reevaluated. We should realistically ask, Does our military-assistance program truly help them in the defense of their country and the Western Hemisphere, or does it in fact diminish the opportunities for the furtherance of the people's individual rights and liberties in those countries?

#### GROWING DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN THE AMERICAS

Unquestionably there is a growing democratic movement in Latin America, and, as the oldest and biggest democratic Government on the face of the globe, we can rejoice in this progression. However, we should always remember that we have not been asked to determine for other people in other countries what type of government is best for them. Nor should we endeavor to try and remake governments in the image of our own.

It is true that we believe in democracy and the dignity and personal freedom of the individual. And I am sure we all feel that eventually all other people will come to that same conclusion. But it does not necessarily follow that to be a good government, a government must be an exact replica of our own.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has made the point that at present our neighbors

to the south could make but a small contribution to a war between the Communist bloc and the capitalist bloc. I believe the Senator should keep in mind that if we project this problem 10 or 15 years into the future, and assume that the countries of Latin America continue to develop and progress, both in enlightenment and in the capability of produce, as rapidly as they have during the past 15 years, they might be able to make a very great contribution.

The thought occurred to me some time ago that if the United States were destroyed overnight by an atomic attack from the Soviet Union, perhaps no other power on earth would be strong enough to resist the Soviet Union. But if we project that possibility perhaps 10 or 15 years into the future, so that our neighbors to the south will have been enabled to become strong enough to resist the Soviet Union, their contribution might be great, particularly when we consider their progress during the last 10 or 15 years.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that if we do not retire the men who are in control of the military in the Latin American countries, which in effect is a nonproductive occupation, and if we do not require that they spend millions of dollars to maintain the obsolescent equipment which we give to them, but allow them to use their best manpower and all the money they have for the development of their own economy and the industrialization of their countries, then in time they might be able to acquire a stature which will permit them to manufacture the same type of modern military equipment and enable them, as we have done, to resist the advances of Soviet communism.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his observation.

Nor does it follow that merely to effect a change in the personnel of a government already established always results in an improvement. For to shift from one dictator to another, where the new dictator's only qualification is that he wants "his turn" does not result in good for the people of that country, it only subjects them to a new "wringer."

In the last 3 years dictatorial regimes have been overthrown in Argentina, Colombia, Honduras, Haiti, and now in Venezuela. We all naturally hope that these changes represent progress toward governments more responsive to the needs of their people. There is no doubt that profound changes are under way all over Latin America. The people of Latin America are no longer satisfied to be economic peons and political prisoners. As the people of this vast area throw off the shackles of economic slavery, and awaken to the possibilities of living as useful and independent citizens, they are naturally demanding, and in time will get, a larger voice in the operations of their own governments. They are reaching for a better life, economically and politically, and we in the United States must be alert to the opportunities to help them accomplish this worthwhile goal.

#### RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP IN OUR OWN BACK YARD ESSENTIAL

In conclusion, I may say these are some of the problems and some of the realities of Latin America today. Unquestionably, Latin America holds much of the future of the United States. We can lose it or win it, depending upon how we meet the current problems.

In recent years, the United States has not provided the quality of leadership necessary to produce the maximum mutual benefits to us and our Latin American friends.

Our Latin American neighbors look to us for leadership in solving the many problems which confront them as well as ourselves today. These are problems in our own back yard. They are the problems of our nearest friends.

In assisting the Latin American Republics in the solution of their problems it is vital that we replace leadership characterized by complacency and indifference with leadership characterized by boldness, courage, and positive constructive action. In short, responsible leadership. For truly if we cannot demonstrate effective leadership among historical friends within our own hemisphere, how can we hope to rally nations across the globe to freedom's cause.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida on what I believe to be the most enlightened, comprehensive, and thorough speech on the problems involved in our relationships with Latin America and South America to be made during this Congress; and I say that with respect to both the first session and the second session of the 85th Congress. The Senator from Florida has rendered the entire Senate a very valuable service in presenting the facts and figures regarding the trade relations and other relations of the United States with those countries. As one Member of the Senate, I am extremely grateful to him for providing us with this information.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for making that statement.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, February 19, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17, 1958:

John F. Dyer, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 6 years, vice Calvin C. McGregor, term expired.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 11, 1958.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17, 1958:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter K. Scott, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

## UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

To be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms expiring January 27, 1961, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified

Phillip D. Reed, of New York.

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Abbot L. Mills, Jr., of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1958.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 133: 1: *Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Almighty God, we beseech Thee that these days of Brotherhood Week may be radiant with visions of those high and helpful things which we may do together and for one another or members of the human family.

Grant that, as brothers of the Son of Man, our minds and hearts may be impervious to all attitudes which are alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord.

May we resolve more earnestly to covet and cultivate those feelings of sympathy and kindness and be eager to extend the hand of helpfulness to the weary and heavy laden and speak that word of hope and good cheer to the lonely and sorrowing which will enable them to carry on courageously and faithfully.

Show us how we may help bring in that day of blessedness when men and nations everywhere shall live together on the higher levels of peace and good will. Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 13, 1958, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ; the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK; and the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy.

## HIGH COST OF LIVING IN SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. MILLER of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the San Francisco Bay economic area of California have to "squeeze budgets," according to an article by Harlan Trott, in the February 12 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I quote from this article:

A 6-percent drop in buying power hit salaried homeowners in the San Francisco Bay area in 1957, while wage earners who rent their homes saw the cost of living reach what amounted to a 4.3-percent wage cut in terms of the annual family budget.

This isn't exactly news to bay-area householders, but is statistically confirmed by the Heller committee for research in social economics at the University of California.

I want to tell my colleagues that many of these people who are so badly hit are Federal employees in the classified and postal services.

We have been and are dragging our feet in giving them a salary increase to meet the ever-increasing cost of living.

Though they are well organized, they cannot strike to bolster their bargaining power. They are wholly dependent upon the will of Congress—and Congress, to my thinking, is shirking its responsibility toward them.

The Heller committee report should quicken our conscience and goad us into action.

## UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMIC SITUATION DUE TO SLUMP IN AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I sought this minute to acquaint the House that I am going to address this body for a 30-minute period tomorrow on the subject of the unemployment and economic situation as they relate to the agricultural situation in the United States at the present time.

I invite my colleagues to be present if they care to, and give a special invitation to those from the large city districts,

because they should be down on the floor of this House fighting for parity for the American farmer in his defense.

## LET'S SAVE THE GUARD

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just sent a letter registering my strongest possible protest to the Secretary of Defense over reports of a plan to reduce America's National Guard by 40,000 men.

Most Americans are agreed that the country gets more value out of the dollar it spends on the National Guard than it does for any other defense dollar.

As recently as the Korean war we found it necessary to call upon the National Guard to help meet a military need, and every Oklahoman is proud of the fact that our 45th Division was ready at that time, just as it was in World War II. The 45th Division is ready today for any defense need, just as other National Guard divisions are ready in other States at a fraction of the cost of a Regular division.

In addition, the Guard is ready for other emergency needs. Within the past year in Oklahoma the National Guard has rendered invaluable aid to the people in several disasters—saving lives and protecting property and proving its usefulness to the State in many ways.

In my office are protests from many citizens, from civic organizations, and from newspapers, who share my belief that a reduction in the Guard today would be pennywise and pound-foolish economy.

Let us stop this move now.

## HOUSE COMMITTEE TO HANDLE SPACE LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1958, I introduced House Resolution 474, which provides for the establishment of a House committee to handle space legislation. This resolution followed the series of moves on my part intended to emphasize the importance of making adequate provision for the time when it will be vitally necessary that we make provision for the control of the use of space. Last October I issued a release calling attention to the scientific developments which were forcing us into a position of providing for space legislation. I followed this with another news release in November of last year. On the first day of the new

session of the Congress of 1958, I introduced a bill providing for a joint committee to be composed of both Senate and House Members to be appointed by the Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives. I am going to continue to urge provision be made to handle legislation and hearings covering space matters and I hope the Rules Committee takes action at an early date.

#### LABOR IS CLEANING ITS HOUSE— HOW ABOUT GOVERNMENT?

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO national and international unions have been given the deadline of April 15 by President George Meany for compliance with labor's approved codes of ethical conduct for labor organizations. These codes, overwhelmingly reaffirmed last December at the Atlantic City second constitutional labor convention, are directed against internal corruption and seek to preserve the American labor movement from disruptive elements, improper financial practices, and irresponsible leadership.

Point by point, of course, there can be no exact comparison between on the one hand a code of ethics for labor leaders and on the other hand a set of standards for Members of Congress or Government officials. But, in general, the idea that all officials, elective or appointive, should have established codes of conduct is consistent. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while the Congress is proposing to set up rules and regulations, we should start with ourselves. Right now, with the hearings of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in the public attention, it may be that the pot has been calling the kettle black and that the executive and legislative branches of Government need codes of conduct as much as, or at least before we deal with, others.

No one should misunderstand these remarks. I am 100 percent for a crusade for honesty; but labor seems to be cleaning its own house—how about Government? I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will schedule an early hearing on my bill, H. R. 10631, to promote ethics in Government. It would restore the faltering faith of the American people in the officials and institutions of their Government. Right now the Nation is wondering just what kind of rules Congress operates under. We could provide the answer through adopting a high set of standards for ourselves.

#### ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEAN. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a tendency in this Congress to feel that the American people are no longer interested in economy in government.

Do not let us fool ourselves.

Last Wednesday, school board elections were held in my home State of New Jersey. The results of these elections, I believe, provide an accurate barometer of the public attitude toward economy.

The citizens of New Jersey rightly insist that their children must have the finest possible educational opportunities. Yet, in at least 64 New Jersey communities, voters rejected the proposed school budgets presented for their consideration as too extravagant.

This large-scale rejection of school budgets—carrying with it an implied demand by the citizens for greater economy—is the highest in the State's history.

Last year, voters in 41 districts throughout the State rejected the budgets offered to them—and that figure represented nearly a 100 percent jump in rejections over 1956. Such indisputable figures certainly indicate that the public realization of the need for economy at all levels of our Government is not dead.

The American people are insistent upon the most modern and efficient military strength to safeguard and strengthen our security. Few dispute the need for an all-out effort in this vital field.

But the results of the New Jersey school board elections are significant. For, if these elections are an accurate indicator, as they would seem to be, the demand for economy in other areas of government is growing, and not receding.

#### ALBERT V. FARALDI, POINT PLEASANT, N. J.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always in order to express appreciation of the work of any constituent who by his example of public service raises the general tone of the community. This is abundantly true of Albert V. Faraldi, who lives in Point Pleasant, Ocean County, N. J., which is located in the Third Congressional District that I have the honor and privilege to represent.

Mr. Faraldi has won a national good citizenship award from the National Association of Food Chains because of his record of interest and participation in the affairs of the community in which he lives. This gentleman, who is manager of the supermarket in Point Pleasant Beach, is one of the 11 national winners selected from about 10,000 supermarket managers and is the only winner of this award from the State of New Jersey. Among his civic activities he serves

as president of the Greater Point Pleasant Chamber of Commerce; he is a charter member of the local volunteer fire department, and an officer in the local chapter of the American Red Cross. He is active as a fund raiser for the Girl Scouts of America and the March of Dimes, and the citizens of the community turn to him naturally when there is a civic job to be done. A married man and the father of three small boys in whose welfare he devotes a real fatherly interest, he is active in the affairs of the local parent-teachers association.

The Governor of the State of New Jersey on behalf of its citizens has extended congratulations to Mr. Faraldi and presented him with a State flag. Under the sponsorship of the Greater Point Pleasant Chamber of Commerce, the Boroughs of Point Pleasant and Point Pleasant Beach have designated February 27 as Albert V. Faraldi Good Citizenship Day which will be climaxed by a luncheon in honor of Mr. Faraldi.

Ours is a wonderful country which produces men like Mr. Faraldi and we need have no fear for the future when such leadership is developed as is found in this outstanding citizen. I am proud to have the honor to represent in the Congress a man of this character because by his example he brings inspiration, renewed confidence, and hope for the days to come. His unselfishness and devotion to the needs of others proves that service to humanity is the best work of life.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF EMPLOYEES OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 235) to increase from \$50 to \$75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN UNCOMPLETED NAVAL VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8547) to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### RECREATIONAL ASPECTS OF WATERSHED PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5497) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 4 (2) (A) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 1018, 84th Cong.) be amended by inserting immediately after "and disposal of water", the following: "or for recreational and fish and wildlife development."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, following line 7, add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not furnish or agree to furnish financial assistance to local organizations for the institutions of works of improvement for recreational and fish and wildlife development pursuant to the authority of this act prior to July 1, 1958."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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 77 (C) (6) OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 982) to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph (6) of section 77 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 205 (c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) If a lease of a line of railroad is rejected, and if the lessee, with the approval of the judge, shall elect no longer to operate the leased line, it shall be the duty of the lessor at the end of a period to be fixed by the judge to begin the operation of such lines, unless the judge, upon the petition of the lessor, shall decree after hearing that it would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest for the lessor to operate the said line, in which event it shall be the duty of the lessee to continue operation on or for the account of the lessor, until abandonment of such line is authorized in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of that act, the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, or until such operation pursuant to this paragraph is otherwise lawfully terminated. During any such operation, the lessor shall be deemed to be a carrier subject to all applicable provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and shall be entitled to receive just, reasonable, and equitable divisions of rates, fares, or charges applicable to the transportation of persons or property over its line or lines of railroad and the lines of the lessee or other carriers, and the provisions of section 15 (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as now or hereafter amended, shall apply to said divisions whether or not joint rates covering such transportation have been established."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "lines" and substitute "line."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "that act" and substitute "the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

#### FISH FARMING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1552) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program for the purpose of carrying on certain research and experimentation to develop methods for the commercial production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with rice field crops, and for other purposes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6995) to amend Public Law 883, 84th Congress, to provide for the conveyance of certain additional property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could have advice as to whether the \$50,000 appropriation as originally contemplated has been deleted?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. If I may advise the gentleman, I think, sir, that every dime of the \$50,000 appropriation was deleted in the subcommittee out of which that bill was passed. This includes just one lot and a couple of feet of an adjacent lot in which this historical building is located.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It was originally contemplated, though, was it not, that the \$50,000 be paid to the Historical Society?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes. That was part of the original bill. They are just going to get the lot, that is all.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Fine. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.," approved August 1, 1956 (Public Law 883, 84th Cong.: 70 Stat. 887), is amended—

(1) by striking out "and removed from said land without cost to the United States"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. The Administrator shall convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described property:

"Lots 5, 6, and 7, block 29, city of Roseburg, Douglas County, Oreg. Subject to rights granted to John Hunter by deed dated April 7, 1899, granting access over a 10-foot gateway along the south and east sides of lot 7 and the east side of lot 6 as recorded in volume 39, page 186, deed records of Douglas County, Oreg. Subject to the rights of the public, if any, to use an alleyway along the east side of lots 5, 6, and 7.

"Such property shall be conveyed on condition that the Douglas County Historical Society shall use such property as an historical site, and if such property shall ever cease to be so used, title thereto shall revert to the United States which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon. The cost of any survey which the Administrator determines is necessary to carry out the provisions of this section shall be paid by the Douglas County Historical Society.

"Sec. 3. If the real property described in section 2 of this act reverts to the United States, the property described in the first section of this act shall, within such reasonable period of time after such reversion as the Administrator may prescribe, be removed from such real property by the Douglas County Historical Society without cost to the United States and disposed of by the society in such manner as it may deem appropriate.

"Sec. 4. In order to provide assistance in the development of a museum for the purpose of preserving historical objects of Douglas County, Oreg., the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Douglas County Historical Society the sum of \$50,000, representing approximately one-half of the amounts heretofore received by the United States from the property devised to the United States by Lillie Lela Moore."

Sec. 2. The Administrator shall make such changes in the conveyance authorized by the first section of Public Law 883, 84th Congress, or make such new conveyance, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the amendments made by the first section of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, strike lines 4 through 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. The Administrator shall convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described property in the city of Roseburg, Douglas County, Oreg.:

"(a) Lot 5, block 29; and (b) all that portion of lot 6, block 29, described as beginning at a cross chiseled in the sidewalk in the west line of said lot 6 from which the street monument at the intersection of Rose and Washington Streets bears north 62 degrees 02 minutes west 30.0 feet and north 28 degrees 01 minute east 90.26 feet; thence south 62 degrees 02 minutes east 35.67 feet to a brass cap; thence south 28 degrees 01 minute east 8.63 feet to a brass cap; thence north 62 degrees 01 minute 30 seconds west 35.7 feet to the east line of Rose Street; thence south 28 degrees 01 minute west 8.63 feet to the point of beginning.

Reserving to the United States of America, its transferees and assigns a permanent easement over and upon the easterly 10 feet of said lot 5 for alleyway purposes.

"The cost of any survey which the Administrator determines is necessary to carry out the provisions of this section shall be paid by the Douglas County Historical Society. Such property shall be conveyed on condition that the Douglas County Historical Society shall use such property as a historical site; and, if such property shall ever cease to be so used, title thereto shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon."

On page 3, strike lines 6 through 14.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

### INVITATION TO AUTOMATION CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 347) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958, is the fourth such congress and exposition of this kind; and

Whereas such congress and exposition is being arranged for the purpose of exhibiting products used in increasing production, decreasing cost, and improving the standard of living all over the world; and

Whereas our American goal of ever higher quality products at costs which permit ever wider use has caused our business and labor leaders to devote ever increasing attention to automation; and

Whereas automation has achieved recognition as the principal material means of attaining the more productive and enjoyable life all men seek, and offers the United States and the world the most practical means of abolishing the mental and physical drudgery which deadens appreciation of the finer things of life; and

Whereas the Nation's leading executives, engineers, labor leaders, and scientists, with many of their colleagues from abroad, assembled at the Third Automation Exposition and Congress at New York, N. Y., in November 1956 to inform themselves on the latest developments in automation, automatic control, electronic computers, and instrumentation and allied techniques: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is authorized and requested to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, line 7, after "1958," strike the period, insert a semicolon, add the word "and," and insert a new paragraph which shall read as follows:

*"Be it further resolved,* That no funds appropriated by Congress for any purpose whatsoever shall be used to defray the expenses of any foreign country or foreign individual participating in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in New York City."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

### SECOND ANNUAL UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE FAIR

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 509) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States is authorized, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held at the Coliseum, New York City, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting merchandise and articles of trade and production; and the promotion of travel, tourism, and transportation; and for the purpose of bringing together buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, line 4, after the word "commerce", strike out the period, insert a semicolon, add the word "and", and insert a paragraph which shall read as follows:

*"Be it further resolved,* That no funds appropriated by Congress for any purpose whatsoever shall be used to defray the expenses of any foreign country or foreign individual participating in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

### RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9371) to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That any member or former member of the Army or Air Force, who, after August 31, 1952, and before February 1, 1954, was transferred from the United States to a restricted area where his dependents were not permitted to accompany him and whose dependents were transported at the expense of the United States to Hawaii, is entitled to transportation of his household goods from the San Francisco port of embarkation to Hawaii.

SEC. 2. Any payments for transportation of those shipments made by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force to the Military Sea Transport Service for which a person described in section 1 was charged are validated.

SEC. 3. Any person described in section 1 who has repaid the United States the amount charged for that transportation may be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper under this act.

SEC. 4. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which appear to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 5. Appropriations available to the military departments concerned for the travel and transportation of military personnel are available for payments under this act.

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.

### CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8439) to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General shall, upon application made pursuant to such rules and regulations as he shall promulgate pursuant to this act, cancel any departure bond posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act, on behalf of any refugee who entered the United States as a nonimmigrant after May 6, 1945, and prior to July 1, 1953, and who had his immigration status adjusted to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence pursuant to any public or private law.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, the term "refugee" shall mean any alien who (1) establishes that he lawfully entered the United States as a nonimmigrant, (2) that he is or was a person displaced from the country of his birth or nationality or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and (3) that he cannot or could not return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to refund out of funds not otherwise appropriated any sum or sums of moneys received by the Treasurer of the United States pursuant to the forfeiture of any bond posted in the case of a refugee as defined in sections 1 and 2 of this act on application by the person, persons, organization, or corporation entitled to the refund, and if a person who would have been entitled to a refund is deceased the application shall be made in behalf of his estate. The payments made pursuant to this section shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury directly to such person, or persons, or organization, or corporation which have paid the moneys upon the forfeiture of the bonds.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 17, after "act" insert "whose status was adjusted to aforesaid."

Page 2, line 24, after "corporation" strike out "which have paid the moneys upon the forfeiture of the bonds" and insert "entitled to the refund."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to relieve certain refugees of their obligations under bonds furnished by them when they entered the United States as nonimmigrants. Many of those who fled to this country

after World War II and could not, for fear of further persecution, return to their homelands, have since had their status adjusted to that of permanent residents. They either now are, or intend to become, citizens of the United States. It does not seem just that these people whom we have recognized as worthy to remain in this country and to become citizens should be required to make payment under bonds originally furnished by them to assure their departure.

H. R. 8439 would allow refugees, as defined in section 2 of the bill, who entered the United States as nonimmigrants between May 6, 1945, and July 1, 1953, to apply to the Attorney General for cancellation of their bonds. According to the testimony introduced at the hearings, this would affect approximately 350 to 400 bonds ranging in amount from \$500 to \$1,000. The cancellation of most of these bonds will involve simply a forgiveness of an obligation on the part of the Government. For those who have already paid, provision is made for a refund by the Secretary of the Treasury.

This bill has received the generous support of a number of fine religious and service organizations. The information supplied by these groups shows there is ample justification for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this measure would benefit a group of most deserving persons. It is worthy of the support of every Member.

#### OCEANSIDE-LIBBY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of the Oceanside-Libby Union School District, San Diego County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Oceanside-Libby Union School District, San Diego County, Calif., the sum of \$6,028. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such school district against the United States arising out of the payment of such sum to the United States by such school district, in order to obtain the consent of the United States for such school district to grant to the State of California an easement for highway purposes over certain real property acquired from the United States by such school district under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, even though (before the acquisition of such property by such school district) the United States, under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, could have granted such easement to such State without reimbursement: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act, in excess of 10 percent thereof, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after "act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

#### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Economic Committee the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. REUSS, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

#### VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9700) to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it not be printed in the Journal or the Record, but that the committee amendments be printed in lieu thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Page 10, immediately below "Sec. 1823." insert "Sec. 1824. Waiver of discharge requirements for hospitalized persons."

Page 11, immediately below "Sec. 3012" insert "Sec. 3013. Effective dates of educational benefits."

Page 11, in the material following "Sec. 3021." insert "certain" immediately before "accrued benefits."

Page 15, line 14, immediately after "title VII" insert "and section 5202 (b)."

Page 26, lines 17 and 18, strike out "laws applied by such court" and insert "laws of the jurisdiction where the person was convicted by such court."

Page 49, line 10, immediately before "misconduct" insert "willful."

Page 59, line 15, immediately before "misconduct" insert "own willful."

Page 100, line 7, immediately after "in receipt of" insert "or but for the receipt of retirement pay would be entitled to."

Page 101, lines 13 and 14, strike out "in receipt of" and insert "who is in receipt of, or but for the receipt of retirement pay would be entitled to."

Page 104, line 2, strike out "mechanical-electronic" and insert "mechanical or electronic."

Page 106, line 17 immediately after "hospital" insert "or domiciliary."

Page 121, line 7, immediately after the period insert "If the mode of payment is changed to a refund life income in accordance with prior provisions of law after payment has commenced, payment of monthly installments will be adjusted as of the date of maturity of such policy with credit being allowed for payments previously made on the insurance."

Page 127, line 20, strike out "All" and insert "Except as otherwise provided in this title, all."

Page 127, line 21, strike out "participating."

Page 135, line 17, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 137, line 11, strike out "At" and insert "(a) Effective July 23, 1953, at."

Page 137, line 18, strike out "effective July 23, 1953," and insert "on and after such date."

Page 138, immediately after line 5, insert: "(b) The section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act."

Page 138, line 11, strike out "in cash, any dividend accumulation and unpaid" and insert "of dividends in cash or that the dividends be placed on deposit in accordance with the provisions of his policy, any regular annual."

Page 153, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Public Law 373, Seventy-second Congress," and insert "the act of."

Page 159, lines 4 and 5, strike out "be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, and shall thereupon."

Page 159, lines 8 and 9, strike out "without covering into the Treasury of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions."

Page 164, line 18, immediately after "in receipt of" insert "or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to."

Page 167, line 20, immediately before "for the" insert "(including educational and vocational counseling and other necessary incidental services)."

Page 170, line 23, immediately after "pursuing" insert "a course of."

Page 170, line 24, immediately before "and" insert "training."

Page 172, line 11, immediately after "vocational rehabilitation" insert "training."

Page 172, line 17, strike out "shall" and insert "is authorized to."

Page 172, line 23, strike out "receiving vocational rehabilitation" and insert "pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation training."

Page 173, line 3, immediately after "vocational rehabilitation" insert "training."

Page 173, lines 20 and 21, strike out "and may be collected by" and insert "by proper."

Page 173, line 21, immediately after "from" insert "future."

Page 204, strike out "accordingly" and insert "accordingly."

Page 230, line 24, strike out "course," and insert "course;".

Page 231, lines 7 and 8, strike out "objective," and insert "objective."

Page 232, line 21, strike out "removed," and insert "removed."

Page 237, line 16, immediately after "eligible person" insert "pursuing a course of education under this title."

Page 238, line 1, strike out "of this act."

Page 246, line 19, immediately after "veteran" insert "(including a person who died in the active military, naval, or air service)."

Page 246, line 4, strike out "service" and insert "active duty."

Page 255, line 7, strike out "lending institution" and insert "lender."

Page 256, line 1, strike out "primarily" and insert "principally."

Page 256, line 2, strike out "mortgage."

Page 256, line 3, immediately before "before" insert "or insurance."

Page 264, line 18, immediately after "purposes" insert "in connection with bona fide pursuit of a gainful occupation by the veteran."

Page 274, line 12, immediately before the period insert "of loans made from the revolving fund."

Page 274, immediately after line 14, insert:

"WAIVER OF DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR HOSPITALIZED PERSONS"

SEC. 1824. The benefits of this title may be afforded to any person who is hospitalized

pending final discharge from active duty, if he is qualified therefor in every respect except for discharge.

Page 281, after line 13, insert:

"(d) The Secretary may utilize for the purposes of this section the personnel and facilities of the agencies in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113). For the purpose of payments made to such agencies under such act, the furnishing of such personnel and facilities shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the public employment offices of such agencies."

Page 298, lines 16, 19, and 22, strike out "under section 3021."

Page 299, line 23, immediately after "Code," insert "or the change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal under section 1553 of title 10 of the United States Code, or from other corrective action by competent authority."

Page 300, line 3, immediately after "record" insert "or for the change, modification, or correction of a discharge or dismissal, as the case may be."

Page 301, line 21, immediately after "be the" insert "day following the."

Page 304, line 14, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Treasurer of the United States."

Page 305, line 21, immediately after "of" insert "CERTAIN."

Page 305, line 23, strike out "Periodic" and insert "Except as provided in section 3203 (a) (2) (A) and Public Law 828, Seventy-sixth Congress, periodic."

Page 307, line 18, strike "Veterans' Administration" and insert "issuing office."

Page 308, lines 20 and 21, strike out "indemnity under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951" and insert "servicemen's indemnity."

Page 326, line 10, strike out "special" and all that follows down through "requisitions" in line 19, and insert "deposit fund accounts with the United States Treasury and such balances and deposits shall thereupon be available for disbursement for properly authorized purposes."

Page 327, line 13, strike out "claimant;" and insert "claimant."

Page 327, line 16, strike out "pending;" and insert "pending."

Page 328, line 18, strike out "Government;" and insert "Government."

Page 327, line 20, strike out "claimant;" and insert "claimant."

Page 327, line 23, strike out "proper;" and insert "proper."

Page 328, line 6, strike out "claim;" and insert "claim."

Page 328, line 10, strike out "organizations;" and insert "organizations."

Page 328, line 20, strike out "specifically;" and insert "specifically—."

Page 328, lines 21 and 24, strike out "The" and insert "the."

Page 334, line 20, strike out "of this act."

Page 336, line 7, strike out "imprisonment" and insert "imprisoned."

Page 361, line 18, strike out "premises" and insert "premises."

Page 375, line 6, strike out "and" and insert "any."

Page 375, lines 10 and 11, and 16 and 17, strike out "State, Territory, Commonwealth, insular possession," and insert "State."

Page 377, lines 16 and 17, strike out "of Veterans' Affairs."

Page 382, lines 24 and 25, strike out "State, possession," and insert "State."

Page 383, lines 2 and 3, and 10, strike out "State, possession," and insert "State."

Page 394, lines 15 and 17, strike out "and."

Page 394, line 18, immediately after "Congress," insert "and section 1507 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Page 392, line 23, and page 393, line 2, immediately after "index" insert "and tables."

Page 395, line 7, immediately after "of" insert "Part I of."

Page 397, immediately after line 18, insert:

"(k) Effective as of June 30, 1958, section 513 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 694m (c)), is amended by striking out '1958' and inserting '1959.'"

Page 397, line 2, strike out "(k)" "(l)", and insert "(l)."

Page 398, lines 1, 10, 14, 19, 24, strike out "(l)", "(m)", "(n)", "(o)", and "(p)" and insert "(m)", "(n)", "(o)", "(p)", and "(q)", respectively.

Page 399, lines 3, 6, and 10, strike out "(q)", "(r)", and "(s)" and insert "(r)", "(s)", and "(t)", respectively.

Page 400, lines 1, 17, 21, and 25, strike out "(t)", "(u)", "(v)", and "(w)" and insert "(u)", "(v)", "(w)", and "(x)."

Page 400, line 6, strike out "1701J-I" and insert "1701J-1."

Page 400, line 21, immediately after "102" insert "(a)."

Page 401, line 2, immediately before "title" insert "under."

Page 401, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert:

"(y) Title 10 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

"(1) By amending section 1441 by inserting immediately after 'and' the following: '(except as provided in section 415 (g) of the Veterans' Benefits Act).'

#### VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT

"(2) By amending chapter 79 by adding at the end thereof the following."

Page 404, line 1, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Page 404, immediately before line 12, insert:

"(4) Effective as of January 1, 1958, section 6160 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In the case of any initial award of naval pension granted before July 14, 1943, where the person granted the naval pension is also entitled to pension or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, such naval pension shall not exceed one-fourth of such pension or compensation.'"

Page 404, lines 12 and 17, strike out "(y)" and "(z)" and insert "(z)" and "(aa)", respectively.

Page 405, immediately after line 7, insert:

"(4) By striking out 'under section 921' each place it occurs in section 901.

"(5) By inserting 'day following the' immediately before 'date of his discharge' in section 910 (b).

"(6) By striking out 'Pension' in section 921 (a) and inserting 'Except as provided in section 1502 (a) (2) (A) and Public Law 828, 76th Congress, pension.'"

Page 405, line 15, strike out "(4)" and insert "(7)."

Page 405, line 17, strike out "or."

Page 405, lines 24 and 25, strike out "penalties" and insert "penalties, liabilities."

Page 413, line 4, strike out "24" the second time it appears and insert "42".

Page 413, line 13, immediately after "613," insert "614-618."

Page 415, line 25, immediately after "1 (a)" insert "(38 U. S. C. ch. 12A)."

Page 416, line 4, strike out "19" and insert "20."

Page 416, immediately after line 24, insert:

"(79) Section 2 of the Act of December 18, 1942 (ch. 768, 56 Stat. 1066)."

Beginning on page 417, line 1, through line 11 on page 421, strike out the paragraph designations "(79)" through "(116)" and insert in lieu thereof "(80)" through "(117)", respectively.

Page 419, line 4, strike out "1950" and insert "1951."

Page 420, line 6, strike out "3" and insert "4."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we are considering today, H. R. 9700, proposes to consolidate into one act all the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—all of the laws coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Members will recall that during the first session of this Congress there was enacted Public Law 85-56 which was reported as H. R. 53, and which the House unanimously passed under suspension of the rules, on April 1, 1957. This latter bill consolidated into one act the Veterans' Administration laws on compensation for service-connected disability, pension for non-service-connected disability, hospitalization and medical benefits, burial allowance, and general administrative laws of the Veterans' Administration. The bill, H. R. 9700, is a further extension of this general procedure and incorporates all of the provisions of the Public Law 85-56, and in addition thereto, includes education benefits, vocational rehabilitation, housing laws and insurance, aid to State homes, and so forth.

It is essentially a restatement of all of the existing laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. It would consolidate, as I have indicated, and integrate these laws into 1 comprehensive enactment, achieving simplification of language in many areas and enabling all persons to use it with the confident understanding that it embraces in one statutory pact the many and diverse laws administered by the Veterans' Administration which heretofore have been scattered among a series of enactments. I feel confident in saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first real consolidation which has occurred in this field since the founding of the Republic.

Two days of hearings were held on this measure by a special subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], and serving with him the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER]. This committee, after hearing representatives of the four veterans' organizations, approve the bill, and receiving the testimony of officials of the Veterans' Administration, unanimously reported the bill to the full committee. The full committee on January 27 unanimously reported the bill favorably to the House.

Prior to the bill's introduction it had been the subject of months of conferences and study on the part of the staff of the committee, the office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, and representatives of the General Counsel's office of the Veterans' Administration. I say this to indicate the careful consideration and preparation which has gone into this undertaking.

Mr. James M. Menger, Jr., of the legislative counsel's office; Messrs. T. F. Daley, D. C. Knapp, R. P. Bland, How-

ard Bernstein, Alfred Bronaugh of the Veterans' Administration, and Edwin B. Patterson, counsel to the committee, did the main work on this bill.

As I have indicated, this bill is largely a restatement of existing law. There are, however, some liberalizations in this proposal all in an effort to provide greater uniformity and simplify administration.

In connection with these changes I think it is significant that Mr. T. F. Daley, the associate general counsel for legislative services of the Veterans' Administration, in testifying on this bill stated:

Considered as a whole, it is believed that the bill is presently an accurate restatement of the law, subject to a few relatively minor changes which generally are of a perfecting nature and do not have a major impact.

I want to indicate some of these liberalizations:

#### COVERAGE OF CERTAIN SERVICE GROUPS FOR VA BENEFITS

First. Provisions qualifying certain types of National Guard training duty as active service for purposes of all Veterans' Administration benefits except education under title XVI and loan guaranty under title XVIII, if disability from any cause was sustained during active duty for training or injury was sustained during inactive duty training. This applies to training of guardsmen under certain provisions of title 32, United States Code, and covers generally the type of training which originally qualified them for specific benefits, including compensation, under Public Law 108, 81st Congress. Public Law 108 and its current restatement—title 32, United States Code, section 318—require that such training be for more than 30 days to qualify disability from disease for benefits and, if it is less than 30 days, limits the coverage to injury. By definitions in section 101 of the bill, this distinction would be eliminated and, unlike the limitation of existing law to specific benefits, would grant a general service status upon incurrence of disability during training as prescribed and thus broaden the range of benefits available. This will result in equalizing the status of these National Guard men with that of reservists. The bill would add training under section 316 of title 32, which deals with duty as instructors at rifle ranges for the training of civilians in the use of military arms. The proposed expansion of coverage for this group is considered desirable in the interests of uniform treatment and is consistent with what was done for purposes of dependency and indemnity compensation in Public Law 881, 84th Congress.

Second. Section 206 (b) qualifies generally for purposes of compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, insurance, special housing assistance, vocational rehabilitation, payment on an automobile, and determination of service connection for medical and hospitalization purposes the status of preenlistees, draftees, and National Guard men called to Federal service, where an injury or disease is incurred while en route to or from, or at, a place for final acceptance or entry upon active duty. In the main,

this is a liberalization of existing laws which provide certain benefits in these cases where the incident occurred during the World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict periods. This again is considered a desirable expansion and also follows the precedent established by Public Law 881, 84th Congress, for purposes of dependency and indemnity compensation.

Third. Subsection 101 (21) (D) includes service as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies within the definition of active duty, which, in turn, constitutes active military, naval, or air service for the purposes of the bill generally. At present, this group is not generally eligible for wartime benefits except those provided for World War II service. The effect of the bill is to constitute their service during any of the war periods, including the Korean conflict period, as active service entitling them to the various wartime benefits, such as war rates of compensation, pension, and the status of war veterans for purposes of hospitalization and medical treatment, if other conditions are met. However, the educational provisions in title XVI continue the existing exclusion of time spent at one of the academies in measuring the duration of the veteran's entitlement to this benefit. Here again, the bill extends the pattern cut by Public Law 881 to various benefits additional to dependency and indemnity compensation.

Fourth. Subsection 106 (c) extends the provision contained in Public Law 881 relative to a continuing active-duty status after release or discharge subsequent to December 31, 1956, during the period required for travel to home, to apply to all benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Fifth. Subsection 106 (d) makes the so-called portal-to-portal principle of Public Law 881 applicable for purposes of the various benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration. This is the provision that if a properly authorized individual assumes an obligation to perform active duty for training or inactive duty training and is disabled or dies from an injury incurred after December 31, 1956, while proceeding directly to, or returning directly from, such training, he shall be deemed to be on active duty for training or inactive duty training, as the case may be, at the time the injury was incurred. Since the bill constitutes training duty as active service where disability or death from injury is sustained, this will have the effect of providing various additional benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration to the group affected, including disability compensation. The present bill merely represents a logical extension of the principle established by Public Law 881 for death benefits to include other benefits.

Sixth. Subsection 101 (23) (B) specifically includes in the definition of "inactive duty training" special additional duties authorized for Reserves by an authority designated by the Secretary concerned and performed by them on a voluntary basis in connection with the prescribed training or maintenance activities of the units to which they are

assigned. Subsection 101 (31) of title 10, United States Code, dealing generally with the "Armed Forces," defines inactive duty training to include this type of duty and the pattern would be specifically extended to VA-administered benefits.

Seventh. Section 3105 specifically includes commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Public Health Service within the provisions concerning waiver of retirement pay in certain cases in order to receive an amount of pension or compensation from the Veterans' Administration equivalent to the amount of retirement pay which has been waived.

Eighth. As stated in item 1 above, the general expansions of coverage for various types of training duty would not apply to educational benefits under title XVI or loan benefits under title XVIII. A significant exception exists. Each of these titles specifically provides that service performed on active duty for training under section 99 of the National Defense Act between June 30, 1954, and February 1, 1955, by persons commissioned in the District of Columbia Air National Guard who completed the course of training in the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps during 1954 shall constitute active duty within the requirements of each of those titles. This will have the effect of making education and training under what was previously title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and loan assistance under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as restated in this bill, available to persons in this category. The group consists of approximately 1,500 ROTC graduates from the 1954 classes for whom the Air Force was unable to provide commissions in the Air Force Reserve, and who instead were given the option, as against being drafted, of accepting a commission in the Air National Guard of the District of Columbia and entering upon active duty for training in a National Guard capacity for an extended period of some 3 years. These persons are already covered generally for purposes of basic benefits, such as compensation, but they are not eligible for so-called readjustment benefits. Other bills are pending before the committee to grant these benefits, on the theory that the duty performed is essentially similar to the duty which would be performed had the persons concerned been commissioned in the Air Force Reserve and called to extended active duty as had theretofore been the practice with respect to ROTC graduates. The committee believes that this group is being denied benefits primarily because of a technicality and that it would only be equitable to extend to them an active-duty status for this purpose.

#### INSURANCE LAWS

First. Section 722 restates the existing section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to authorize the granting of insurance to persons with a service-connected disability after their separation from service. Existing law requires that application for such insurance must

be made within 1 year from the date service connection of the disability is determined by the Veterans' Administration. The bill would extend the time for application with respect to persons shown to have been mentally incompetent during any part of the 1-year period by authorizing an application in such cases within 1 year after a guardian is appointed or within 1 year after the removal of the mental disability, whichever is the earlier date. Where the guardian was appointed or the removal of the disability occurred prior to January 1, 1959, application may be made within 1 year of that date. Experience under the existing law has disclosed certain hardship cases in which an incompetent veteran, in the absence of a guardian to act for him, has been unable to secure insurance to which he would otherwise be entitled. The Veterans' Administration believes this proposed change in the law is meritorious and recommended its adoption.

Second. Prior to the enactment of Public Law 881, 84th Congress, if the 5-year term period of any level premium term policy expired when the policy was lapsed, such policy could not be reinstated and there was no authority to grant new insurance. Public Law 881 amended the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide certain relief in such cases to authorize reinstatement, notwithstanding the expiration of the term period, if the lapse occurred not earlier than 2 months before such expiration. This provision is restated in section 705 with respect to national service life insurance. Section 745 of the bill extends a similar authority to renew with respect to United States Government life-insurance level-premium term policies retroactive to the same date such benefit was afforded on national service life-insurance policies. Thus, insureds similarly situated would be treated uniformly. The Veterans' Administration favored this extension of the law.

Third. Section 746 would make applicable to United States Government life insurance a provision similar to one contained in the National Service Life Insurance Act—restated in section 707 of the bill—whereby dividends shall, as necessary, be applied in payment of premiums, in the absence of a request that they be paid in cash. The basic purpose is to avoid inadvertent lapses and the Veterans' Administration favored extending the principle of such legislation to United States Government life insurance. Dividends that accumulate for this purpose will be held in a credit account and will draw interest.

#### FEE-BASIS EMPLOYEES

Existing law, enacted in 1930, authorizes a fee of not to exceed \$20 per day for part-time and fee-basis employees of the Veterans' Administration when ordered to appear as witnesses in Government insurance suits. Section 784 (e) of the bill would increase this authorized per diem to \$50. The inadequacy of the existing per diem is readily apparent in view of the current economic conditions and the Veterans' Administration would favor the increase proposed by the bill.

#### EDUCATION LAWS

First. Sections 1602 (a) (8) and 1702 (a) (8) of the bill specifically include the Panama Canal Zone among the areas in which training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, title XVI, and under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956, title XVII, may be provided to eligible persons. This corresponds to a proposal to the Congress made by the Veterans' Administration in April 1957 to correct a serious technical question which has arisen under the terms of these laws as to whether the Canal Zone is covered by the provisions permitting these programs to operate in the several "States, Territories, and possessions of the United States." It is believed that this remedial amendment would be entirely consistent with the intention of the Congress in enacting the original laws providing these forms of assistance. This correction would not only apply prospectively but, by an amendment in section 5601 of the bill, would be retroactively effective to the respective dates of enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. A bill—H. R. 7251, 85th Congress—to accomplish this purpose was passed by the House on August 19, 1957.

Second. Sections 1631 (b) and (c) contain minor changes with respect to the requirements for certification by institutions concerning the attendance status of eligible veterans under the education and training program for Korean conflict veterans corresponding to title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. In brief, this change would bring the pertinent requirements for that program into parity with the related requirements under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act by permitting certification that the veteran was actually enrolled in and pursuing an institutional course leading to a standard college degree in accordance with the regular policies of the institution without a showing concerning actual attendance during the period of coverage. This provision now extends only to accredited institutions. The amendment would accomplish the purpose of H. R. 8075, 85th Congress, on which the Veterans' Administration has favorably reported.

Third. Section 1725 (b) would add to the list of courses to which the general requirement for at least 2 years' operation is inapplicable "any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree." This incorporates into the title governing training under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act an exception which is already contained in the educational program for Korean conflict veterans under title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. The Veterans' Administration favorably reported on the amendment which established this exception in the latter act, and stated in its report on this bill that the inclusion of a similar exception in the provisions governing the war orphans' program is entirely consistent and desirable.

#### HOUSING

Section 1803, in conjunction with section 1810 of the bill, authorizes the automatic guaranty of home and farmhouse loans made by supervised lenders under the special provisions permitting the guaranty of as much as 60 percent of the amount of the loan, subject to a \$7,500 maximum guaranty. This is in accord with a proposal made by the Veterans' Administration to the Congress on January 15, 1957, as embodied in H. R. 4436, 85th Congress, pending before this committee. It is noted that the item was included in section 3 of H. R. 4602, 85th Congress, which was passed, but on which the President withheld approval for reasons going to other aspects of the measure.

While all of the changes are of a type designed to provide more uniformity, there is one particular change which I wish to call to the attention of the House. This involves the inclusion for benefits of approximately 1,500 1954 Air Force ROTC graduates who, up to this time, have been denied the full education benefits which they would normally have been entitled to had they been normally commissioned in anything but the District of Columbia Air National Guard and commissioned for active duty for training only. The form of this commission and training prevented these men, through no fault of their own, from receiving the benefits of Public Law 550, 82d Congress, the so-called GI bill of rights. The situation, briefly, is that the Defense Department in its 1954 Air Force ROTC class was bumping its ceiling and a number of these ROTC graduates had the alternative of either returning to an enlisted man's status, being drafted, or accepting a commission for which they had been trained. To prevent this situation from developing the Department of Defense designed a commission and service which would permit them to serve while assigned to the District of Columbia Air National Guard, but did not afford them the benefits to which the other individuals commissioned in the regular manner enjoy. There are approximately 1,500 individuals affected, and it is from this group that the only cost comes in the enactment of this bill. The Veterans' Administration estimates that this section will cost approximately \$1,200,000 and that this will not amount to more than \$480,000 in any one year.

I want also to say a word about the savings provisions which are a part of this act. They are important from a number of points of view and, briefly stated, will prevent any veteran or dependent of a veteran from losing any right to which he now is entitled under existing laws. Three sections are involved: sections 5504, 5511, and 5512. I will discuss 5511 first.

Section 5511 is addressed to the situation in which claims for benefits may be pending on the effective date of the bill, January 1, 1959, or filed thereafter under circumstances which, pursuant to existing laws, would entitle the claimant to payments covering a period prior to the effective date of the act. It is provided that with respect to any such prior

period the claim shall be adjudicated under the prior laws and thereafter under the applicable provisions of the new act. An example might be the case of a claim for compensation filed after January 1, 1959, but within 1 year of the veteran's discharge from service or his death from service causes occurring prior to January 1, 1959. Under these circumstances, the award of compensation would be effective for the payment of benefits on the day following the date of discharge or the date of death, as the case may be, even though a part of the elapsed period occurred prior to the effective date of the new law. This is in accord with the general principle now applicable in cases of this character. Section 5511 would not, however, authorize benefits for a prior period if the individual concerned was not entitled under the prior law, even though entitlement might be predicated upon the provisions of the new law. An example in this area would be the case of a selectee who, prior to January 1, 1959, was injured while en route to, or returning from, the place for final acceptance subsequent to the end of the Korean conflict period. While in that case the bill in effect provides that the past service shall be regarded as active military service for various purposes, including disability compensation, no award of disability compensation based on the disability resulting from the injury could be made for a period prior to the effective date of the act because the draftee had no compensable status during that period.

Section 5512 will have two basic effects. First, it will provide continuing protection for persons receiving benefits so long as they continue to meet the requirements of the prior laws under which those benefits were granted, notwithstanding the fact that they may not meet eligibility requirements under comparable provisions of the new law. Secondly, it would operate to place all persons on the rolls on the day preceding the effective date of the act in the status of receiving the rates established by the corresponding provisions of the new act, including those cases in which some eligibility requirement of the new act is not met, unless a greater benefit is payable under the prior law. This would have the practical effect of extending to these protected cases the benefits of any increase in rates provided in the future by simple amendments to the general provisions of the new law as, for example, an amendment to title III increasing the rates of compensation provided in that title without any specific reference to persons—for example, remarried Spanish War widows—whose original award of benefits was made under prior laws. This protective device in section 5512 also applies, by virtue of the last sentence, to claims pending on the effective date of the new act, or filed thereafter, in which, pursuant to section 5511, awards are made for a period prior to January 1, 1959. In these instances, the person would, in effect, be deemed to have been receiving benefits on the day prior to the effective date of the act.

Section 5504 is a special provision which will serve to preserve the necessary continuity from prior laws. First, it provides that any references in other laws which remain effective to a provision repealed or replaced by the new act shall be considered as referring to the corresponding provisions of the new act. This is a precaution to take care of any possible situation in which some collateral statute has not been amended in the bill to correct the reference to a repealed provision. Secondly, and especially significant, is the provision that "references in this act to any provision of this act, shall, where applicable, be deemed to refer also to the prior corresponding provisions of law." In many places throughout the bill there is reference to provisions of the bill without the inclusion of specific reference to the similar provision of the prior law which is being repealed. To preserve continuity with respect to actions taken or events occurring under the superseded law where it is clear that such actions or events must be given continuing effect to accomplish the results intended, this provision would act as a safeguard without the necessity for referring specifically in the various provisions of the new act to the corresponding provisions of superseded law. An example is section 1804 (b) on page 253 of the bill, which restates the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in connection with the loan program to refuse appraisal of a project owned, sponsored, or to be constructed by a person identified with housing previously sold to veterans "under this title" as to which substantial deficiencies have been discovered or there has been failure to discharge contractual obligations or unfair practices to the prejudice of veteran purchasers. Section 5504 (b) will make it clear that this authority extends to cases in which the actions on which the Administrator's refusal is based occurred under the prior title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, even though the specific reference is to property previously sold "under this title."

I invite the House's attention also to section 5507 which provides that in the printing of the slip law version of this act there shall be included a comprehensive index and series of tables which will make this law understandable and usable to all individuals who come in contact with it. I think this in itself will be of great assistance to Members of Congress and to service officers throughout the country who must constantly work in this field.

The four Government departments to which this legislation was referred, namely, the Veterans' Administration, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department, have all submitted reports indicating their approval of the bill in principle.

There is one amendment in addition to those contained in the bill as reported. This is on page 281 after line 13, and is, in effect, a typographical correction. Somehow in this 421-page bill 9 lines of type were lost involving the administration of unemployment compensation by

the Department of Labor. The amendment restores this language.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement relating to the provisions of H. R. 9700 dealing with the finality of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the veterans' housing program. This statement has been checked with the Veterans' Administration, and it is agreed that this statement accurately describes the effect of H. R. 9700 in this regard.

H. R. 9700 restates existing law in this regard without change. Today there are two provisions of law relating to this question. They are section 211 (a) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 and section 509 (1) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Section 211 (a) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 provides that decisions of the Administrator on any question of law or fact concerning a claim for benefits or payments under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive. Section 509 (1) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provides that with respect to matters arising by reason of the veterans' housing program the Administrator may sue and be sued in his official capacity.

Except for this section 509 (1), there is no provision of law which specifically provides for review of the Administrator's decisions under the veterans' housing program.

H. R. 9700 makes no change in existing law. The provision of present law relating to finality of decisions of the Administrator is restated in section 211 (a) of the bill, with an amendment expressly providing that that section does not apply in the case of authorized suits under the housing program. The provision of present law relating to suits against the Administrator is restated, without any change in substance in section 1820 (a) (1) of the bill.

In other words, H. R. 9700 leaves existing law just as it is today insofar as it concerns the question of the extent of the Administrator's finality of decision under the veterans' housing program, and rights to sue and be sued.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill may be speedily enacted into law. I believe it is in the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve as a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill, H. R. 9700, as well as the similar bill, H. R. 53, which the Congress enacted last year and which became Public Law 85-56.

The chairman has already gone into considerable detail expressing and explaining the provisions of this bill and I do not think it is necessary at this point to repeat what he has said. The basic objective of this bill, as was true in Public Law 85-56, is to make more uniform and more intelligible the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Basically, H. R. 9700 does not seek to enlarge the field of benefits. There are

a few liberalizing changes. There are no new restrictions. Savings provisions are included to fully protect individuals already on the pension or compensation rolls or retired under the Veterans' Administration benefits.

As the Chairman has indicated, the bill is endorsed in principle by all the executive departments that have been consulted in its preparation. Nearly all of the amendments suggested by the executive branch were minor in character and have been adopted. Most of the amendments presented in this bill, however, are of a clarifying, typographical nature and do not change the substance of the bill from that as introduced. The bill would be effective January 1, 1959.

We had representatives of AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion before our subcommittee. All of these organizations endorsed the bill in principle, and the latter two had changes of substance to propose. It was the view of the subcommittee, and later concurred in by the full committee it would be better for the proposals by these organizations to be considered at a later date rather than be considered as a part of this bill because of the basic purpose of the bill being a consolidating measure. This is said without regard to the merits of various proposals suggested.

I am sure that all of the lawyers in the House will greatly appreciate this measure because it will mean that all the veterans' laws will be in one act in one place, and available for appropriate action by many members who desire to consider the subject. Further, it is my understanding that it will be the practice of the committee, once this bill is enacted, to keep the law up to date by the publication of the law as amended by each succeeding Congress.

There is no opposition to the basic principle of this bill and I hope it will be enacted promptly.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I feel with many others that there is a need for codification of our veterans' laws, but I should like to ask the gentlemen of the subcommittee 1 or 2 questions: Does this bill, voluminous as it is, embrace any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report with respect to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. SISK. No. I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is no substantial change in any law and nothing that could be considered any part of the Hoover Commission report is incorporated in the present act.

Mr. EVINS. Does this bill embrace or include any of the recommendations of the so-called Bradley Commission report with respect to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. SISK. The answer, I might say to the gentleman from Tennessee, is, no it does not.

Mr. EVINS. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] have both stated that there are no major changes or no

great and substantial changes in the laws for compensation for veterans. There are special provisions included in the act and the bill would become effective once the bill was passed on January 1, 1959. What would be the situation with respect to an application for compensation or pension filed prior to that date? Would the amount of such compensation or pension be changed following the effective date of the new law?

Mr. SISK. The amounts would not be changed—no. There is nothing in this bill that in anywise changes the amounts of compensation or pension that would be available.

Mr. EVINS. When the gentleman uses the expression that there would be no "major" changes or no "great" changes, would he state what the changes would be specifically and what, in the main, would be the effect of any changes authorized by this bill?

Mr. SISK. Actually, as I said, of course, there are no substantial changes. However, there are a few liberalizing features that are provided in the present bill. I think that probably the one main, outstanding change would be the liberalization with reference to certain members of the District of Columbia National Guard. Due to no fault of these men, but due to the fact that the Air Force found itself overburdened with too many officers, they were unable to go through with certain agreements that they had made with reference to the commissioning of these men in the Regular Air Force. Therefore, in order to give them certain considerations, they were put into the District of Columbia National Guard. Under the present law, they have been exempted from any benefits. There is a liberalizing provision in this bill which now would permit these men to be compensated under the veterans' laws. I understand there were only a small number of them. I am told that the number is about 1,500 men.

Mr. EVINS. As I understand it, the bill covers the subject of unemployment compensation, which is administered by the Department of Labor, and also the subject of mustering-out pay, which is administered by the Department of Defense. There were some recommendations in the Bradley report that veterans and nonveterans be all considered in one category and as one type of citizen and that the special veterans' considerations be eliminated. Does the gentleman, as a member of the subcommittee, assure the House today that this bill, H. R. 9700, does not embrace the Hoover Commission report or the Bradley Commission report recommendations?

Mr. SISK. I want to again assure the gentleman that there is no change whatsoever in the laws which he has mentioned. There is no part of either the Bradley Commission report or the Hoover Commission report incorporated in the present legislation.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would the gentleman state whether or not there is any language in this bill which would affect

the payment to non-service-connected veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict?

Mr. SISK. There is no change whatsoever. No; it would not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is there any language in this bill which would affect the privilege of free hospitalization?

Mr. SISK. None whatsoever.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In other words, as the gentleman stated a moment ago, there are no specific changes in existing laws providing benefits for veterans in this bill?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly correct. The one or two cases where there is a minor change constitute a liberalizing change insofar as the veterans are concerned; that is the one change which the gentleman mentioned a little bit ago. But, there is no case where there is any restriction of benefits to the veteran.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman be good enough to answer this question? There is no language in this bill which would in any way, shape, or form take any benefits away from the veterans of this country at the present time?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to be sure the record is correct and clear—the gentleman from Tennessee asked about the President's Commission on Veterans' Benefits, the so-called Bradley Commission. The Bradley Commission did recommend a codification of the veterans' laws. This bill is a consolidation of the various laws in this field.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the chairman of this great committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and say to the Members of the House that the work that has been done on this bill will be of tremendous benefit to every veteran and every veterans' organization in this country. It takes away no right whatsoever from any veteran and it does in a few instances liberalize the benefits to veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as you know last year the Congress enacted and the President approved a bill which became Public Law 85-56, which consolidated all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical and burial benefits, and most of the general administrative provisions pertaining to such laws.

The bill we are considering today incorporates all of the provisions of Public Law 85-56, and in addition will consolidate all of the other laws administered by the Veterans' Administration which were not included in the 1957 act. These include the laws covering education and training benefits for veterans and war orphans, vocational rehabilitation, loan guaranty, insurance, dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors, and Federal aid to State homes. Thus it will consolidate into one comprehensive act the many separate laws now pertaining to Federal benefits

for veterans and dependents. This should facilitate the administration of veterans' benefits by the Veterans' Administration, and greatly assist service officers, Members of Congress, and others who need to refer frequently to the laws relating to veterans.

The bill is essentially a restatement of existing law without any major substantive change. The few changes proposed are minor liberalizations to achieve uniformity. It will not adversely affect the basic entitlement of any veteran or dependent now on the rolls.

The Veterans' Administration and all of the major veterans' service organizations have endorsed the bill. Its enactment will achieve a most worthwhile objective which was accomplished in part by the enactment of Public Law 85-56, and I recommend its approval by the Members.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the index to H. R. 9700.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

#### INDEX

- Absence without leave: Section 105 (b).
- Accrued benefits:
  - Claims considered for: Section 3001 (b).
  - Definition: Section 3021 (a).
- Hospital, domiciliary, institutional care: Section 3203 (a) (2).
- Payment of: Sections 3021, 3022.
- Time limitation: Section 3021 (c).
- Active duty:
  - Definition: Sections 101 (21), 1602 (a) (10), 1801 (a) (3), 2101 (d).
  - Discharge, travel time: Section 106 (c).
  - Pay, concurrent payments: Section 3104 (c).
  - Provisional acceptance: Section 106 (b).
  - Active duty for training:
    - Defined: Section 101 (22).
    - Travel to or from: Section 106 (d).
  - Active military, naval, or air service, defined: Section 101 (24).
  - Adjunct treatment: Section 612 (b) (4).
  - Adjusted Payments Act of 1936, protected cases: Section 5514 (b).
  - Administrator:
    - Annual report: Section 214.
    - Appointment and salary, Section 210 (a).
    - Attorney General opinions: Section 211 (b).
    - Authority:
      - Act July 3, 1930, continuation: Section 5503.
      - Delegation of: Sections 212 (a), 1811 (g), 3311, 4202 (10).
      - General: Sections 210 (b), (c), 1761.
      - Issuance of subpoenas: Section 3311.
      - Regulations:
        - Continuation of: Section 5506.
        - Power to make: Sections 210 (c), 1743 (b).
      - Contracts, agreements for services: Section 213.
      - Courses, approval of: Sections 1622, 1642, 1653, 1654, 1723, 1733, 1735.
      - Decisions, finality of: Sections 108 (c), 211 (a), 785, 1820 (c), 5210.
      - Defined: Section 101 (1).
  - Laws, compile and publish: Section 215
  - Regulations, Administrator's:
    - Continuation of: Section 5506
    - Power to make: Sections 210 (c), 1743 (b).
    - Vocational rehabilitation: Sections 1505, 1508.
  - Reports:
    - Annual report to Congress: Section 214.
    - War orphans education, false and misleading statements: Section 1768.
    - Schools, approval of: Section 104.
    - Staff: Section 212 (b).
    - Uncompensated services, acceptance of: Section 213.
  - Adoption:
    - Child: Sections 101 (4), 701 (3).
    - Parent: Sections 101 (5), 701 (4).
    - Advisory committee: Sections 1662, 4112.
    - Affidavits, validity of: Section 3312.
    - Agents and attorneys:
      - Appeals: Section 4005 (c).
      - Fees: Sections 784 (g), 3402 (b) (1), 3403 (1), 3404 (c).
      - Penalties: Sections 3404 (b), 3405.
      - Power of attorney: Section 3402 (b) (2), 3403 (2).
    - Recognition of: Sections 3401-3404.
    - Retired service personnel: Section 3402 (c).
    - Suspension of: Section 3404 (b).
    - Aggravation, preexisting disability: Section 353.
    - Agreements, State: Sections 2001, 2002.
    - Air National Guard. (See National Guard.)
    - Alien:
      - Benefits, in enemy country: Sections 3108, 3109.
      - Faithful service: Section 3103 (c).
      - Allied Governments:
        - Service in forces of:
          - Citizens of United States: Section 109 (b)
          - Reciprocal benefits: Section 109 (a).
        - Amebiasis: Section 301.
        - Amendments: Section 5601.
        - American Experience Table of Mortality: Sections 702, 743.
        - American Legion, representatives of: Section 3402.
        - American National Red Cross, representatives of: Section 3402.
        - Anemia, primary: Section 301.
        - Annual report: Section 214.
        - Annuity table for 1949: Sections 722, 723.
        - Appeals:
          - Agents: Section 4005 (c) (1).
          - Application for: Section 4005.
          - Application rejected: Section 4003.
          - Board of Veterans: Section 4001.
          - By whom made: Section 4005 (c) (1).
          - Considered by Board of Veterans Appeals: Section 4004.
          - Date of filing: Section 4005 (c) (2).
          - Docketing: Section 4006.
          - Simultaneously contested claims: Section 4007.
          - Time limitations: Section 4005.
        - Appliances, prosthetic:
          - Fitting and training: Section 613.
          - Furnishing: Section 612.
        - Procurement: Sections 612 (d), 5013.
        - Research: Section 216.
        - Applications:
          - Appeals: Section 4005.
          - Benefits. (See particular benefit.)
          - Form furnished free: Section 3002.
          - Form, joint, VA and social security: Section 3001 (a).
          - Form prescribed: Sections 3001 (a), 5227.
          - Incomplete: Section 3003.
          - Multiple benefits, one application: Section 3001 (b).
          - Renouncement of benefits: Section 3106.
        - Apportionment:
          - Alien in enemy country: Section 3108 (c).
          - Benefits forfeited for treason: Section 3504 (b).
          - Benefits, generally: Section 3107.
          - Pension, penal institution, confinement: Section 505.
          - Suspended payments: Section 3202 (d).
          - Apprentice training: Sections 1651, 1723 (c).
    - Appropriations:
      - Availability, continuing: Section 5505.
      - Canteen Service: Section 4204.
      - Military and naval insurance. (See Insurance.)
      - National Service Life Insurance. (See Insurance.)
      - Research, prosthetic: Section 216 (c).
      - Approval of courses: Sections 1642, 1723, 1733, 1735.
      - Approval of schools: Section 104.
      - Armed Forces:
        - Definition: Section 101 (10).
        - Facilities, use of: Section 5003.
        - Reserve component, definition: Section 101 (27).
        - Reserves:
          - Active duty: Section 101 (21).
          - Active duty for training: Section 101 (22).
          - Defined: Section 101 (26).
          - Inactive duty, training: Section 101 (23).
          - Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945: Section 107 (b).
        - Arrests, crimes, VA facilities: Section 625.
        - Arteriosclerosis: Section 301.
        - Arthritis: Section 301.
        - Artificial limbs, furnishing of: Section 612 (d).
        - Assignments, allowed, prohibited: Sections 416 (e) (1), 718, 753, 1802 (c), 1816, 2104 (a), 3101.
        - Atrophy, progressive muscular: Section 301.
        - Attachment, exemption from: Sections 2104 (a), 3101.
        - Attendants, travel expenses: Section 111 (c).
        - Attorney General:
          - Compromise insurance suits: Section 784 (1).
        - Educational institutions listed under Executive Order 9835: Sections 1626, 1726.
        - Opinions of: Section 211 (b).
        - Attorney, power of: Sections 3402 (b) (2), 3403 (2).
        - Attorneys. (See Agents and attorneys.)
        - Attorneys, VA, travel expenses: Section 784 (d).
        - Authorized travel:
          - Active duty: Section 101 (21) (E).
          - Inactive-duty training: Section 101 (22) (D), 106 (c).
        - Automobiles:
          - Ability to operate: Section 1902.
          - Amount payable: Section 1901, 1902, 1903.
          - Eligibility for: Section 1901.
          - Limitation on number: Section 1904.
          - Manner of payments: Section 1903.
          - Time limitations: Section 1905.
        - Upkeep: Section 1902.
        - Awards:
          - Effective dates: Section 3010.
          - Increase, effective date: Section 3011.
          - Report or finding of death, effective date of award: Section 3010 (e).
          - Basic pay (see also Dependency and indemnity compensation):
            - Certification of: Section 421 (a).
            - Definition: Section 401 (1).
            - Basic service period, definition: Section 1602 (a) (1).
            - Bedridden permanently, special compensation rate: Section 314 (1).
          - Benefits:
            - Accrued: Sections 3021, 3022.
          - Alien, in enemy country: Sections 3108, 3109.
          - Allied forces, veterans: Section 109.
          - Apportionment of: Section 3107.
          - Assignment, allowed, prohibited: Sections 416 (e) (1), 718, 753, 3101 (a).
          - Bars to: Section 3103.
          - Citizens of United States, serving in allied forces: Section 109 (b).
          - Duplication, prohibited: Sections 315 (b), 416, 417, 1632 (h), 1762, 2008, 2104 (c), 3104, 3105.
          - Election:
            - Compensation, additional for dependents: Section 315 (b).
            - Dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 416.

- Retirement pay: Section 3105.  
 Unemployment compensation: Section 2008 (b) (c).  
 War orphans educational assistance: Section 1711 (c).  
 Women's Army Auxillary Corps: Section 106 (a) (2).  
 Entitlement, prior laws, continued: Sections 5511-5514.  
 Exemption from:  
 Attachment, levy, seizure: Section 3101.  
 Claims of creditors: Section 3101.  
 Taxation: Section 3101.  
 Forfeited, payment of: Sections 3503, 3504.  
 Forfeiture: Sections 711, 754, 1508, 2500 (b), 3503, 3504.  
 Fraudulent accepting or obtaining: Section 3502.  
 Minors and incompetents: Section 3202.  
 Misappropriation by fiduciaries: Section 3501.  
 Protected cases: Sections 5511-5514.  
 Renunciation of rights to: Section 3106.  
 Setoff, allowed, prohibited: Section 3101.  
 Social security, in lieu of: Section 412.  
 Waiver of overpayments: Sections 415 (f), 3102 (a).  
 Withheld:  
 Aliens in enemy country: Section 3108.  
 Restoration: Section 3109.  
 Blackwater fever: Section 301.  
 Blindness:  
 Compensation rates:  
 One eye, additional rate: Section 314 (k).  
 Two eyes, special rate:  
 Anatomical loss: Section 314 (n).  
 Regular aid and attendance: Section 314 (m).  
 Total combined with total deafness: Section 314 (o).  
 Visual acuity 5/200 or less: Section 314 (l).  
 Insurance: Section 714.  
 Mechanical or electronic equipment: Section 614.  
 Pension, regular aid and attendance: Section 502 (b).  
 Seeing-eye dog: Section 614.  
 Board of Veterans' Appeals:  
 Composition: Section 4001.  
 Creation: Section 4001.  
 Docketing of appeals: Section 4006.  
 Error, correction of: Section 4003.  
 Finality of decisions: Section 4004.  
 Jurisdiction of: 4004 (a).  
 Members:  
 Appointment, approval: Section 4001 (b).  
 Assignment: Section 4002.  
 Procedure: Section 4002.  
 Bond, unemployment compensation, dis-bursing officers: Section 2003 (e).  
 Boxer Rebellion. (Included in Spanish-American War.)  
 Brain:  
 Hemorrhage: Section 301.  
 Thrombosis: Section 301.  
 Bronchiectasis: Section 301.  
 Buerger's disease: 301.  
 Burden of proof, training travel: Section 106 (d).  
 Burial benefits:  
 Contract for services: Section 903 (c).  
 Death in VA facility: Section 903.  
 Eligibility: Section 902.  
 Flag: Section 901.  
 Limitations: Section 902 (b).  
 Prior laws, eligibility under: Section 905.  
 Reimbursement: Section 904.  
 Time limitation: Section 904.  
 Transportation of body: Sections 902, 903.  
 Buttocks, loss of, additional compensation, rate: Section 314 (k).  
 Cadets, active duty: Section 101 (21) (D).  
 Calculi of kidney, bladder, or gall bladder: Section 301.  
 Canteen Service, Veterans':  
 Accounts, audit of: Section 4207.  
 Appropriations: Section 4204.  
 Budget: Section 4206.  
 Canteens, establishment and operation: Section 4202 (1).  
 Checks, etc., cashing: Section 4202 (11).  
 Delegation of authority: Section 4202 (10).  
 Employees:  
 Condition of employment: Section 4202 (5).  
 Pay: Section 4202 (5).  
 Equipment, services, and utilities: Section 4202 (4).  
 Financing: Section 4204.  
 Fund, revolving: Sections 4204-4206.  
 Gifts, donations: Section 4202 (8).  
 Independent unit of VA: Section 4208.  
 Limitations on service: 4203.  
 Location of canteens: Section 4202 (1).  
 Prices: Section 4202 (7).  
 Purchase or sale without advertisement: Section 4202 (6).  
 Purpose: Section 4201.  
 Regulations: Section 4202 (9).  
 Space, buildings, and structures: Section 4202 (3).  
 Utilities, reimbursement for: Section 4202 (4).  
 Warehouse: and storage depots: Section 4202 (2).  
 Cardiovascular-renal disease: Section 301.  
 Certification:  
 Basic pay: Section 421 (a).  
 Death gratuity: Section 423.  
 Korean veterans, education: Section 1631 (c).  
 Records: Sections 3302 (b), 3303.  
 Social security: Section 422.  
 Unemployment compensation: Sections 2003 (c), 2003 (e).  
 War orphans' education: Sections 1731 (c), 1765 (b).  
 Checks:  
 Benefits paid by: Section 3020 (a).  
 Cancellation: Sections 3020 (c), 3022.  
 Cashed by Canteen Service: Section 4202 (11).  
 Delivery or nondelivery of: Sections 3020 (b), (c).  
 Forwarding permitted: Section 3020.  
 Child:  
 Approval of schools: Section 104.  
 Compensation, eligibility: Sections 321, 341.  
 Definition of: Sections 101 (4), 701 (3), 1702 (a) (2).  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation, eligibility: Sections 410, 416.  
 Pension:  
 Eligibility: Sections 533, 535, 537, 542, 544.  
 Income limitations: Section 545.  
 School attendance: Sections 101 (4) (c), 414 (c).  
 Cholera: Section 301.  
 Chronic diseases:  
 Defined: Section 301 (3).  
 Presumptions: Section 312.  
 Cirrhosis of liver: Section 301.  
 Citizens of United States, service in Allied forces: Section 109 (b).  
 Civil War widows and children: Sections 532, 533.  
 Claims:  
 Burden of proof, training travel: Section 106 (d).  
 Compensable status prior to this act: Section 352.  
 Confidential nature: Section 3301.  
 Creditors, exemption from: Sections 2104 (a), 3101.  
 Disallowance of: Sections 2002 (c), 3004.  
 Emergency officers' retirement: Section 5513.  
 False and misleading: Sections 1668, 1768.  
 Insurance:  
 Definition: Section 784 (h).  
 Denial: Section 784.  
 Multiple benefits, one application: Section 3001 (b).  
 Pending January 1, 1959: Section 5511.  
 Pensionable status prior to this act: Section 504.  
 Prior laws, receipt under: Sections 5512, 5513.  
 Receipt of benefits December 31, 1958: Section 5512.  
 Reopened: Section 3004.  
 Within year from discharge or death: Section 3010.  
 Clothing, furnishing of:  
 Employees, VA: Section 233 (1).  
 Indigent patients: Section 623.  
 Limitation: Section 623.  
 Special, prosthetic appliances: Sections 612 (d), 623.  
 Coast and Geodetic Survey:  
 Active duty, defined: Section 101 (21) (c).  
 Korean conflict veterans, education: Section 1602 (b).  
 Retired pay, waiver of: Section 3105.  
 Coast Guard, Armed Forces, inclusion in: Section 101 (10).  
 Coast Guard Reserve, temporary members: Sections 101 (22), 101 (23).  
 Coccidioidomycosis: Section 301.  
 Cohabited, 5 or more years: Section 103 (a).  
 Commissioner, definition: Section 1602 (a) (9).  
 Commissioners' 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Sections 722, 723.  
 Committee, advisory: Sections 1662, 4112.  
 Commitment proceedings, court costs: Section 3201.  
 Commonwealth Army Veteran, definition: Section 633 (1).  
 Compensable status:  
 At death: Section 402 (c) (2).  
 Persons heretofore having: Section 352.  
 Compensation:  
 Accrued benefits: Sections 3021, 3022.  
 Additional, dependents:  
 Election: Section 315 (b).  
 Peacetime: Section 335.  
 Wartime: Section 315 (a).  
 Apportionment of payments: Section 3107.  
 Approval of schools: Section 104.  
 Awards, effective date: Section 3010.  
 Chronic diseases: Sections 301, 312.  
 Claim for, filing: Section 3001.  
 Current payments: Section 3104.  
 Death:  
 After April 30, 1957, insurance waiver: Sections 321, 341, 417 (a).  
 Before January 1, 1957: Sections 321, 341, 416.  
 Child, eligibility: Sections 101 (4), 321, 341.  
 Claim considered for other benefits: Section 3001.  
 Election of dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 416.  
 From training, hospitalization, treatment or examination: Section 351.  
 Parent, eligibility: Sections 101 (5), 321, 341.  
 Wars prior to April 21, 1898: Section 343.  
 Widow, eligibility: Sections 101 (3), 103, 302, 321, 341.  
 Definition: Section 101 (13).  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation. (See Dependency and indemnity compensation.)  
 Disability:  
 Eligibility: Sections 310, 331.  
 Exceeding rate requirements: Section 314 (p).  
 Forfeited benefits payable to dependents: Section 3503 (b).  
 Hospital, domiciliary, institutional care: Section 3203.  
 Housing, specially adapted, eligibility: Section 801.  
 Injury from training, hospitalization treatment, or examination: Section 351.  
 Twenty-year ratings: Sections 110.  
 Discharge, type of: Sections 101 (2), 310, 331.  
 Discontinuance, effective date: Section 3012.  
 Disease, line of duty: Sections 105, 310, 321, 331, 341.  
 Election of benefits:  
 Additional for dependents: Section 315 (b).  
 Women's Army Auxillary Corps: Section 106 (a) (2).

Incompetent veteran, disappearance, payment to dependents: Section 358.  
 Increase, effective date: Section 3011.  
 Line of duty: Sections 105, 310, 321, 331, 341.  
 Misconduct bar: Sections 105, 310, 813 (a), 331, 351.  
 Peacetime service, eligibility: Sections 331, 341.  
 Period of war: Sections 101 (11), 301 (2).  
 Persons heretofore having compensable status: Sections 352.  
 Presumption. (See Presumption, this index.)  
 Protected cases:  
 Claims pending: Section 5511.  
 Claims within year from discharge or death: Section 3010.  
 Compensable status prior to this act: Section 352.  
 Prior laws, receipt under: Section 5512.  
 Basic pay defined: Section 401 (1).  
 Basic pay, increased, decreased: Section 421 (b).  
 Benefits, in lieu of social security: Section 412.  
 Certification:  
 Basic pay: Section 421 (a).  
 Costs: Section 422 (b).  
 Death gratuity: Section 423.  
 Regulations: Section 422 (c).  
 Social security: Section 422 (a).  
 Child:  
 Parent, more than one, same line: Section 3104 (b) (2).  
 Rates:  
 Age 18, helpless: Section 414 (a).  
 No widow: Sections 412, 413, 414 (a).  
 Servicemen's indemnity, restriction on payment of: Section 416 (e).  
 Claim considered for other benefits: Section 3001 (b).  
 Concurrent payments: Sections 416 (e), 3104.  
 Costs, certification, social security: Section 422 (b).  
 Death:  
 After April 30, 1957: Section 417.  
 After December 31, 1956: Section 410.  
 Before January 1, 1957: Section 416.  
 From training, hospitalization, treatment, or examination: Section 351.  
 Death gratuity, certification of: Section 423.  
 Definitions:  
 Basic pay: Section 401 (1).  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 101 (14).  
 Veteran: Section 401 (2).  
 Dependents entitled: Sections 410, 415, 416.  
 Discontinuances, effective dates: Section 3012.  
 Election (death before January 1, 1957): Rights of, limitations on: Section 416.  
 Eligibility, defined: Sections 410, 416.  
 Eligibility established:  
 Benefits, other barred: Section 417 (b).  
 Compensation, death, barred: Section 417 (b).  
 Employees' compensation, Federal barred: Section 417 (b).  
 Pension, death, barred: Section 417 (b).  
 Income of parents:  
 Exclusions: Section 415 (g).  
 Limitations: Section 415.  
 Reports: Section 415 (e).  
 Increases, effective dates: Section 3011.  
 Insurance premiums waived; restriction on payment of: Section 417 (a).  
 Marriage date, widow: Section 404.  
 Overpayment, to parent, disposition of: Section 415 (f).  
 Parent:  
 Eligibility: Sections 415 (a), 416.  
 Income of:  
 Exclusions: Section 415 (g).  
 Limitations: Section 415.  
 Reports: Section 415 (e).  
 Overpayment, disposition of: Section 415 (f).  
 Rates: Section 415.

Persons entitled: Section 410.  
 Rates:  
 Benefits in lieu of social security: Section 412.  
 Child, age 18, helpless: Section 414 (a), (b).  
 Child, no widow: Sections 413, 414 (a).  
 Parent: Sections 412, 415.  
 Widow, alone: Sections 411, 412.  
 Widow and children:  
 Child age 18 to 21 in school: Section 414 (c).  
 Child under age 18: Sections 411, 412.  
 Helpless child age 18 or over: Section 414 (b).  
 Reductions, effective dates: Section 3012.  
 Regulations, Administrator's power to make: Section 422 (c).  
 Renunciation of right to: Section 3106.  
 Reserve Officers' Training Corps:  
 Basic pay, computation of: Section 403.  
 Coverage, defined: Section 403.  
 Service, defined: Section 403.  
 Service-connection requirements: Section 410.  
 Servicemen's indemnity, restriction on payment of: Section 416 (e).  
 Social security:  
 Benefits in lieu of: Section 412.  
 Certification of: Section 422 (a).  
 Cost of certification: Section 422 (b).  
 Regulations by Administrator: Section 422 (c).  
 Veteran, defined: Section 401 (2).  
 Widow:  
 Defined: Section 404.  
 Eligibility: Section 404.  
 Marriage date: Section 404.  
 Rates:  
 Alone, no children: Sections 411, 412.  
 Child, age 18 to 21 in school: Section 414 (c).  
 Child under age 18: Sections 411, 412.  
 Helpless child age 18 or over: Section 414 (b).  
 Dependents:  
 Additional compensation for: Section 315.  
 Definition: Section 1602 (a) (5).  
 Parents: Section 102.  
 Desertion: Sections 105, 711.  
 Diabetes, mellitus: Section 301.  
 Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship: Section 1662.  
 Disability:  
 Chronic diseases: Sections 301, 312.  
 Definition, medical care: Section 601 (1).  
 Discharge, travel time: Section 106 (c).  
 Exceeding compensation rate requirements: Section 314 (p).  
 From training, hospitalization, treatment, or examination: Section 351.  
 Permanent and total:  
 Definition, pension: Section 502.  
 Housing: specially adapted: Section 801.  
 Non-service-connected: Section 521.  
 United States Government life insurance: Section 758.  
 Prior to acceptance for Federal service: Sections 106 (b), 402 (c) (1).  
 Rating schedule: Section 355.  
 Sound condition, presumption of: Sections 311, 332.  
 Specially compensated, combination of: Section 314 (o).  
 Specified, additional compensation: Section 314 (k).  
 Total:  
 Compensation rate: Section 314 (j).  
 Insurance. (See insurance.)  
 Training, travel time: Section 106 (d).  
 Tropical diseases: Sections 301, 312, 333.  
 Twenty-year ratings: Section 110.  
 Waiver of, insurance: Sections 722, 757 (d), 759 (a), 781 (a).  
 Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: Section 106 (a).  
 Disabled American Veterans, representatives of: Section 3402.  
 Disagreement, insurance, definition: Section 784 (h).

Disappearance:  
 Death presumed: Section 108.  
 Incompetent veteran: Section 358.  
 Disbursing officers:  
 Bonded: Section 2003 (e).  
 Nonliability of: Sections 2003 (g), 3102 (b).  
 Discharge:  
 Bars to benefits: Section 3103.  
 Definition: Section 101 (18).  
 General requirement: Section 101 (2).  
 Retirement includes: Section 101 (18).  
 Surgeon's certificate of disability: Section 532 (c).  
 Travel time after: Section 106 (c).  
 Type required: Sections 101 (2), 310, 331, 410 (b), 722.  
 Disclosure, information: Section 3301.  
 Domiciliary care (included in hospital, domiciliary, medical care):  
 Dracontiasis: Section 301.  
 Draft, disability prior to rejection: Section 106 (b).  
 Duty with the Armed Forces, definition: Section 1702 (a) (3).  
 Dysentery: Section 301.  
 Education:  
 Agreement to report: Section 104.  
 Approval of schools: Section 104.  
 Program of, defined: Section 1702 (a) (5).  
 Protected cases: Section 5514.  
 Reports of attendance: Section 104.  
 Termination of attendance: Section 104.  
 Education and training allowance, accrued amounts: Sections 3021, 3022.  
 Education—Korean conflict veterans:  
 Accredited courses. (See Courses.)  
 Active duty, definition: Section 1602 (a) (10).  
 Administrator:  
 Application, approval: Section 1621.  
 Conflict of interest, employees, waiver of: Section 1664 (b).  
 Counseling: Section 1661 (b).  
 Courses, approval of: Section 1642.  
 Education and training allowances, discontinuance of: Section 1656 (b).  
 Educational institutions, disapproval of: Section 1634.  
 Foreign training, denial or discontinuance: Section 1620.  
 Information, employment opportunities, dissemination: Section 1661 (b).  
 Office of Education, use of: Section 1644.  
 Program, approval of changes: Section 1622 (b).  
 State and local agencies, reimbursement: Section 1645.  
 State approving agencies:  
 Authority to act as: Section 1641.  
 Duty to cooperate with: Section 1643.  
 Travel expenses: Section 111.  
 Use of other agencies by: Section 1644.  
 Waiver, conflict of interest, employees: Section 1664 (d).  
 Advisory committee: Section 1662.  
 Applications:  
 Apprentice or other training on the job: Section 1651.  
 Course, approval of:  
 Accredited: Section 1653.  
 Nonaccredited: Section 1654.  
 Program of education or training: Section 1621.  
 Apprentice training:  
 Approval of: Section 1651 (b).  
 Education and training allowances for: Section 1632 (c).  
 Full-time, definition of: Section 1633 (b).  
 Attorney General, list under Executive Order 9835: Section 1626.  
 Avocational and recreational training: Section 1623 (b).  
 Basic service period, definition: Section 1602 (a) (1).  
 Certifications, receipt of allowances: Section 1631 (c).  
 Claims, false or misleading: Section 1668.  
 Coast and Geodetic Survey, commissioned officers: Section 1602 (b).

- Commissioner of Education:  
Accredited institutions, listing of: Section 1653 (a).  
Advisory committee, member of: Section 1662 (a).  
Definition of: Section 1602 (a) (9).  
Conflicting interests:  
Penalties: Section 1664 (a).  
Waiver of: Section 1664 (d).  
Control by agencies of United States: Section 1663.  
Correspondence schools:  
Allowances when training exclusively in: Section 1632 (e).  
Charges against entitlement for training in: Section 1611 (c).  
Counseling: Section 1661 (b).  
Courses:  
Accredited: Section 1653.  
Apprentice: Sections 1633 (b), 1651.  
Approval of: Section 1642 (a).  
Avocational and recreational, prohibited: Section 1623 (b).  
Definition of: Section 1602 (a) (4).  
Disapproval of: Section 1656.  
Full-time: Section 1633.  
Institutional on-farm training: Section 1652.  
Nonaccredited: Section 1654.  
Nonveteran enrollment required: Section 1623 (c).  
Notice of approval: Section 1655.  
On-the-job training: Section 1651.  
Standards for approval: Sections 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654.  
Definitions:  
Active duty: Sections 1602 (a) (10).  
Basic service period: Section 1602 (a) (1).  
Commissioner: Section 1602 (a) (9).  
Course: Section 1602 (a) (4).  
Dependent: Section 1602 (a) (5).  
Educational institution: Section 1602 (a) (6).  
Eligible veteran: Section 1062 (a) (2).  
Full-time training: Section 1633 (b).  
Program of education or training: Section 1602 (a) (3).  
State: Section 1602 (a) (8).  
Training establishment: Section 1602 (a) (7).  
Dependent, definition: Section 1602 (a) (5).  
Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship: Section 1662.  
Education and training allowances:  
Apprentice training: Section 1632 (c).  
Ceilings, allowance and income, on-job training: Section 1632 (c).  
Certifications required: Section 1631 (c).  
Computation of:  
Correspondence training: Section 1632 (e).  
Flight training: Section 1632 (g).  
Institutional training:  
Combined with on-job training: Section 1632 (b).  
Less than one-half time: Section 1632 (f).  
One-half time or more: Section 1632 (a).  
Discontinuance of: Sections 1624, 1656 (b).  
Duplicate benefits prohibited: Section 1632 (h).  
On-farm training: Section 1632 (d).  
On-job training: Section 1632 (c).  
Period for which payment authorized, Section 1631.  
Purpose: Section 1631.  
Reduction formula: Section 1632 (c), (d).  
Time of payment: Section 1631 (c).  
Educational and vocational counseling: Section 1661 (b).  
Educational institutions:  
Allowances to, for reports and certifications: Section 1665 (b).  
Certifications to be made by: Section 1631 (c).  
Courses, approval of: Sections 1653, 1654.  
Definition of: Section 1602 (a) (6).  
Disapproval of: Section 1634.  
Disapproval of courses in: Sections 1656, 1664 (c).  
Listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835: Section 1626.
- Overcharges by: Section 1634.  
Overpayments to veterans, liability for: Section 1666.  
Pecuniary relationship with Federal and State employees, penalties for: Section 1664.  
Records, availability for examination: Section 1667.  
Reports to be made by: Section 1665.  
Eligible veteran, definition of: Section 1602 (a) (2).  
Employees, conflict of interest: Section 1664.  
Enrollment, denial of:  
Attorney General's list: Section 1626.  
Foreign training: Section 1620.  
Minimum nonveteran requirement: Section 1623 (c).  
Two-year operation rule: Section 1625.  
Entitlement:  
Ceiling on aggregate use of: Section 1611 (a).  
Charge against:  
Correspondence training: Section 1611 (c).  
Flight training: Section 1632 (g).  
Extension of period of: Section 1611 (b).  
Generally: Section 1610.  
Maximum: Section 1611 (a).  
Service excluded in computing: Section 1611 (a).  
Executive Order 9835: Section 1626.  
False or misleading statements: Section 1668.  
Federal Trade Commission:  
Cease and desist orders of: Section 1654 (c) (10).  
Information to be furnished by: Section 1669.  
Foreign educational institutions, training in: Section 1620.  
Full-time courses, criteria for: Section 1633.  
Full-time training, definition: Section 1633.  
General Accounting Office: Section 1661 (a).  
Initiating a program, time limitation: Section 1612.  
Institutional on-farm training:  
Allowances while pursuing: Section 1632 (d).  
Approval of: Section 1652.  
Nonaccredited course:  
Approval of: Section 1654.  
Permissible absences while pursuing: Section 1631 (b) (2).  
Required nonveteran enrollment in: Section 1623 (c).  
Nonveteran enrollment, requirement of: Section 1623 (c).  
Office of Education:  
Authorization of appropriations to: Section 1644 (b).  
Utilization of: Section 1644.  
On-job training:  
Approval of: Section 1651 (b).  
Education and training allowances for: Section 1632 (c).  
Income ceiling: Section 1632 (c).  
Overcharges by educational institutions: Section 1634.  
Overpayments to veterans, liability for: Section 1666.  
Payments:  
Educational institutions: Section 1665 (b).  
State and local agencies: Section 1645.  
Veterans (see also Education and training allowances): Section 1632.  
Policy, statement of: Section 1601.  
Program of education or training:  
Approval of: Section 1621.  
Change of: Section 1622.  
Continuous pursuit of: Section 1612 (b).  
Defined: Section 1602 (a) (3).  
Discontinuance of (unsatisfactory progress): Section 1624.  
Initiation of: Section 1612.  
Limitation, foreign training: Section 1620.  
Selection of: Section 1620.  
Suspension of: Section 1612 (b).  
Time limitations: Sections 1612, 1613.
- Public Health Service, commissioned officers: Section 1602 (b).  
Records, examination of: Section 1667.  
Reduction formula, education and training allowances: Section 1632 (c) (d).  
Reimbursement to States: Section 1645.  
Reports:  
Disapproval of courses: Section 1656 (c).  
Educational institutions: Section 1665 (a).  
False and misleading statements: Section 1668.  
Review of payments: Section 1661 (a).  
Standards for approval: Sections 1651-1654.  
State approving agency:  
Approval of courses by:  
Generally: Section 1642.  
Standards for: Sections 1651-1654.  
Authority of Administrator to act as: Section 1641 (b).  
Conflicting interest of employees, forbidden: Section 1664.  
Cooperation with Administrator: Section 1643.  
Designation: Section 1641.  
Disapproval of courses by: Sections 1656, 1664 (c).  
Notification of actions to be made by: Sections 1655, 1656.  
Reimbursement for expenses to: Section 1645.  
State:  
Definition: Section 1602 (a) (8).  
Reimbursement to: Section 1645.  
Statements, false or misleading: Section 1668.  
Subversive schools: Section 1626.  
Time limitations: Sections 1612, 1613.  
Training establishment, definition: Section 1602 (a) (7).  
Two-year operations rule: Section 1625.  
Unsatisfactory progress, discontinuance for: Section 1624.  
Use of agencies other than VA: Section 1644.  
Waiver, conflicting interests: Section 1664 (d).  
Education—war orphans:  
Administrator:  
Approval:  
Application: Sections 1713, 1721, 1725, 1735 (c).  
Program, changes of: Section 1722.  
Authority, general: Section 1761.  
Authority with respect to special restorative training: Section 1743.  
Counseling, educational and vocational: Section 1761 (b).  
Defrayal of eligible person's traveling expenses by: Section 111.  
Determination of need for special restorative training by: Section 1741.  
Disapproval of enrollment by: Sections 1723, 1725, 1726.  
Discontinuance of allowances by: Sections 1724, 1736.  
Processing of applications by: Section 1714.  
Regulations: Section 1743 (b).  
Reports of false and misleading statements: Section 1768.  
Use of other agencies by: Section 1761 (c).  
Waiver of conflicting interests provision by: Section 1764 (b).  
Waiver of recovery of overpayments: Section 3102.  
Advisory Committee: Section 1662.  
Age limits: Section 1712.  
Allowances (See Educational Assistance.)  
Applications:  
Approval of: Sections 1713, 1721.  
Benefits: Section 1713.  
Processing of: Section 1714.  
Submission of: Section 1713.  
Apprentice training, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
Approval of courses: Section 1735.  
Attorney General, list under Executive Order 9835: Section 1726.  
Avocational and recreational training, prohibited: Section 1723 (a) (2).

Bartending courses, prohibited: Section 1723 (a) (1).  
 Benefits, nonduplication of: Section 1762.  
 Certification:  
   Payment for: Section 1765 (b).  
   Required for receipt of educational assistance allowance: Section 1731 (c).  
   Child, defined: Section 1702 (a) (2).  
   Conflicting interests: Section 1764.  
   Control by agencies of United States: Section 1763.  
   Correspondence courses, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
   Counseling, educational and vocational: Section 1761 (b).  
   Courses:  
     Approval of: Section 1735.  
     Disapproval of enrollment in: Section 1723.  
     Failure to meet standards: Section 1736.  
     Measurement of: Section 1733.  
     Period of operation for: Section 1725.  
   Dancing courses, prohibited: Section 1723 (a) (1).  
   Definition:  
     Child: Section 1702 (a) (2).  
   Duty with the Armed Forces: Section 1702 (a) (3).  
   Educational institution: Section 1702 (a) (6).  
   Eligible person: Section 1702 (a) (1).  
   Guardian: Section 1702 (a) (4).  
   Program of education: Section 1702 (a) (5).  
   Special restorative training: Section 1702 (a) (7).  
   State: Section 1702 (a) (8).  
   Duty with the Armed Forces:  
     Definition of: Section 1702 (a) (3).  
     Effect of: Section 1712.  
   Educational assistance:  
     Application:  
       Approval: Sections 1713, 1721.  
       Processing: Section 1714.  
       Submission of: Section 1713.  
       Duration of: Section 1711.  
     Duty with the Armed Forces, effect of: Section 1712.  
   Eligibility and entitlement generally: Section 1710.  
   Periods of eligibility for: Section 1712.  
   Educational assistance allowances:  
     Certification required: Section 1731 (c).  
     Computation of: Section 1732.  
   Discontinuance of: Sections 1724, 1726, 1736.  
   Period for which payment authorized: Section 1731 (b).  
   Purpose of: Section 1731 (a).  
   Time of payment: Section 1731 (c).  
   Educational and vocational counseling: Section 1761 (b).  
   Educational institutions:  
     Allowance to, for reports and certification: Section 1765 (b).  
     Approval of courses offered by: Section 1735.  
   Availability of records for examination: Section 1767.  
   Certification to be made by: Section 1731 (c).  
   Definition of: Section 1702 (a) (6).  
   Disapproval of: Section 1734.  
   Liability for overpayments: Section 1766.  
   Listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835: Section 1726.  
   Overcharges by: Section 1734.  
   Pecuniary relationship with Veterans' Administration employees: Section 1764.  
   Reports by: Section 1765 (a).  
   Educational plan: Section 1720.  
   Election of benefits: Section 1711 (c).  
   Eligibility:  
     Generally: Section 1710.  
     Periods of: Section 1712.  
   Eligible person:  
     Definition of: Section 1702 (a) (1).  
     Designation in lieu of parent or guardian: Section 1702 (c).  
   Status under act after attainment of majority: Section 1702 (b).

Entitlement:  
   Duration of: Section 1711.  
   Periods of: Section 1712.  
   Enrollment, denial of: Section 1723, 1726.  
   Employee VA, conflict-of-interest waiver: 1764 (b).  
   Examination of records: Section 1767.  
   Executive Order 9835: Section 1726.  
   False or misleading statements: 1768.  
   Flight training, conditions for enrollment in: Section 1723 (b).  
   Foreign training, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
   General Accounting Office: Section 1761 (a).  
   Guardian:  
     Application by: Section 1713.  
     Definition of: 1702 (a) (4).  
     Designation of some other person for: Section 1702 (c).  
   Development of educational plan by: Section 1720.  
   Payment of allowances on behalf of eligible person: Sections 1731 (a), 1742 (a).  
   Request for special restorative training: Section 1741 (a).  
   Institutional on-farm training, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
   Nonduplication of benefits: Section 1762.  
   On-job training, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
   Overcharges by educational institutions: Section 1734.  
   Overpayments:  
     Liability of educational institutions: Section 1766.  
   Parent:  
     Application, by: Section 1713.  
     Death when child age 18 to 23, extension of entitlement: Section 1712 (a) (2) (C).  
     Development of educational plan by: Section 1720.  
     Designation of some other person for: Section 1702 (c).  
     Payment of allowances on behalf of eligible person: Sections 1731 (a), 1742 (a).  
     Request for special restorative training: Section 1741 (a).  
   Service requirement: Section 1702 (a) (1).  
   Payments:  
     Educational assistance allowance: Section 1731.  
     Educational institutions: Section 1765 (b).  
     Review by GAO: Section 1761 (a).  
     Special training allowance: Section 1742.  
   Personality development courses prohibited: Section 1723 (a) (1).  
   Policy, statement of: Section 1701.  
   Program of education:  
     Approval of: Section 1721.  
     Change of: Section 1722.  
     Definition of: Section 1702 (a) (5).  
     Development of: Section 1720.  
     Selection of: Section 1720.  
   Radio course, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).  
   Records, examination of: Section 1767.  
   Reduction of entitlement: Section 1711 (b).  
   Reports:  
     Educational institutions: Section 1765 (a).  
     False or misleading statements: Section 1768.  
   Review of payments: Section 1761 (a).  
   Secondary school courses, conditions for enrollment in: Section 1723 (d).  
   Service connection, criteria applicable to: Section 1702 (a) (1).  
   Special restorative training:  
     Allowances for: Section 1742.  
     Content of: Section 1741 (a).  
     Definition of: Section 1702 (a) (7).  
     Duration of: Section 1741 (b).  
     Entitlement to: Section 1741.  
     Purpose of: Section 1740.  
   Special administrative provision applicable to: Section 1743.  
   Special training allowance: Section 1742.  
   State, definition of: Section 1702 (a) (8).  
   Subversive schools: Section 1726.  
   Television course, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).

Tuition and fees:  
   Overcharges: Section 1734 (a).  
   Permissible charges for: Section 1743 (a).  
   Two-year operation rule: Section 1725.  
   Unsatisfactory progress, discontinuance for: Section 1724.  
   Use of agencies other than VA: Section 1761 (c).  
   Vocational rehabilitation, election of: Section 1711 (c).  
   Waiver, conflict of interest, VA employee: Section 1764 (b).  
   Educational institution:  
     Defined: Sections 1602 (a) (6), 1702 (a) (6).  
   Disapproval of: Section 1634.  
   Listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835: Sections 1626, 1726.  
   Effective date this act: Section 5501.  
   Effective dates of awards: Section 3010.  
   Election:  
     Compensation:  
       Additional for dependents: Section 315 (b).  
       Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: Section 106 (a) (2).  
       Dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 416.  
       Retirement pay: Section 3105.  
       Unemployment compensation: Section 2008 (b) (c).  
       War orphans educational assistance: Section 1711 (c).  
     Eligible person, definition: Section 1702 (a) (1).  
     Eligible veteran, definition: Section 1602 (a) (2).  
   Embezzlement: Section 3501.  
   Emergency hospitalization: Section 611 (b).  
   Emergency officers retirement:  
     Apportionment of payments: Section 3107.  
     Protected cases: Section 5513.  
   Employees' compensation, Federal:  
     Canteen Service employees: Section 4202 (5).  
     Duplication prohibited: Sections 416, 417 (b).  
   Women's Army Auxiliary Corps Service: Section 106 (a) (2).  
   Employees, State, employment service for veterans:  
     Assignment of: Section 2012.  
     Qualifications of: Section 2012.  
   Employees, VA:  
     Association meetings, expense of attendance: Section 4113 (a).  
     Canteen Service, use of: Section 4203.  
     Conflict of interest: Sections 1664, 1764.  
     Consultants: Sections 217 (b), 1503.  
     Garages: Section 5004.  
     Military installations: Section 231.  
     Recreational facilities: Section 233 (3).  
     Subpenaed to attend trials, leave: Section 784 (f).  
     Telephones, medical officers: Section 234.  
     Training: Sections 235, 1511, 4113 (b), (d).  
     Transportation of schoolchildren: Section 233 (2).  
     Travel expenses: Sections 285 (c), 784 (d), 1511 (b), 4113.  
     Wearing apparel, furnish and launder: Section 233 (1).  
   Witness fees: Section 784 (e).  
   Employees, veterans' employment representative: Section 2011.  
   Employment service for veterans:  
     Administration, funds for: Section 2014.  
     Cooperation, Federal agencies: Section 2013.  
     Definition, veteran: Section 2015.  
   Employees, State:  
     Assignment of: Section 2012.  
     Qualifications of: Section 2012.  
   Employment placement: Section 2010.  
   Expenses, administrative: Section 2014.  
   Federal agencies, cooperation of: Section 2013.  
   Funds, administrative: Section 2014.  
   Job counseling: Section 2010.  
   Purpose of: Section 2010.  
   State representatives: Section 2011.

- Veteran, definition of: Section 2015.  
 Encephalitis lethargica residuals: Section 301.  
 Endocarditis: Section 301.  
 Endocrinopathies: Section 301.  
 Enemy:  
 Assisting: Section 3504.  
 Country, alien beneficiary in: Sections 3108, 3109.  
 Epilepsies: Section 301.  
 Equipment, recreational: Section 233 (3).  
 Escheat: Sections 716 (e), 717 (d), 750, 3202 (d).  
 Estates:  
 Insurance payments: Sections 710, 716 (e), 717 (c), (d), 747, 750, 754.  
 Safeguarding of: Section 3202.  
 Evidence:  
 Affidavits, validity of: Section 3312.  
 False or fraudulent: Sections 787, 2005, 3503.  
 Medical and lay: Section 354.  
 Examinations:  
 Hospital care incident to: Section 611 (a).  
 Insurance: Sections 748, 782.  
 Travel expenses: Section 111.  
 Executive Order 9835: Sections 1626, 1726.  
 Exhibits, visual: Section 233 (4).  
 Expenses:  
 Association meetings, attendance of: Section 4113 (a).  
 Commitment proceedings: Section 3201.  
 Employment service for veterans, administrative: Section 2014.  
 Fiduciaries, courts, etc.: Section 3202 (c).  
 Insurance administration: Section 782.  
 Travel. (See Travel expenses.)  
 Extrahazardous service:  
 Compensation: Sections 336, 343.  
 Insurance. (See Insurance.)  
 Extremities, loss:  
 Housing, specially adapted: Section 801.  
 Natural elbow or knee action prevented, disability compensation: Section 314 (m).  
 Prosthetic appliance use prevented, disability compensation: Section 314 (n).  
 Eye. (See Blindness.)  
 Facilities, VA, definition of: Sections 601 (4), 5001 (f), 5209.  
 False and misleading statements: Sections 1668, 1768.  
 Father, defined: Section 701 (4).  
 Federal agencies, cooperation, States:  
 Employment service for veterans: Section 2013.  
 Unemployment compensation: Section 2004 (a).  
 Federal employees' compensation. (See Employees' compensation, Federal.)  
 Federal farm-loan banks: Section 755 (b).  
 Federal Trade Commission, education, Korean-conflict veterans: Section 1669.  
 Fees:  
 Agents and attorneys: Sections 784 (g), 3402 (b), 3403 (1), 3404 (c).  
 Certification of records: Section 3302 (b).  
 Copies of records: Section 3302 (b).  
 Particular claims: Section 3403 (1).  
 Penalties: Sections 3404 (b), 3405.  
 Representatives of organizations: Section 3402 (b) (1).  
 Witness: Sections 784 (e), 3311.  
 Feet, loss:  
 Compensation: Section 314 (1).  
 Insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Fiduciaries:  
 Accounting required: Section 3202 (b).  
 Cases, numbers of: Section 3202 (a).  
 Duties, improperly executed: Section 3202 (b).  
 Expenses, appointment, etc.: Section 3202 (c).  
 General: Section 3202.  
 Legal custodians: Section 3202 (a).  
 Litigation, court appearances: Section 3202 (b).  
 Misappropriation, embezzlement: Section 3501.  
 Suspension of payments: Section 3202 (b).  
 Filariasis: Section 301.
- Finality of decisions: Sections 108 (c), 211 (a), 785, 5210.  
 Fire, loss of personal effects: Section 626.  
 Flag to drape casket: Section 901.  
 Foot and eye or hand, loss:  
 Compensation: Section 314 (1).  
 Insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Foot, loss, additional compensation: Section 314 (k).  
 Forfeiture:  
 Certain benefits payable: Sections 2005 (b), 3503, 3504.  
 False evidence: Sections 2005, 3503.  
 Fraud: Sections 2005, 3503.  
 Insurance: Sections 711, 754.  
 Offenses under repealed laws: Section 5502.  
 Treason, mutiny, etc.: Section 711, 3504.  
 Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1508.  
 Fraud:  
 Benefits, accepting or obtaining: Sections 2005, 3502.  
 Forfeiture of benefits: Section 3503.  
 Insurance: Sections 110, 710, 787.  
 Twenty-year ratings, reduction: Section 110.  
 Full-time training, defined: Section 1633.  
 Funds:  
 Employment service for veterans: Section 2014.  
 General Post. (See general post fund.)  
 Incompetent beneficiaries: Section 3204.  
 National Service Life Insurance: Sections 720, 721, 724 (b), 786, 3102 (c).  
 Patient's personal: Section 3204.  
 Revolving:  
 Canteen service: Sections 4204, 4205.  
 Loans, direct: Section 1823.  
 Service-disabled veterans' insurance: Section 722.  
 Supply: Section 5011.  
 Veterans' special term insurance: Section 723.  
 Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1507.  
 Unemployment compensation: Section 2003.  
 United States Government Life Insurance: Sections 724 (b), 755, 757, 786, 3102 (c).  
 Funeral expenses:  
 Death in VA facility: Section 903.  
 Eligibility: Section 902.  
 Funeral services, contracts for: Section 903 (c).  
 General Accounting Office:  
 Accrued benefits, payment of: Section 3022.  
 Audit and review, payments, education: Sections 1661 (a), 1761 (a).  
 General Post Fund:  
 Assets:  
 Residual: Section 5224.  
 Sale of: Section 5222.  
 Claims: Sections 5202 (e), 5223, 5226.  
 Death while inmate, VA facility: Section 5220.  
 Disbursements: Sections 5202 (d), 5223.  
 Gifts, devises, and bequests: Sections 5102, 5104.  
 Investment: Section 5228.  
 Property left or found: Section 5202 (d).  
 Gifts, devises, bequests: Sections 4202 (8), 5001 (d), 5005, 5006, 5101-5105.  
 Guaranty of loans. (See loans.)  
 Guardian:  
 Defined: Section 1702 (a) (4).  
 Payments to and supervision of: Section 3202.  
 Hand and eye or foot, loss:  
 Compensation: Section 314 (1).  
 Insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Hands, loss:  
 Compensation: Section 314 (1).  
 Insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Hansen's disease (leprosy): Sections 301, 3203 (d).  
 Hearing, loss:  
 Compensation: Section 315 (o).  
 Insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Hodgkin's disease: Section 301.  
 Hospital care, defined: Section 601 (5).  
 Hospital, domiciliary and medical care:  
 Adjunct treatment: Section 612 (b) (4).  
 Allied forces, veterans: Section 109 (a).  
 Applications, notice re assets, disposition: Section 5227.  
 Apportionment of benefits during: Section 3107.  
 Arrests for crimes on reservations: Section 625.  
 Basic authority: Sections 610-612.  
 Benefits during: Section 3203.  
 Clothing, furnishing of: Section 623.  
 Commitment proceedings: Section 3217.  
 Contracts for: Sections 109 (d) (2), 601 (4), 5003.  
 Death benefits withheld, payment: Section 3203 (a) 2.  
 Definitions:  
 Disability: Section 601 (1).  
 Domiciliary care: Section 601 (7).  
 Hospital care: Section 601 (5).  
 Medical services: Section 601 (6).  
 VA facilities: Section 601 (4).  
 Veteran of any war: Section 601 (2).  
 Dental:  
 Appliances: Section 612 (c), (d).  
 Outpatient care: Section 612 (b).  
 Domiciliary care, defined: Section 610 (7).  
 Eligibility: Sections 610-612, 622, 627.  
 Emergencies: Section 611 (b).  
 Hansen's disease (leprosy): Sections 301, 3203 (d).  
 Inability to defray expenses: Sections 610, 622.  
 Incompetency, benefits withheld, payment: Section 3203 (b).  
 Loss of personal effects by fire: Section 626.  
 Mechanical, electronic equipment for the blind: Section 614.  
 Outside United States: Section 624.  
 Persons eligible under prior laws: Section 627.  
 Philippines:  
 Construction of hospitals in: Section 631.  
 Definitions:  
 Commonwealth Army: Section 633 (1).  
 Service-connected disability: Section 633 (2).  
 Presidential authority: Section 631.  
 Regulatory authority: Section 632.  
 Procedure: Section 621.  
 Prosthetic appliances:  
 Fitting and training: Section 613.  
 Furnishing: Section 612.  
 Psychosis, presumption of service connection: Section 602.  
 Recreational facilities: Section 233 (3).  
 Reduction of benefits: Section 3203.  
 Regulations: Section 621.  
 Rules: Section 621.  
 Seeing-eye dogs: Section 614.  
 Spanish-American War veterans outpatient care: Section 612 (b) (5), (e).  
 State homes, payments to: Sections 641-643.  
 Statement under oath: Section 622.  
 Termination against medical advice: Section 3203 (a) (1).  
 Tobacco, furnishing of: Section 615.  
 Travel: Section 111.  
 Vocational rehabilitation trainees: Section 1506.  
 Hospital, domiciliary, and medical facilities:  
 Armed Forces facilities, use of: Section 5003.  
 Construction and repair: Section 5002.  
 Contracts for: Sections 109 (a) (2), 601 (4), 5003.  
 Defined: Sections 601 (4), 5001 (f), 5209.  
 Easements or rights-of-way: Section 5014.  
 Estates, decedents, jurisdiction: Section 5208.  
 Fireproof construction: Section 5001 (b).  
 Garages: Section 5004.  
 Gifts, donations: Sections 5001 (d), 5005, 5006, 5101-5105.  
 Lease of: Section 5012 (a).  
 Location: Section 5001 (c).  
 Property:  
 Acceptance of: Section 5005.  
 Decedent's personal. (See Property.)  
 Unclaimed. (See Property.)

Provision of: Sections 5001 (a), 5001 (e), 5002, 5003, 5012 (b).  
 Recreational facilities: Section 233 (3).  
 Housing loans. (See Loans.)  
 Housing, specially adapted:  
 Administrator's powers and limitations: Sections 801, 802.  
 Claims pending on effective date of act: Section 5511.  
 Disability required: Section 801.  
 Dwelling need of veteran, suitability to: Section 801.  
 Eligibility: Section 801.  
 Income and expenses of veteran, relation to: Section 801.  
 Liability of Government: Section 805.  
 Limitation: Sections 801, 802.  
 Maximum amount of assistance: Section 802.  
 Medical feasibility: Section 801.  
 Optional plans: Section 802.  
 Other housing benefits, relationship: Section 804.  
 Plans and specifications furnished: Section 803.  
 Hypertension (cardiovascular-renal disease): Section 301.  
 Illegitimate child: Sections 101 (4), 701 (3).  
 Inactive duty training:  
 Defined: Section 101 (23).  
 Travel to or from: Section 106 (d).  
 Income limitations:  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation: Sections 415 (b), (c), (d).  
 Pension: Sections 503, 522, 545.  
 Incompetents:  
 Benefits withheld, payment: Section 3203 (b).  
 Commitment: Section 3201.  
 Disappearance: Section 358.  
 Insurance: Sections 783, 784 (b).  
 Payments, to whom made: Section 3202.  
 Payments while institutionalized: Section 3203 (b).  
 Service-disabled veterans' insurance: Section 722.  
 Indemnity, servicemen's, assignment allowed: Section 3101 (a).  
 Index, authority for: Section 5507.  
 Indian wars, period of: Sections 501 (1), 601 (3).  
 Information:  
 Disclosure of: Section 3301.  
 Employment opportunities, dissemination of: Section 1661 (b).  
 Injury from training, hospitalization, treatment or examination: Section 351.  
 Injury, preexisting, aggravation of: Section 353.  
 Inspection of records: Section 3301 (7).  
 Inspections:  
 Insurance: Section 782.  
 State homes: Section 642 (a).  
 Insurance:  
 Insurance of loans (see Loans.)  
 National service life:  
 Administrative cost: Section 782.  
 Administrator's decisions, finality: Section 785.  
 Adoption:  
 Child: Section 701 (3).  
 Parent through: Section 701 (4).  
 Age:  
 Attained age, term premiums: Section 705.  
 Limitations:  
 Disability income: Section 715.  
 Premium waiver: Section 712 (a).  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 702.  
 Amount: Section 703.  
 Annuity table for 1949: Sections 722, 723.  
 Application for:  
 Replacement: Section 781.  
 Service disabled: Section 722.  
 Total disability income: Section 715.  
 Total disability waiver: Section 712.  
 Appropriation: Sections 719, 722, 723, 724 (b), 3102 (c).  
 Assignments: Sections 718, 3101.  
 Automatic renewal, term: Section 705.

Bars to benefits, inapplicable: Section 3103 (d).  
 Beneficiaries:  
 Assignments of interest: Section 718.  
 Cash value, death lawful punishment: Section 711.  
 Change by insured: Section 717 (a).  
 Designated, insured not survived: Sections 716 (d), 717 (d).  
 Designation by insured: Section 717 (a).  
 Designation not made: Sections 716 (d), 717 (d).  
 Estates, payments to: Sections 716 (e), 717 (c), (d).  
 Incompetents, optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Installments unpaid at death: Section 716 (d), (e).  
 Minors, optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Order of: Section 716 (b), (d).  
 Permitted class: Section 716 (b).  
 Premium waiver, right to apply for: Section 712 (c).  
 Cash value:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 702.  
 Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Section 722.  
 Death, lawful punishment: Section 711.  
 Policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Replacement of insurance surrendered for cash: Section 781.  
 Claims, denial, notice by registered mail: Section 784 (b).  
 Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Sections 722, 723.  
 Conscientious objectors, forfeiture: Section 711.  
 Conversion: Section 704.  
 Costs:  
 Administrative: Section 782.  
 Extra hazards of service: Section 721.  
 Surrendered policies replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 Deafness, statutory total disability: Section 714.  
 Death:  
 Before effective date: Section 709.  
 Before 6 months' total disability: Section 713.  
 Inflicted for lawful punishment: Section 711.  
 Insurance against: Section 703.  
 Definition:  
 Child: Section 701 (3).  
 Claim: Section 784 (h).  
 Disagreement: Section 784 (h).  
 Father: Section 701 (4).  
 Insurance: Section 701 (1).  
 Mother: Section 701 (4).  
 Parent: Section 701 (4).  
 Widow: Section 701 (2).  
 Widower: Section 701 (2).  
 Denial of claim, right of action Federal court: Section 784.  
 Desertion, forfeiture: Section 711.  
 Disability:  
 Rating, total, 20 years or more: Section 110.  
 Statutory total: Section 714.  
 Waiver of: Sections 722, 757 (d), 781 (a).  
 Dividends:  
 Applied to pay premiums: Section 707.  
 Disability income policies classified separately: Section 715.  
 Policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Effective date: Section 709.  
 Eligibility:  
 Replacement insurance: Section 781.  
 Service-connected disabled veterans: Section 722.  
 Endowment, converted to: Section 704.  
 Escheat: Sections 716 (e), 717 (d).  
 Estates:  
 Payment to: Sections 716 (e), 717 (c), (d), 754.  
 Refunds in fraud cases: Section 710.  
 Examinations:  
 Medical costs: Section 782.  
 Premium waiver: Section 712.  
 Expired term policies, replacement: Section 781 (b).

Extended value:  
 American experience table of mortality: Section 702.  
 Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Section 722.  
 Policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Extra hazard costs: Section 721.  
 False evidence, penalties: Section 787.  
 Father, defined: Section 701 (4).  
 Five-year term:  
 Conversion: Section 704.  
 Renewal: Section 705.  
 Forfeiture: Section 711.  
 Fraud:  
 Ground for contesting: Section 710.  
 Penalties: Section 787.  
 Premium refund: Section 710.  
 Twenty-year disability ratings: Section 110.  
 Fund: Sections 720, 721, 724 (b), 781 (a), 786, 788, 3102 (c).  
 Funds, revolving:  
 Service disabled veterans': Section 722.  
 Veterans' special term: Section 723.  
 Health requirements, waiver of: Section 722.  
 Heirs, no payment to: Section 716 (e).  
 Illegitimate child: Section 701 (3).  
 Incompetents:  
 Applications for: Section 722.  
 Optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Suits: Section 784 (b).  
 Incontestability: Section 710.  
 Inspections, cost borne by the United States: Section 782.  
 Installments, continuous during lifetime: Sections 716 (a), 717 (b).  
 Interpleader suits: Section 784 (a).  
 Investment of funds: Sections 720 (b), 723 (b).  
 Lapsed policy, reinstatement and renewal: Section 705.  
 Legal representative, no payment to: Section 716e.  
 Liens:  
 Advance of first premium: Section 708.  
 Unpaid premiums, death before 6 months' total disability: Section 713.  
 Loan value:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 702.  
 Commissioner's 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Section 722.  
 Policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Loco parentis: Section 701 (4).  
 Medical examinations, costs borne by United States: Section 782.  
 Military or naval forces of United States, not member, ground for contesting: Section 710.  
 Minors:  
 Optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Suits: Section 784 (b).  
 Mortality, tables of:  
 American experience: Section 702.  
 Commissioner's 1941 Standard Ordinary: Sections 722, 723.  
 Maturity during in-service premium waiver: Section 724 (b).  
 Mother, defined: Section 701 (4).  
 Mutiny, forfeiture: Section 711.  
 National service life insurance fund: Sections 720, 721, 724 (b), 781 (a), 786, 788, 3102 (c).  
 Nonparticipating: Sections 722, 723, 724 (a).  
 Optional settlements: Sections 716, 717, 783.  
 Overpayments, when waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Paid-up value:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 702.  
 Commissioner's 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality: Section 722.  
 Policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Payment:  
 Death lawful punishment: Section 711.  
 Escheat as bar: Sections 716 (e), 717 (d).  
 Estates: Sections 716 (e), 717 (c), (d).  
 Installments, number of: Sections 716, 717,

- Installments unpaid at death of beneficiary: Section 716 (d), (e).  
 Less than \$5: Section 716 (e).  
 Less than \$10: Section 717 (c).  
 Modes:  
 Maturity before August 1, 1946: Section 716 (a).  
 Maturity on or after August 1, 1946: Section 717 (b).  
 Minors or incompetents: Section 783.  
 Optional settlement:  
 Maturity before August 1, 1946: Section 716 (a) (3).  
 Maturity on or after August 1, 1946: Section 717.  
 Minors or incompetents: Section 783.  
 Overpayment, when waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Permitted class as represented by insured: Section 716 (f).  
 Persons entitled, interpleader suit: Section 784 (a).  
 Refund life income: Sections 716 (a) (3), 717 (b) (4).  
 Total disability: Section 715.  
 Penalties: Sections 711, 787.  
 Permitted class of beneficiaries: Section 716 (b).  
 Philippine veterans: Section 107.  
 Plans of: Section 704.  
 Policy:  
 Expired, replacement: Section 781 (b).  
 Lapsed, reinstatement and renewal: Section 705.  
 Provisions: Section 706.  
 Surrendered for indemnity, replacement: Section 781 (a).  
 Values: Sections 702, 722.  
 Premiums:  
 Advance of first premium: Section 708.  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 702.  
 Dividends used to pay: Section 707.  
 Liens: Section 713.  
 Nonpayment, ground for contesting: Section 710.  
 Payment of: Sections 707, 708.  
 Rates: Sections 702, 722, 723.  
 Refund in fraud cases: Section 710.  
 Refund of, policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Service-disabled veterans: Section 722.  
 Special term: Section 723.  
 Total disability income: Sections 715, 781 (a).  
 Unearned, refund, policy provisions: Section 706.  
 Waiver:  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation, restriction on payment of: Section 417 (a).  
 In-service: Section 724.  
 Total disability: Sections 712, 722, 781 (a).  
 Printing and binding: Section 782.  
 Rates, premium: Sections 702, 722, 723.  
 Ratings, 20-year disability: Section 110.  
 Recovery of payments waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Refund life income: Sections 716 (a) (3), 717 (b) (3).  
 Registered mail notice of claim denial: Section 784 (c).  
 Reinstatement: Section 705.  
 Renewal, automatic: Section 705.  
 Replacement insurance: Section 781.  
 Saving provision: Sections 788, 5502-5506, 5511, 5512.  
 Service-connected disability, waiver of: Section 722, 759 (a).  
 Service-disabled veterans: Section 722.  
 Set off: Section 3101.  
 Spying, forfeiture: Section 711.  
 Statutory total disabilities: Section 714.  
 Stepchild: Section 701 (3).  
 Stepparents: Section 701 (4).  
 Suits:  
 Attorneys' fees: Section 784 (g).  
 Claim, defined: Section 784 (h).  
 Claims denied, notice by registered mail: Section 784 (b).  
 Disagreement, defined: Section 784 (h).  
 Interpleader: Section 784 (a).  
 Parties: Section 784 (a).  
 Statutes of limitations inapplicable: Section 784 (b).  
 Subpenas: Section 784 (c).  
 Time limits: Section 784 (b).  
 Witnesses, Veterans' Administration employees:  
 Fees, part-time and fee-basis personnel: Section 784 (e).  
 Leave: Section 784 (f).  
 Travel and subsistence allowance: Section 784 (d).  
 Surrendered for cash, replacement: Section 781 (a).  
 Term:  
 Conversion right: Section 704.  
 Expired, replacement: Section 781 (b).  
 Renewal, automatic: Section 705.  
 Special: Section 723.  
 Termination: Section 705.  
 Total disability:  
 Automatic renewal: Section 705.  
 Conversion to endowment prohibited: Section 704.  
 Costs, surrendered insurance replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 Death before 6 months of: Section 713.  
 Income provision: Sections 715, 781 (a).  
 Premiums waived: Sections 712, 722, 781 (a).  
 Rating, 20 years or more: Section 110.  
 Statutory: Section 714.  
 Treason, forfeiture: Section 711.  
 Waiver:  
 Disability: Sections 722, 757 (d), 781 (a).  
 Overpayments: Section 3102.  
 Premiums:  
 Costs, surrendered policies replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 In-service: Section 724.  
 Total disability: Section 712.  
 United States Government Life:  
 Administrative cost: Section 782.  
 Administrator's decisions, finality: Section 785.  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 743.  
 Amount: Section 741.  
 Application:  
 Replacement: Section 781.  
 Total disability income: Section 748.  
 Appropriation. (See Military and naval insurance.)  
 Assignments: Sections 753, 3101.  
 Automatic insurance, statutory total permanent disability: Section 758.  
 Automatic renewal, term: Section 745.  
 Bars to benefits, inapplicable: Section 3103 (d).  
 Beneficiaries:  
 Assignments of interest: Section 753.  
 Cash value, death lawful punishment: Section 754.  
 Change by insured: Section 749.  
 Designated, insured not survived by: Section 750.  
 Designation not made: Section 750.  
 Estates, payments to: Section 750.  
 Incompetents, optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Installments unpaid at death: Section 750.  
 Minors, optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Cash values:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 744 (b).  
 Death inflicted as lawful punishment: Section 754.  
 Policy provision: Section 744 (a).  
 Replacement of insurance surrendered for cash: Section 781 (a).  
 Claims, denial, notice by registered mail: Section 784 (b).  
 Conversion: Section 742.  
 Costs:  
 Administrative: Section 782.  
 Extra hazards of service: Section 757.  
 Surrendered policies replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 Deafness, statutory total permanent disability: Section 758.  
 Death:  
 Inflicted as lawful punishment: Section 754.  
 Insurance against: Section 741.  
 Definitions:  
 Claim: Section 784 (h).  
 Disagreement: Section 784 (h).  
 Insurance: Section 740.  
 Disability:  
 Rating, permanent total, 20 years or more: Section 110.  
 Statutory total permanent: Section 758.  
 Total disability income provision: Section 748.  
 Total, waiver of premiums: Sections 748, 760, 781 (a).  
 Total permanent, insurance against: Section 741.  
 Waiver of: Sections 757 (d), 759, 781 (a).  
 Dividends:  
 Applied to pay premiums: Section 746.  
 Policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Eligibility for replacement insurance: Section 781.  
 Endowment, converted to: Section 742.  
 Escheat: Section 750.  
 Estates:  
 Payment to: Sections 750, 754.  
 Refunds in fraud cases: Section 747.  
 Examinations:  
 Medical costs: Section 782.  
 Total disability: Section 748.  
 Expired term policies, replacement: Section 781 (b).  
 Extended values:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 744 (b).  
 Policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Extra hazard costs: Section 757.  
 False evidence, penalties: Section 787.  
 Federal farm-loan banks: Section 755 (b).  
 Five-year term:  
 Conversion: Section 745.  
 Renewal: Section 745.  
 Forfeiture: Section 754.  
 Fraud:  
 Ground for contesting: Section 747.  
 Penalties: Section 787.  
 Premium refund: Section 747.  
 Twenty-year disability ratings: Section 110.  
 Fund: Sections 724 (b), 750, 755, 757, 760 (b), 781 (a), 786, 788, 3102 (c).  
 Health requirements, waiver of: Section 759.  
 Hospitalized, waiver of premium: Section 760.  
 Incompetents:  
 Mental, by waiver of premium: Section 760.  
 Optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Suits: Section 784 (b).  
 Incontestability: Section 747.  
 Inspections, cost borne by United States: Section 782.  
 Installments, continuous during lifetime, policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Interpleader suit: Section 784 (a).  
 Investment of fund: Section 755.  
 Lapsed policy, reinstatement, and renewal: Section 745.  
 Liens on policies: Sections 744 (c), 759 (b), 760 (b).  
 Loan values:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 744 (b).  
 Policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Loans, interest on: Section 744 (c).  
 Maturity at certain ages, policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Medical examinations, cost borne by United States: Section 782.  
 Mentally incompetent, waiver of premium: Section 760.  
 Military and naval insurance appropriation: Sections 724 (b), 756, 757, 760 (b), 781 (a), 788, 3102 (c).  
 Military or naval forces of United States, not member, ground for contesting: Section 747.  
 Minors:  
 Optional settlements: Section 783.  
 Suits: Section 784 (b).  
 Mortality, tables of:  
 American Experience: Section 743.

Maturity during in-service premium waiver: Section 724 (b).  
 Nonparticipating: Section 724 (a).  
 Optional settlement: Section 752, 783.  
 Overpayments, when waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Paidup values:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 744 (b).  
 Policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Payment:  
 Death, lawful punishment: Section 754.  
 Escheat as bar: Section 750.  
 Estate: Sections 747, 750, 754.  
 Installments, number of: Section 751.  
 Installments unpaid at death of beneficiary: Section 750.  
 Less than \$5: Section 751.  
 Optional settlement: Sections 752, 783.  
 Overpayment, when waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Persons entitled, interpleader suit: Section 784 (a).  
 Total disability: Section 748.  
 Penalties: Section 787.  
 Plans of: Section 742.  
 Policy:  
 Expired, replacement: Section 781 (b).  
 Lapsed, reinstatement and renewal: Section 745.  
 Provisions: Section 744.  
 Surrendered for indemnity, replacement: Section 781 (a).  
 Values: Section 744.  
 Premiums:  
 American Experience Table of Mortality: Section 744 (b).  
 Dividends used to pay: Section 746.  
 Liens: Sections 759 (b), 760 (b).  
 Nonpayment, ground for contesting: Section 747.  
 Payment of: Sections 743, 746.  
 Payment on due date waived: Section 760.  
 Rates: Section 743.  
 Refund in fraud cases: Section 747.  
 Refund of, policy provisions: Section 744 (a).  
 Total disability income: Sections 748, 781 (a).  
 Waiver:  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation, restriction on payment of: Section 417 (a).  
 In service: Section 724.  
 Payment on due date: Section 760.  
 Total disability: Section 748, 760, 781 (a).  
 Printing and binding, cost borne by United States: Section 782.  
 Rates, premium: Section 743.  
 Ratings, 20-year disability: Section 110.  
 Recovery of payments waived: Section 3102 (a).  
 Registered mail, notice of claim denial, 784 (b).  
 Reinstatement:  
 Premium liens continued: Section 759 (b).  
 Term: Section 745.  
 Waiver of service-connected disability: Section 759 (a).  
 Renewal, automatic: Section 745.  
 Replacement insurance: Section 781.  
 Savings provision: Sections 788, 5502-5506, 5511, 5512.  
 Service-connected disability, waiver of: Sections 757 (d), 759 (a).  
 Setoff: Section 3101.  
 Statutory permanent total disability: Section 758.  
 Suits:  
 Attorneys' fees: Section 784 (g).  
 Claim: Section 784 (h).  
 Claims denied, notice by registered mail: Section 784 (b).  
 Compromise judgments, yearly renewable term: Section 784 (i).  
 Disagreement: Section 784 (h).  
 Interpleader: Section 784 (a).  
 Parties: Section 784 (a).  
 Statutes of limitations inapplicable: Section 784 (b).  
 Subpenas: Section 784 (c).  
 Time limits: Section 784 (b).

Witnesses, Veterans' Administration employees:  
 Fees, part-time and fee-basis personnel: Section 784 (e).  
 Leave: Section 784 (f).  
 Travel and subsistence allowance: Section 784 (d).  
 Surrendered for cash, replacement: Section 781 (a).  
 Term:  
 Conversion right: Section 742.  
 Expired, replacement: Section 781 (b).  
 Renewal, automatic: Section 745.  
 Total disability:  
 Costs, surrendered policies replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 Income provision: Sections 748, 781 (a).  
 Premiums waived: Sections, 748, 760, 781 (a).  
 Temporary, waiver of premium: Section 760.  
 Total permanent disability:  
 Insurance against: Section 741.  
 Rating, 20 years or more: Section 110.  
 Statutory: Section 758.  
 United States Government life insurance fund. (See Fund.)  
 Waiver:  
 Disability: Sections 757 (d), 759, 781 (a).  
 Overpayments: Section 3102.  
 Premiums:  
 Costs, surrendered policies replaced while disabled: Section 781 (a).  
 In-service: Section 724.  
 On due date: Section 760.  
 Total disability: Section 748.  
 Yearly renewable term: Sections 756, 758.  
 Institutional on-farm training: Sections 1652, 1723 (c).  
 Investigations: Section 3311.  
 Job counseling, employment service for veterans: Section 2010.  
 Judicial:  
 Notice, VA seal: Section 202.  
 Review, insurance: Section 784 (a).  
 Korean conflict, period of: Section 101 (9).  
 Korean-conflict veteran:  
 Defined: Section 2007 (a).  
 Education. (See Education.)  
 Mustering-out payment. (See Mustering-out payment.)  
 Laws:  
 Compile and publish: Section 215.  
 Cross-references: Section 5504.  
 Eligibility under prior: Sections 627, 905.  
 Legal custodians: Section 3202 (a).  
 Leishmaniasis, including kala-azar: Section 301.  
 Leprosy (Hansen's disease): Sections 301, 3203 (d).  
 Leukemia: Section 301.  
 Levy, exemption from: Sections 2104 (a), 3101.  
 Line of duty: Sections 105, 310, 321, 331, 341, 610.  
 Loans:  
 Administrator:  
 Approval:  
 Loans not automatically guaranteed: Section 1802 (e).  
 Prior approval for guaranty: Section 1802 (d).  
 Charges, fees, and discounts, limits on: Section 1805.  
 Compromise claims: Section 1820 (a) (3).  
 Construction standards minimum prescribed: Section 1804 (a).  
 Decisions, finality of: Section 1820 (c).  
 Delegate functions: Section 1811 (g).  
 Direct-loan areas, designation of: Section 1811 (a).  
 Except certain farm loans from first-lien requirements: Section 1812 (c).  
 Investment of funds: Sections 1811 (g), 1823 (a).  
 Lien requirements, exception from: Section 1812 (c).  
 Modification of terms, consent: Section 1820 (a) (2).  
 Property:  
 Construction, warranties: Section 1806 (a).

Operate: Section 1820 (a) (6).  
 Purchase or sell: Section 1820 (a) (5).  
 Value of, reasonable, determination: Sections 1810 (b), 1812 (b), 1813 (b), 1814 (b).  
 Refusal to appraise: Section 1804 (b).  
 Refusal to guarantee or insure loans: Section 1804 (d).  
 Revolving fund, advances to, time limitation on: Section 1823 (c) (d).  
 Sale of direct loans: Section 1811 (e).  
 Sue and be sued: Section 1820 (a) (1).  
 Waiver or release of rights: Section 1820 (a) (4).  
 Allied forces veterans, citizens of United States: Section 109 (b).  
 Amortization: Section 1803 (d) (2).  
 Amount of loan guaranty: Sections 1803 (a) (1), (b), 1810 (c).  
 Application for release of liability: Section 1817.  
 Assignment: Sections 1802 (c), 1816.  
 Automatic guaranty of loans:  
 Business property: Section 1813 (a).  
 Farms: Section 1812 (a).  
 Generally: Sections 1802 (d), 1803 (a) (1).  
 Homes: Section 1810 (a).  
 Refinancing indebtedness: 1814 (a).  
 Business loans: Section 1813.  
 Certificate:  
 Discharge: Section, 1802 (c).  
 Eligibility of: Section 1802 (c).  
 Lender, re charges, fees or discounts: Section 1805.  
 Loan guaranty: Section 1802 (c).  
 Occupancy: Section 1804 (c).  
 Charges, fees and discounts, control of: Section 1805.  
 Citizens of United States, service in Allied forces: Section 109 (b).  
 Conditions, for:  
 Business: Section 1813 (b).  
 Farm: Section 1812 (b).  
 Generally: Section 1803 (c).  
 Home: Section 1810 (b).  
 Indebtedness, refinancing: Section 1814 (b).  
 Construction warranty: Section 1806 (a).  
 Damages, recovery of: Section 1822.  
 Dates, termination of program: Sections 1803 (a) (2), 1811 (f).  
 Default procedure: Section 1816.  
 Definitions:  
 Active duty inclusion: Section 1801 (a) (3).  
 Veteran, inclusion of widow: Section 1801 (a) (2).  
 World War II: Section 1801 (a) (1).  
 Delinquent indebtedness, refinancing of: Section 1814.  
 Direct:  
 Advances: Section 1811 (d).  
 Amount: Sections 1811 (b) (1), (2).  
 Charge against guaranty entitlement: Section 1811 (b) (1).  
 Custody of investments: Section 1811 (g).  
 Generally: Section 1811.  
 Interest rate: Section 1811 (b) (1).  
 Repayment: Section 1811 (c).  
 Revolving fund: Section 1823.  
 Sale of: Section 1811 (e).  
 Time limitation for making: Section 1811 (f).  
 Discharge certificate, use as certificate of eligibility: Section 1802 (c).  
 Discount control: Section 1805.  
 Eligibility:  
 Basic: Section 1802 (a).  
 Coast and Geodetic Survey service: Section 1801 (b).  
 Hospitalization pending discharge: Section 1824.  
 Korean conflict service: Section 1802 (a).  
 Public Health Service: Section 1801 (b).  
 Service after October 6, 1945, and before October 7, 1946: Section 1801 (a).  
 Widow: Section 1801 (a) (2).  
 World War II service: Section 1802 (a).  
 Entitlement, basic, restoration of: Section 1802.  
 Farm or farm equipment: Section 1812.  
 Finality of decisions of Administrator: Section 1820 (c).

- Fraud, defense against: Section 1821.  
Fund, direct loan:  
Advances to: Section 1823 (b).  
Deadline for advances to: Section 1823 (d).  
Deposits: Section 1823 (a).  
Interest payable on: Section 1823 (b).  
Proceeds from securities sales: Section 1823 (c).  
Reserves for payment of losses: Section 1823 (a).  
Guaranty deadline: Section 1803 (a) (2).  
Guaranty, United States liability: Section 1803 (b).  
Home loans: Section 1810.  
Hospitalization pending discharge as eligibility for: Section 1824.  
Incontestability of, for guaranty: Section 1821.  
Insurance of loans: Section 1815.  
Interest rate:  
Direct loans: Section 1811 (b) (1).  
Guaranteed loans: Section 1803 (c).  
Non-real-estate: Section 1815 (b).  
Lenders:  
Federal institutions: Section 1802 (f).  
Qualified: Section 1802 (d).  
Reports to Administrator: Section 1802 (c).  
Service of loans, failure to provide: Section 1804 (d).  
Liability:  
Veterans, release of: Section 1817.  
United States on guaranty: Section 1803 (b).  
Lien liquidation: Sections 1810 (a), 1812 (c).  
Limitations of other statutes, inapplicability: Section 1802 (f).  
Maturity of: Section 1803 (d) (1).  
Minimum requirements, planning construction, general acceptability: Section 1804 (a).  
Occupancy of property by veteran: Sections 1804 (c), 1810 (a).  
Plans and specifications:  
Availability of: Section 1806 (b).  
Changes in: Section 1806 (a).  
Prior approval submissions: Section 1802 (e).  
Property:  
Plans and specifications: Section 1806.  
Reasonable value: Sections 1810 (b), 1812 (b), 1813 (b), 1814 (b).  
Redemption of, subordinate liens: Section 1820 (d).  
Purpose of:  
Business: Section 1813 (a).  
Farm: Section 1812 (a).  
Home: Section 1810 (a).  
Indebtedness, refinancing of: Section 1814 (a).  
Reasonable value of property: Sections 1810 (b), 1812 (b), 1813 (b), 1814 (b).  
Recovery of damages: Section 1822.  
Redemption of property, subordinate liens: Section 1820 (d).  
Refinancing of existing indebtedness: Section 1814.  
Refusal to appraise: Section 1804 (b).  
Refusal to guarantee or insure: Section 1804 (d).  
Release from liability under guaranty: Section 1817.  
Report by lender: Section 1802 (c).  
Restoration of entitlement: Section 1802 (b).  
Revolving fund, direct loan: Section 1823.  
Security for: Section 1803 (d) (3).  
Standards—planning, construction, and general acceptability: Section 1804 (a).  
Submission for prior approval: Section 1802 (e).  
Supervised lenders: Section 1802 (d).  
Time limitation for making: Sections 1803 (a) (2), 1811 (f).  
Unfair practices, effect of: Section 1804 (b).  
Vocational rehabilitation trainees: Section 1507.  
Warranty of construction: Section 1806 (a).
- Widow, unmarried, eligibility: Section 1801 (a) (2).  
World War II, definition: Section 1801 (a) (1).  
Loco parentis: Sections 101 (5), 701.  
Lolasis: Section 301.  
Mail, registered; notice:  
Court action, assets deceased inmates: Section 5226.  
Insurance claims denial: Section 784 (b).  
Malaria: Section 301.  
Marriage:  
Date: Sections 101 (3), 103, 302, 404, 532 (d), 534 (c), 536 (c), 541 (b), 543 (b).  
Legal impediment, without knowledge: Section 103 (a).  
Same veteran, more than once: Section 103 (b).  
Validity, proof of: Section 103 (c).  
Medal of Honor roll: Sections 560-562.  
Medical:  
Advisory group: Section 4112.  
Care. (See Hospital, domiciliary, medical care.)  
Examinations. (See Examinations.)  
Officers, telephones: Section 234.  
Services, includes: Section 601 (6).  
Medicine and surgery. (See Department, Medicine and Surgery.)  
Mexican War widows: Section 531.  
Midshipmen, active duty: Section 101 (21) (D).  
Mileage, beneficiary travel: Section 111.  
Military installations, VA employees: Section 231.  
Minors:  
Insurance: Sections 783, 784 (b).  
Payments to: Section 3202.  
Misappropriation, 3501.  
Misconduct: Sections 105, 310, 313 (a), 331, 351, 521 (a).  
Moro Province. (Included in Spanish-American War.)  
Mother, definition: Section 701 (4).  
Moving pictures: Section 233 (4).  
Multiple sclerosis: Section 301.  
Mustering-out payments, Korean conflict: "Active duty," defined: Section 2101 (d).  
Benefits (Mustering Out Payment Act, 1944), availability of: Section 2104 (d).  
Decisions, finality of, Secretaries, Armed Forces: Sections 2104 (b), (c).  
Definition, "active duty": Section 2101 (d).  
Duplication, prohibited: Section 2104 (e).  
Eligibility: Section 2101 (a).  
Exemptions, prohibitions:  
Assignments: Section 2104 (a).  
Attachment, levy, seizure: Section 2104 (a).  
Claims of creditors: Section 2104 (a).  
Taxation: Section 2104 (a).  
Limitations on: Section 2101.  
Payments:  
Amount of: Section 2102 (a).  
Determination of: Section 2102.  
Manner of:  
Veteran living: Sections 2102 (b), 2104 (c).  
Veteran deceased: Sections 2103, 2104 (c).  
Regulations: Section 2104 (b).  
Mutiny: Sections 711, 3504.  
Myasthenia gravis: Section 301.  
Myelitis: Section 301.  
Myocarditis: Section 301.  
National Guard:  
Active duty for training: Section 101 (22).  
Disability prior to Federal enrollment: Section 106 (b).  
Inactive-duty training: Section 101 (23).  
National service life insurance. (See Insurance.)  
Nephritis: Section 301.  
Non-service-connected, definition: Section 101 (17).  
On-farm training, Korean-conflict veterans: Section 1632 (d).  
On-job training:  
Korean veterans, education: Section 1651.  
Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1504 (d).  
War-orphans education, prohibited: Section 1723 (c).
- Onchocerciasis: Section 301.  
Organic diseases of nervous system: Section 301.  
Organizations:  
Approved by Administrator: Section 3402.  
Canteen Service, use of: Section 4203.  
Fees: Section 3402 (b) (1).  
Penalties: Sections 3404 (b), 3405.  
Power of attorney: Section 3402 (b) (2).  
Representatives, recognition: Section 3402.  
Retired service personnel: Section 3402 (c).  
Space, office facilities: Section 3402 (a) (2).  
Oroya fever: Section 301.  
Osteitis deformans: Section 301.  
Osteomalacia: Section 301.  
Outpatient treatment. (See Hospital, domiciliary, and medical care.)  
Overcharges by educational institutions: Sections 1634, 1734 (a).  
Overpayments:  
Collection of: Sections 415 (f), 1666, 1766, 3101 (b).  
Dependency and indemnity compensation to parents: Section 415 (f).  
Waiver of: Sections 415 (f), 3102 (a).  
Palsy, bulbar: Section 301.  
Paralysis agitans: Section 301.  
Parent:  
Compensation:  
Eligibility: Sections 321, 341.  
Income limitations: Section 102.  
Definition of: Sections 101 (5), 415, 701 (4).  
Dependency and indemnity compensation: Eligibility: Sections 410, 415, 416.  
Income limitations: Sections 102, 415.  
Overpayment of: Section 415 (f).  
Dependent: Section 102, 415.  
Payments:  
Assignment allowed, prohibited: Sections 416 (e) (1), 718, 753, 2104 (a), 3101 (a).  
Benefits withheld, restoration: Section 3109.  
Concurrent: Sections 416, 2008, 3104, 3105.  
Guardians: Section 3202.  
Incompetents and minors: Sections 3202, 3203 (b).  
Hospital, domiciliary, institutional care: Section 3203.  
Korean-conflict veterans, education: Sections 1631, 1632, 1645, 1665.  
Method of, VA benefits: Section 3020.  
Minors and incompetents: Section 3202.  
Setoff allowed, prohibited: Section 3101 (b).  
State homes: Sections 641-643.  
Suspended cases: Section 3202 (d).  
Unemployment compensation, certification of: Section 2003 (c).  
War orphans, education: Sections 1731, 1742, 1761 (a), 1765 (b).  
Peacetime service:  
Compensation:  
Additional for dependents: Section 335.  
Eligibility: Sections 331, 341.  
Presumption:  
Sound condition: Section 332.  
Tropical disease: Section 333.  
Rates: Sections 334, 342.  
Wartime rates payable: Sections 336, 343.  
Penal institution, confinement: Section 505.  
Penalties:  
Agents and attorneys: Sections 3404 (b), 3405.  
Conflict of interest, employees, VA: Sections 1664 (a), 1764.  
False evidence: Sections 787, 2005, 3503.  
Forfeiture for certain acts: Sections 711, 754, 3503, 3504.  
Fraudulent acceptance of benefits: Sections 2005, 3502.  
Misappropriation by fiduciaries: Section 3501.  
Offenses under repealed laws: Section 5502.  
Unemployment compensation, liability for repayment: Section 2005 (b).  
Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1508.  
Pension:  
Accrued benefits: Sections 3021, 3022.

- Apportionment of payments: Sections 505, 3107.
- Approval of schools: Section 104.
- Awards, effective date: Section 3010.
- Claim for, filing: Section 3001.
- Concurrent payments: Sections 3104, 3105.
- Death:
- Child:
- Definition: Section 101 (4).
- Civil War: Sections 532, 533.
- Indian wars: Sections 534, 535.
- Korean conflict: Sections 543, 544.
- Spanish-American War: Sections 536, 537.
- World War I: Sections 541, 542.
- World War II: Sections 543, 544.
- Claim considered for other benefits: Section 3001 (b).
- Widow:
- Eligibility: Sections 101 (3), 103, 531, 532, 534, 536, 541, 543.
- Civil War: Section 532.
- Indian wars: Section 534.
- Korean conflict: Section 543.
- Mexican War: Section 531.
- Spanish-American War: Section 536.
- World War I: Section 541.
- World War II: Section 543.
- Definition: Section 101 (15).
- Disability, 20-year ratings: Section 110.
- Discharge, type of: Section 101 (2).
- Discontinuance, effective date: Section 3012.
- Hospital, domiciliary, institutional care: Section 3203.
- Income limitations: Sections 503, 522, 545.
- Increase, effective date: Section 3011.
- Medal of Honor roll: Sections 560-562.
- Non-service-connected disability: Section 521.
- Penal institution, confinement: Section 505.
- Permanent and total disability, definition: Section 502.
- Persons heretofore having pensionable status: Section 504.
- Protected cases:
- Claims pending: Section 5511.
- Claims within year from death: Section 3010.
- Pensionable status prior to this act: Section 504.
- Prior laws, entitlement under: Section 5512.
- Rates:
- Dependents:
- Civil War: Sections 532, 533.
- Indians wars: Sections 534, 535.
- Korean conflict: Sections 543, 544.
- Mexican War: Section 531.
- Spanish-American War: Sections 536, 537.
- World War I: Sections 541, 542.
- World War II: Sections 543, 544.
- Veterans:
- Indian wars: Section 511.
- Korean conflict: Section 521.
- Spanish-American War: Section 512.
- World War I: Section 521.
- World War II: Section 521.
- Ratings, combining of service-connected and non-service-connected disabilities: Section 523.
- Reduction, effective date: Section 3012.
- Regular aid and attendance: Section 502 (b).
- Renouncement of rights: Section 3106.
- Service: Sections 511, 512.
- Service, days of: Sections 511 (b), 512, 521, 532.
- State home, retention of: Section 641 (b) (1).
- Surgeon's certificate of disability: Section 532 (c).
- Unpaid at death: Sections 3021, 3022.
- Vicious habits: Section 521 (a).
- Waiver of overpayments: Section 3102 (a).
- Willful misconduct: Section 521 (a).
- Period of war, definition: Sections 101 (11), 301 (2), 601 (3).
- Periodic monetary benefits: Section 3021 (a).
- Personal effects, loss of by fire: Section 626.
- Personal services: Section 213.
- Philippines:
- Commonwealth Army veterans:
- Hospital and medical care: Sections 631-632.
- Limitation of benefits: Section 107 (a).
- Offices: Section 230 (b).
- Scouts, limitation of benefits: Section 107 (b).
- Philippine Insurrection. (Included in Spanish-American War.)
- Pinta: Section 301.
- Plague: Section 301.
- Policy, insurance. (See Insurance.)
- Power of attorney:
- Agents and attorneys: Section 3402 (b) (2), 3403 (2).
- Particular claims: Section 3403 (2).
- Representatives of organizations: Section 3402 (b) (2).
- Preexisting injury or disease, aggravation of: Sections 310, 353.
- Premiums, insurance. (See Insurance.)
- Presumption:
- Death: Section 108.
- Psychosis, hospital care: Section 602.
- Rebuttable: Sections 313, 333 (b).
- Service connection: Sections 312, 333.
- Sound condition: Section 311, 332.
- Printing and binding, insurance: Section 782.
- Procurement and supply:
- Condemnation: Section 5012 (b).
- Contract services: Section 213, 232.
- Facilities: Sections 5001 (a), 5012 (b).
- Fund, revolving: Section 5011.
- Gifts, donations: Sections 5001 (d), 5005, 5006, 5101-5105.
- Hospitalization, contracts for: Sections 109 (a) (2), 601 (4), 5003.
- Personal services: Sections 213, 232.
- Property, acceptance of: Section 5005.
- Prosthetic appliances: Sections 612 (d), 5013.
- Reduced-fare requests: Section 111 (d).
- Supplies and equipment: Section 5011 (a).
- Telephone service, medical officers: Section 234.
- Transcripts, trial records: Section 3304.
- Veterans' Canteen Service. (See Canteen Service, Veterans'.)
- Visual educational equipment: Section 233 (4).
- Vocational rehabilitation, books, supplies, and equipment: Section 1509.
- Professional, personnel, instruction: Sections 235, 4113.
- Program of education, definition: Section 1702 (a) (5).
- Program of education or training, definition: Section 1602 (a) (3).
- Property:
- Easements or rights-of-way: Section 5014.
- Lease of: Section 5012 (a).
- National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: Section 5006.
- Procurement. (See Procurement and supply.)
- Veterans' Administration facility:
- Death while inmate:
- Assets, residual: Section 5224.
- Claims after sale: Sections 5223, 5226.
- Contract for disposition presumed: Sections 5220 (b), 5221.
- Court actions: Section 5225.
- Disposition: Sections 5220 (b), 5221.
- Notice of law: Section 5227.
- Sale: Section 5222.
- Sentimental value, articles of: Section 5222.
- Vesting: Section 5220.
- Decedent's personal:
- Agreement for disposition: Section 5203.
- Claims after sale: Section 5202 (e).
- Decisions, finality of: Section 5210.
- Disposition: Section 5201 (b), 5202-5206.
- Estates, jurisdiction: Section 5208.
- Notice of law: Section 5203.
- Sale: Sections 5202, 5205, 5206.
- Shipping charges: Section 5207.
- Vesting: Section 5201 (a).
- Unclaimed on premises:
- Agreement for distribution: Section 5203.
- Claims after sale: Section 5202 (e).
- Decisions, finality of: Section 5210.
- Disposition: Sections 5202-5206.
- Notice of law: Section 5203.
- Sale: Sections 5202, 5205, 5206.
- Shipping charges: Section 5207.
- Veterans' Canteen Service. (See Veterans' Canteen Service.)
- Prosthetic appliances:
- Allied forces, veterans: Section 109.
- Fitting and training: Section 613.
- Furnishing: Sections 612, 1506.
- Manufacture: Section 612 (d).
- Mechanical or electronic equipment for blind: Section 614.
- Procurement: Sections 612 (d), 5013.
- Research: Section 216.
- Protected cases: Sections 5511-5514.
- Provisional acceptance: Section 106 (b).
- Psychoses: Sections 301, 602.
- Puerto Rico, unemployment compensation: Section 2002 (b), (c).
- Public Health Service:
- Active duty, defined: Section 101 (21) (B).
- Active duty for training: Section 101 (22) (B).
- Inspection of: Section 3301 (7).
- Inactive duty training: Section 101 (23).
- Korean-conflict veteran, education: Section 1602 (b).
- Retired pay, waiver of: Section 3105.
- Purpura idiopathic, hemorrhagic: Section 301.
- Rates:
- Compensation. (See Compensation.)
- Dependency and indemnity compensation. (See Dependency and indemnity compensation.)
- Insurance premiums. (See Insurance.)
- Pension. (See Pension.)
- Protected: Sections 5512, 5513.
- Unemployment compensation. (See Unemployment compensation, Korean conflict.)
- Wartime, two or more: Section 314 (o).
- Rating:
- Combining of:
- Service- and non-service-connected: Section 523.
- Wartime and peacetime: Section 357.
- Schedule, adoption of: Section 355.
- Twenty-year: Section 110.
- Raynaud's disease: Section 301.
- Records:
- Copies of, furnishing: Sections 3302, 3303.
- Examination of:
- Korean-conflict veterans, education: Section 1667.
- War orphans, education: Section 1767.
- Inspection of: Section (8) 3301.
- Trial, purchase transcripts: Section 3304.
- Recreational equipment, facilities: Section 233 (3).
- Reduced-fare requests: Section 111 (d).
- Reduction of benefits: Section 3203.
- Refusal to wear uniform: Section 3103.
- Registered mail notices:
- Court action, assets deceased inmates: Section 5226.
- Insurance claims denial: Section 784 (b).
- Insurance claims denial: Section 784 (b).
- Regular aid and attendance:
- Compensation: Section 314 (l), (m).
- Pension: Section 502 (b).
- Regulations:
- Administrator's power to make: Section 210 (c), 422 (c), 1743 (b).
- Continuation: Section 5506.
- Mustering-out payments: Section 2104 (b).
- Unemployment compensation: Section 2006.
- Vocational rehabilitation: Sections 1505, 1508.
- Reimbursement:
- Burial expenses: Sections 902-904.

- States, education, Korean conflict veterans: Section 1645.  
 Remarriage: Section 101 (3).  
 Renunciation of rights: Section 3105.  
 Repealed laws, reference to this act: Section 5504.  
 Repeals: Section 5602.  
 Reports:  
 Administrator:  
 Annual report to Congress: Section 214.  
 War orphans education, false and misleading statements: Section 1768.  
 Educational institutions: Sections 1665 (a), 1765 (a).  
 Employers: Section 1504 (d).  
 Research, appliances and devices: Section 216.  
 Reserve component, definition: Section 101 (27).  
 Reserve Officers Training Corps:  
 Basic pay, computation of: Section 403.  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation coverage: Section 403.  
 Reserves. (See Armed Forces.)  
 Residuals, tropical-disease therapy: Section 312 (2).  
 Resignation for good of service: Section 3103.  
 Retirement:  
 Civil service:  
 Canteen Service employees: Section 4202 (5).  
 Department of Medicine and Surgery employees: Section 4109.  
 Discharge includes: Section 101 (18).  
 Retirement pay:  
 Accrued benefits: Section 3021, 3022.  
 Apportionment, emergency officers: Section 3107.  
 Concurrent payments: Section 3104, 3105.  
 Hospital, domiciliary, institutional care: Section 3203.  
 Unpaid at death: Section 3021, 3022.  
 Waiver of: Section 3105.  
 Russia, service in World War I: Section 101 (7).  
 Sabotage: Section 3504.  
 Sarcoidosis: Section 301 (3).  
 Savings provisions:  
 Act, July 3, 1930, authority continuation: Section 5503.  
 Appropriations, continuing availability: Section 5505.  
 Burial benefits eligibility under prior laws: Section 905.  
 Claims pending: Section 5511.  
 Compensable status prior to this act: Section 352.  
 Emergency officers' retirement pay: Section 5513.  
 Gifts, devises, bequests: Section 5105.  
 Insurance: Sections 788, 5502-5506, 5511, 5512.  
 Laws, repealed references to this act: Section 5504.  
 Medical care, eligibility under prior laws: Section 627.  
 Penalties, offenses under repealed laws: Section 5502.  
 Pensionable status prior to this act: Section 504.  
 Prior laws:  
 Entitlement under: Section 2104 (d).  
 Receipt under: Section 5512.  
 Regulations, etc., continuation of: Section 5506.  
 Schedule of ratings, adoption of: Section 355.  
 Schistosomiasis: Section 301.  
 Schools, approval of: Section 104.  
 Scleroderma: Section 301.  
 Sclerosis:  
 Amyotrophic lateral: Section 301.  
 Multiple: Section 301.  
 Seeing-eye dogs: Section 614.  
 Seizure, exemption from: Sections 2104 (a), 3101.  
 Service-connected:  
 Death:  
 Compensation: Sections 321, 341.  
 Dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 410.  
 Definition: Section 101 (16).  
 Disability, Philippine Army veterans: Section 633 (2).  
 Service connection:  
 Aggravation of preexisting injury or disease: Section 353.  
 Chronic diseases: Sections 301, 312.  
 Circumstances of service: Section 354.  
 Disability prior to acceptance for Federal service: Section 106 (b).  
 Discharge, travel time: Section 106 (c).  
 Injury from training, hospitalization, treatment, or examination: Section 351.  
 Insurance, waiver of disability: Sections 722, 757 (d), 759 (a).  
 Presumption. (See Presumption.)  
 Training, travel time: Section 106 (d).  
 Tropical diseases: Sections 301, 312, 333.  
 Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: Section 106 (a).  
 Servicemen's indemnity:  
 Assignment: Sections 416 (e) (1), 3101 (a).  
 Child's entitlement to, affecting dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 416 (e).  
 Election of dependency and indemnity compensation: Section 416.  
 Services:  
 Contracts for: Sections 213, 232.  
 Uncompensated, acceptance of: Section 213.  
 Setoff, allowed, prohibited: Section 3101.  
 Simultaneously contested claims: Section 4007.  
 Social security:  
 Application, joint, with VA: Sections 3001, 3005.  
 Benefits in lieu of: Section 412.  
 Certification of: Section 422.  
 Spanish-American War:  
 Outpatient treatment: Section 612 (b) (5), 612 (e).  
 Period of: Section 101 (6).  
 Special restorative training, definition: Section 1702 (a) (7).  
 Special training allowance, war-orphans education: Section 1742.  
 Speech, loss of, insurance: Sections 714, 758.  
 Spying, insurance forfeiture: Section 711.  
 State agreements: Sections 2001, 2002.  
 State approving agencies: Sections 1641, 1643.  
 State, defined: Sections 101 (20), 1602 (a) (8), 1702 (a) (8), 2007 (c).  
 State home, definition: Section 101 (19).  
 State homes:  
 Eligibility, determination of: Section 643.  
 Effective date of payments: Section 643.  
 Inspection of: Section 642 (a).  
 Intoxicating liquors, sale of: Section 641 (c).  
 Management or control: Section 642 (b).  
 Payments to: Sections 641-643.  
 Reduction of payment to: Section 641 (b).  
 Retention of pension or compensation: Section 641 (b) (1).  
 State representative, employment service for veterans: Section 2011.  
 Statements, false or misleading: Sections 1668, 1768.  
 Stepchild: Sections 101 (4), 701 (3).  
 Stepparents: Section 701 (4).  
 Subpena: Section 784 (c), (f).  
 Subsistence allowance:  
 Accrued amounts: Sections 3021, 3022.  
 Apportionment: Section 3107.  
 Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1504.  
 Subversive schools: Sections 1626, 1726.  
 Suits. (See Courts.)  
 Supply. (See Procurement and supply.)  
 Syringomyelia: Section 301.  
 Taxation, exemption from: Sections 2104 (a), 3101.  
 Telephone service, medical officers: Section 234.  
 Thromboangitis obliterans (Buerger's disease): Section 301.  
 Tobacco, furnishing of: Section 615.  
 Training establishment, definition: Section 1602 (a) (7).  
 Transcripts, trial records: Section 3304.  
 Translators: Section 232.  
 Transportation:  
 Body: Sections 902, 903.  
 Schoolchildren: Section 233 (2).  
 Travel, authorized:  
 Active duty: Sections 101 (21), (E), 106, (c).  
 Active duty for training: Section 101 (22) (D).  
 Travel expenses:  
 Allied forces, veterans: Section 109 (a).  
 Attendants: Section 111 (c).  
 Attorneys, VA: Section 784 (d).  
 Counseling: Section 111.  
 Consultants: Section 217 (b).  
 Domiciliary care: Section 111.  
 Employees, VA: Sections 235, 784 (d), 1511 (b), 4113 (b) (2).  
 Employment service for veterans: Section 2014.  
 Examination, treatment, or care: Section 111.  
 Hospitalization: Section 111.  
 Insurance suits: Section 784 (d).  
 Korean-conflict veterans, education: Section 111.  
 Vocational rehabilitation: Section 111.  
 War-orphans education: Section 111.  
 Treason: Sections 711, 3504.  
 Treatment. (See Hospital, domiciliary and medical care.)  
 Trial records, purchase transcripts: Section 3304.  
 Tropical disease:  
 Defined: Section 301.  
 Presumptions: Sections 312, 333.  
 Trusses: Section 612 (d).  
 Trust funds:  
 Incompetent beneficiaries: Section 3204.  
 National service life insurance: Sections 720, 721, 724 (b), 786, 3102 (c).  
 Personal funds of patients: Section 3204.  
 United States Government life: Sections 724 (b), 755, 757, 786, 3102 (c).  
 Tuberculosis:  
 Active: Sections 301, 312 (3).  
 Arrested:  
 Minimum rate: Section 314 (q).  
 Rating of: Section 356.  
 Tumors, malignant: Section 301.  
 Ulcers, peptic: Section 301.  
 Unemployment compensation, Korean conflict:  
 Agreements, State:  
 Administration, payments: Section 2001.  
 Amendments, terminations: Section 2001 (d).  
 Benefits, certain officers, exempted: Section 2001 (f).  
 Coast and Geodetic Survey, officers, certain, exempted: Section 2001 (f).  
 Eligibility: Section 2001.  
 Mustering-out payments, a limitation: Section 2001 (b).  
 Payments, administration of: Section 2001.  
 Prior law valid: Section 2001 (e).  
 Public Health Service, officers, certain, exempted: Section 2001 (f).  
 Review, subject to: Section 2001 (c).  
 Secretary of Labor: Section 2001 (a).  
 Terms of: Section 2001 (d).  
 Unemployment compensation law, State, conformation thereto: Section 2001 (c).  
 Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952: Section 2001 (e).  
 Agreements, State, none:  
 Administration, payments: Section 2002.  
 Claim, disallowed:  
 Hearings, Secretary of Labor: Section 2002 (c).  
 Review, judicial: Section 2002 (c).  
 Eligibility: Section 2002 (c).  
 Entitlement, State law: Section 2002 (a).  
 Payments, administration of: Section 2002.  
 Payments, direct: Section 2002 (a).  
 Bond, officer or employee, agreement may require: Section 2003 (e).

Certification of payments, Secretary of Labor to Secretary of Treasury: Section 2003 (c).

Certifying officers, nonliability of: Section 2003 (f).

Definitions:

"Korean conflict veterans": Section 2007 (a).

State: Section 2007 (c).

Unemployment compensation: Section 2007 (b).

Delimiting dates: Section 2009.

Disbursing officers:

Bonded: Section 2003 (e).

Nonliability of: Section 2003 (g).

Duplicate benefits, prohibited: Section 2008 (a).

Election of benefits: Section 2008 (b), (c).  
"Korean conflict veteran," definition of: Section 2007 (a).

Liability to repay, false evidence: Section 2005 (b).

Payments to States:

Manner, procedure: Section 2003 (b).

Reimbursement by United States: Section 2003 (a).

Secretary of Treasury, made by: Section 2003 (c).

Money, unused to Treasury: Section 2003 (d).

Money, use as intended: Section 2003 (d).  
Social Security Act, under: Section 2003 (h).

Penalties:

Evidence, false: Section 2005 (a).  
Liability for repayment of: Section 2005 (b).

Puerto Rico, resident of:

Claims disallowed, hearings and review: Section 2002 (c).

Entitlement, District of Columbia law: Section 2002 (b).

Rates: Section 2001 (b).

Regulations: Secretary of Labor: Section 2006.

Reports, State agencies: Section 2004 (b).

Secretary of Labor:

Agreements, State: Section 2001 (a).

Regulations: Section 2006.

Social Security Act, payment to States, under: Section 2003 (h).

State agencies:

Information re military service: Section 2004 (a).

Reports by: Section 2004 (b).

State, definition of: Section 2007 (c).

Terminations, dates: Section 2009.

Unemployment compensation, definition of: Section 2007 (b).

Virgin Islands, resident of:

Claim disallowed, hearings and review: Section 2002 (c).

Entitlement, District of Columbia law: Section 2002 (b).

United Spanish War Veterans, representatives of: Section 3402.

United States Government life insurance. (See Insurance.)

Veneral disease: Section 105 (a).

Veteran, definition of: Sections 101 (2), 301 (1), 401 (2), 1801 (a) (2), 2015.

Veteran of any war, definition: Sections 101 (12), 601 (2).

Veterans' Administration:

Employees. (See Employees, VA).

Facilities, definition: Sections 601 (4), 5001 (f), 5209.

Independent agency: Section 201.

Offices: Section 230.

Seal: Sections 202, 3312.

Space, office facilities, furnished organizations: Section 3402 (a) (2).

Veterans' Canteen Service. (See Canteen Service, Veterans')

Veterans' employment representative: Section 2011.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, representatives of: Section 3402.

Vicious habits: Section 521 (a).

Virgin Islands, unemployment compensation: Section 2002 (b).

Visual exhibits: Section 233 (4).

Vocational rehabilitation:

Absence, leaves of: Section 1505.

Administrator:

Contract, training facilities: Section 1503 (4).

Employees:

Detail: Section 1511.

Instruct: Section 1511.

Employment of consultants and additional personnel: Section 1503.

Leaves of absence, veterans pursuing courses: Section 1505.

Regulate, conduct and cooperation of veterans: Section 1508.

Training, suitable, prescribe and provide: Sections 1502, 1503.

Utilize other Government agencies: Section 1503.

Advances to veteran: Section 1507.

Advisory Committee: Section 1662.

Benefits, prior benefits not chargeable: Section 1502 (d).

Books: Section 1509.

Citizens of United States service in Allied forces: Section 109 (b).

Definitions:

Vocational rehabilitation: Section 1501 (2).

World War II: Section 1501 (1).

Eligibility:

Korean conflict: Section 1502.

World War II: Section 1502.

Employers, reports required of: Section 1504 (d).

Entitlement: Section 1502.

Equipment: Section 1509.

Forfeiture: Section 1508.

Fund, revolving: Section 1507.

Hospitalization, trainees: Section 1506.

Hospitalized, pending discharge: Section 1510.

Injury during training: Section 351.

Leave of absence: Section 1505.

Loans to veterans: Section 1507.

Medical care, trainees: Section 1506.

Noncitizen residence requirements: Section 1502 (c) (3).

On-job training:

Reduction of allowances authorized: Section 1504 (d).

Reports required of employer: 1504 (d).

Penalties: Section 1508.

Prosthesis, trainees: Section 1506.

Protected cases: Section 5514.

Purpose of: Section 1501 (2).

Regulations, administrator: Sections 1505, 1508.

Revolving fund: Section 1507:

Studies, investigations, and reports: Section 217.

Subsistence allowance: Section 1504.

Supplies: Section 1509.

Suspension: Section 1508.

Time limitations:

Claim based on training injuries: Section 351.

Korean conflict service: Section 1502 (c) (2).

World War II service: Section 1502 (c) (1).

Travel expenses: Section 111.

Waiver:

Conflict of interest, employees: Sections 1664 (d), 1764 (b).

Overpayments: Sections 412 (f), 3102 (a).

War periods:

Indian wars: Sections 501 (1), 601 (3).

Korean conflict: Section 101 (9).

Prior to April 21, 1898: Section 343.

Spanish-American: Section 101 (6).

World War I: Sections 101 (7), 301 (2) (A), 501 (2).

World War II: Sections 101 (8), 301 (2) (B), 1901 (b).

Wartime, compensation rates: Sections 314, 322.

Wheelchairs: Section 612 (d).

Widow:

Compensation eligibility: Sections 101 (3), 103, 302, 321, 341.

Definition: Sections 101 (3), 404, 701 (2).

Dependency and indemnity compensation, eligibility: Sections 404, 410, 416.

Loans eligibility: Section 1801 (a) (2).

Marriage:

Date: Sections 101 (3), 103 (b), 302, 404, 532 (d), 534 (c), 536 (c), 541 (b), 543 (b).

Legal impediment, without knowledge: Section 103 (a).

Same veteran, more than once: Section 103 (b).

Validity, proof of: Section 103 (c).

Pension:

Eligibility: Sections 101 (3), 103, 531, 532, 534, 536, 541, 543.

Income limitation: Sections 503, 545.

Remarriage as bar: Section 101 (3).

Widower: Definition: Section 701 (2).

Witnesses:

Attendance, compelling: Sections 784 (c), 3311.

Disobedience to subpoena: Section 3313.

Fees and mileage paid: Section 3311.

Production of evidence required: Section 3311.

Subpoena: Sections 784 (c), (f), 3311.

Willful misconduct: Sections 105, 310, 331, 521 (a).

Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: Section 106.

World War Adjusted Compensation Act, protected cases: Section 5514.

World War I, period of: Sections 101 (7), 301 (2) (A), 501 (2).

World War II, period of: Sections 101 (8), 301 (2) (B), 1501 (1), 1801 (a) (1), 1901 (b).

Yaws: Section 301.

Yellow fever: Section 301.

#### DEFERRING EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes.

#### CAPITAL BANKS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the bill H. R. 10345, providing for capital banks for small business.

The proposal is to set up a bank in each Federal Reserve district patterned after the Federal land banks. Loans would be made in a similar way to applicants needing consideration for loans.

THE SMALL-BUSINESS BANKS TO BE PRIVATELY OWNED

The plan contemplates that eventually the banks will be owned by the borrowers just like the Federal land banks are now owned by the borrowers. It is proposed that the capital for small-business banks be obtained by taking \$10 million from each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks as the initial capital. That is the same way capital was supplied for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. At that time Congress took one-half of the surplus funds of the 12 Federal Reserve banks to start off the FDIC. The

FDIC in 1947 paid that money back to the Treasury, where it belonged, although it was borrowed from the surplus funds of the Federal Reserve banks. It is really public money and it was the right thing to do to pay it back to the Treasury, which was done.

This proposal contemplates a similar situation, taking the money from the Federal Reserve banks for the capital, and when it is paid back it is to be paid back into the Treasury.

**THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS DO NOT WANT TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS**

First I want to bring to your attention the fact that Federal Reserve banks since 1934 have had money at their disposal to make long-term loans, at least much larger than can be made now by a bank, and risk loans or venture capital to small-business concerns. But the Federal Reserve banks have not looked with favor upon that power; they considered it to be in competition with private commercial banks, and they have not done much about it; they have not tried to make the loans.

Now in a proposal that is before the Committee on Banking and Currency it is proposed that the \$27.5 million that is in these banks, that is available to make small business loans be returned to the Treasury and not to require the Federal Reserve banks to make these loans in the future. That being true we should have some place for the small business people to go to get small business loans.

I invite your attention to the fact that the Cravens Committee that assisted in the preparation of S. 1451, known as the Financial Restitution Act of 1957, recommended the repeal of section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act. I read their recommendation:

This recommendation is to repeal section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act on the ground that it has been little used and that the Federal Reserve banks should not compete with commercial banks in the lending field. Therefore the recommendation is approved.

The Senate committee in its report on the bill S. 1451 recommended that section 13 (b) permitting the granting of these loans to small business be repealed by omitting it from the statute. In this connection I quote the following paragraph from page 35 of their report:

There are also omitted, and consequently repealed, provisions contained in title 12, United States Code, section 352a, which were first enacted in 1934, authorizing the Federal Reserve banks to make working capital loans and commitments to established industrial or commercial businesses. This authority has been utilized very little in recent years and, in any event, appears to be inconsistent with central banking functions. Repeal of these provisions, as indicated in section 805 (b) of the present legislation, will result in the payment by the Federal Reserve banks to the Treasury of amounts totaling approximately \$27.5 million, heretofore paid to the reserve banks by the Treasury pursuant to these provisions.

The bill S. 1451 when it reached the House was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency in writing up the summary of

amendments referred to the fact that the repeal of this section 13 (b) was asked for:

**REPEAL OF BUSINESS LOAN AUTHORITY**

Section 13 (p. 83) omits the existing authority for Federal Reserve banks to make working capital loans and commitments to established industrial or commercial businesses.

**THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT OPPOSES HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS FROM THE FEDERAL RESERVE**

During June 1957 representatives of the Treasury appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate and testified that the law providing for the Federal Reserve to help small business should be repealed.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. George M. Humphrey, presented a letter addressed to the President of the Senate in which he recommended that the idle funds now held by the 12 Federal Reserve banks for this purpose be returned to the Treasury, subject to future availability.

This letter is as follows:

**THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,**  
*Washington, January 8, 1957.*

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.**  
SIR: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, to authorize repayment to the Treasury of amounts paid to Federal Reserve banks for making industrial loans.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Federal Reserve banks to repay to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts paid to such banks under the provisions of subsection (e) of section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act for making industrial loans, the amounts repaid to remain available to the banks for making subsequent loans, if found necessary.

Subsection (e) of section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, approved June 19, 1934, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to each Federal Reserve bank, for the purpose of making industrial loans, an amount not to exceed the par value of the bank's holdings of capital stock in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

For the purpose of making payments to the Federal Reserve banks, Congress appropriated \$139,299,556.99 from the increment resulting from the reduction in the weight of the gold dollar. Payments were made by the Treasury to the banks from this appropriation, in the amount of \$27,546,310.97. These funds have not been fully utilized by the Federal Reserve banks for many years. As of November 14, 1956, there were only \$809,000 of loans outstanding and commitments of \$2,176,000. Accordingly, the Department believes that, in the interest of sound fiscal management, the idle funds now held by the banks should be returned to the Treasury subject to future availability.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative print showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

We have been informed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that it has no objection to the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

**G. M. HUMPHREY,**  
*Secretary of the Treasury.*

**IDLE SURPLUS FUNDS IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SHOULD BE USED TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS**

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that Mr. Humphrey referred to these funds as idle funds, and he is correct in that statement. He would also be correct if he referred to the fact that all the surplus funds of the 12 Federal Reserve banks were idle funds, because they are idle funds.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the following statement by Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in which he states in his testimony that he wants section 13 be repealed because he believes it is inconsistent with central banking functions.

This statement is as follows:

Repeal of authority for business loans. The proposed revision of the Federal Reserve Act would omit and thereby repeal section 13 (b) of the present Federal Reserve Act authorizing the Federal Reserve banks to make working-capital loans to industrial or commercial businesses. This authority has not been utilized extensively in recent years and in any event it is believed to be inconsistent with central banking functions.

Repeal of these provisions has heretofore been recommended by the Board. Their repeal would mean that the Reserve banks would repay to the Treasury approximately \$27½ million which has been paid by the Treasury to the Reserve banks under these provisions.

The reason I bring this up is to show that the Federal Reserve System does not look with favor upon making any small-business loans and they are in effect kicking out the agency and the money that is set up for the purpose of making these loans. This being true, we should have a place for them to go to get long-term loans and venture capital. That is proposed in this bill, H. R. 10345, that I have introduced. It has tremendous support in both the House and Senate. We propose the use of the \$27,500,000 as operating capital for the capitalizing the 12 new small-business capital banks.

**A SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANK SYSTEM SHOULD BE CREATED TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS**

On January 29 I spoke on the floor of the House and I discussed at that time this small business banking system. This address commences at page 1292 of the RECORD. I also placed in connection with my remarks a copy of the bill and brought out the fact that in setting up these capital banks it would not require any loan from the Government. The Government would not be required to borrow money and pay interest on it. It would not interfere with the national debt. We have the money just like the FDIC had the money from the surplus funds of the Federal Reserve banks. It is the same situation, and, therefore, we have a precedent for it. That is all we are asking.

**NEED FOR SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS WIDELY RECOGNIZED**

I also placed in the RECORD last week another statement, on February 10, commencing at page 1991 of the RECORD in which I discussed these banks again. I quoted at that time a representative of the American Bankers Association, Mr.

Kelly, who brought out the fact that small business needs gravely and desperately at this time a place where a small-business man can go and get consideration for long-term loans and for operating and venture capital.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK PRESIDENTS SEE NO REASON WHY OUR PLAN FOR SMALL-BUSINESS BANKS COULD NOT WORK

Four presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks were asked to testify before the House Committee on Small Business last November.

One of these interrogated about this particular proposal—it had not been introduced at that time—was Mr. Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, District No. 2, which includes, of course, the State of New York. Mr. Hayes was asked about this. He did not give any reason why he should not take \$10 million from his surplus fund for this purpose in the State of New York. His only request was that the Federal Reserve not be required in any way to administer the operation. He requested that it be a separate and distinct operation from the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System does not want a thing to do with it. Therefore, we need to set up this separate agency.

The testimony of Mr. Hayes, November 19, 1957, before the House Small Business Committee, is quite revealing. I am inserting it in connection with my remarks.

ALFRED HAYES, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. HAYES' RECORD, PAGES 32-33

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Patman, I have not studied the question, so my opinion of it is not worth very much.

I think obviously if Congress should find that banks of that kind would fill a real need, then they should be set up. I have the feeling that they have practically nothing to do with the Federal Reserve banks by their nature, that there is a great difference between the kind of bank you are talking about and the central bank. And I see no particular reason why they should be very closely meshed with the Federal Reserve System.

The CHAIRMAN. Except the Federal Reserve would furnish the initial capital, just as they furnished the initial capital for the FDIC.

Mr. HAYES. I have a general feeling that our capital required is about right for the operations we are supposed to undertake as a central bank. But as I say, I have not studied that.

The CHAIRMAN. But it would not hurt your bank any to take \$10 million of the reserves that you have, to let this new small bank have capital, would it?

Mr. HAYES. As I say, I have not studied this. I have not thought very much about the adequacy of our capital and reserves for the size of our operations. But I think I probably have a naturally conservative inclination to keep all the capital and reserves that we have to support our normal activity.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hayes, your answer disturbs me. Your answer indicates that you think that you depend on your reserves and your capital to function.

Mr. HAYES. No, sir; I do not think—we certainly have to—

The CHAIRMAN. You do not depend on them at all.

Mr. HAYES. I suppose it provides some cushion in theory against whatever risk we may be taking in the way—

The CHAIRMAN. I did not intend to get into any dispute with you, and I hope you take this good naturedly, but it disturbs me that you indicate you are dependent on your reserves and capital, as a central bank—1 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks—when your capital does not enter into your business at all; it is not used, and your reserves are not used. Your power comes from your power to create money, which you do.

Mr. HAYES. Quite correct, Mr. PATMAN. But I think that any enterprise that involves making substantial investments in assets, whatever they may be, probably does well to have some reserves for contingencies.

We are an operating bank, an organization that does have income and outgo and presumably we should have some cushion somewhere to take up unforeseen expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what disturbs me, Mr. Hayes, that you think you use this reserve—

Mr. HAYES. I do not mean to say that the size of our capital and reserves affects our open-market operations, because it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is so insignificant—

Mr. HAYES. I agree that it is a relatively unimportant factor. I just have a general feeling that some kind of a contingency fund is a desirable thing to have. But I certainly agree with you that it does not have a major bearing on any of our policies.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you are going to have something like a capital bank for small business, and if the Congress takes \$10 million out of your reserve fund and lets this capital bank have it, you would rather have it divorced from the Federal Reserve operations altogether, in other words, entirely separate and distinct?

Mr. HAYES. That is my offhand instinct, yes, sir.

At the same time Mr. Malcolm Bryan, who is president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Ga., district No. 6, including the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, part of Tennessee, Louisiana, and Mississippi testified about this. Mr. Bryan did not know of any good reason why we should not use a part of the surplus funds of his bank to establish a small-business bank in that area.

MALCOLM BRYAN, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ATLANTA—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. BRYAN'S RECORD, PAGE 33

The CHAIRMAN. How would you feel about that, Mr. Bryan, about the capital bank for small business, and having a setup like the Federal Reserve? In other words, separate and distinct, but have an overall board appointed by the President, and then have different boards for each of the 12 banks selected by the President, and then later on, as the small-business concerns got an equitable interest, they would begin to get directors on the board, too?

Mr. BRYAN. Well, speaking, sir, purely for myself, I would be inclined to believe that one of the problems of small business is access to equity capital.

I have some considerable feeling that the Federal Reserve System has got all it can say grace over, in consequence of which I would be inclined, if it were in the wisdom of Congress to do so, to have it set up in the way you suggest.

Now, as for taking some of the capital away from the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, allow me to assure you that if you do that I am going to obey the law, just because I do not want to go to jail.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not hurt your bank at all to take \$10 million, would it?

Mr. BRYAN. I do want to make one statement on the capital situation—and that is one of the worst kiddings I get from people in the district who look at our statement of assets and liabilities and capital ratios. They

say, "You are undercapitalized, aren't you?" It's hard to explain when other banks are urged to increase their capital.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean your bank?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not depend on your reserves and your capital stock ratio, do you, Mr. Bryan?

Mr. BRYAN. No; I think that is correct, sir. I think there is some reason, however, to allow the Federal Reserve bank to show a conventional statement that people understand. But I am not insisting on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, would they understand how you could do \$50 billion worth of business on \$332 million worth of capital?

Mr. BRYAN. That, sir, is one of the most difficult problems that I have to explain. And I do not know that I have ever got it explained to anybody's satisfaction.

Next, at same sitting, we interrogated Mr. Johns, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, District No. 8, including the States of Kentucky, Missouri, part of Tennessee, and Arkansas. Mr. Johns did not know of any reason why the surplus funds should not be used for that purpose.

DELOS C. JOHNS, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ST. LOUIS No. 8—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. JOHNS' RECORD, PAGE 34

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johns, would you like to comment on the capital bank for small business idea?

Mr. JOHNS. One small comment. I have not observed that the Federal Reserve banks' presidents spend a great deal of time worrying about their capital funds.

My question about this, I do not wish to dispute the need for some sort of arrangements of this kind, I would hope that this is one of the answers we might gain from the study of the financing of small business that is under way.

I have some reservation, however, as to whether these funds should be supplied with Federal Reserve funds, which the chairman has already referred to as high-powered dollars, or whether it is not more desirable for these capital funds to be derived from the savings of the community.

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest, I did not intend to say that these banks would have \$10 million of high-powered dollars, upon which they could expand. They would just have \$10 million, and that would be their capital.

Mr. JOHNS. Yes. But I think when they lend the money, Mr. Chairman, it quickly becomes a part of the reserves of the commercial banking system.

Then we interrogated Mr. Hugh Leach, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, including, of course, Maryland and Washington, D. C., Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. At the conclusion of his testimony I said:

You would not feel like you were hurt any, would you, Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. I would not feel like I was busted.

In other words, they have plenty of money for that purpose. It is surplus money; it is idle money; it is not used. Do not overlook that. It is idle money; it is unused money; it is not used for any purpose. This would be using it for a good purpose.

HUGH LEACH, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND, FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT No. 5, MARYLAND, WASHINGTON, D. C., VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA AND SOUTH CAROLINA—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. LEACH'S RECORD, PAGES 34-35

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Leach, would you like to comment on the discussion we have had

here about the capital banks for small business, and about taking \$10 million of your money to use as capital in your district?

Mr. LEACH. If the studies show, as they may well do, that an important need of small business is for equity corporations and Congress should decide to set them up, I would hope that they would not be closely connected with the Federal Reserve System, because the required experience and knowledge in an entirely different field.

If Congress takes \$10 million from us, I guess I would not be in a position to object very much.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not feel like you were hurt any, would you, Mr. Leach?

Mr. LEACH. I would not feel like I was busted.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM STATES THAT THE PLAN FOR SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS DESERVES CONSIDERATION

Next, on November 21, 1957, the House Small Business Committee had before it Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I interrogated Mr. Martin about this proposal, and he promised to give it earnest consideration, but he certainly did not give any good reason why we should not use \$120 million for these 12 capital banks for small business.

WILLIAM MCCHESENEY MARTIN, JR., CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. MARTIN'S RECORD, PAGES 332-335, AND 361

Mr. PATMAN. \* \* \* Now, the point of my question is this. I spoke of a \$10 million appropriation—did you read the testimony of Mr. Hayes and the other presidents of these banks before our committee on Monday, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what it is?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I have not read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I have news for you. They did not oppose my proposal to appropriate \$10 million from each Federal Reserve bank too much. And each one of them said that they could put up the \$10 million rather easily if Congress should require it. They did not seem to resist it too much.

Now, since we need capital and we have got to have capital, and this money in the Federal Reserve banks, in each Federal Reserve bank is idle money, it is unused money—the aggregate amount of it is over \$745 million under section 7 and about \$27 million under section 13 (b), which you will not repeal, and then about \$108 million under another section. But you have over \$750 million in these 12 Federal Reserve banks, money that is actual money. It is not any phony money. It is actual money. It is surplus. It is not needed now. It has never been needed in the past, and I say that there is no prospect of its use in the future. Certainly \$10 million from each of the 12 banks or \$120 million aggregate would not be too much to take from that fund.

Do you see any reason why that should not be considered, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see any reason why it should not be considered, Mr. PATMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. However, it has one element different, and I think it is fundamental, it is basic, the most important of all. It is the money. You know when you appeared on the Senate bill, the question there was you would have to borrow the money. You would have to pay interest on it. It might cause the national debt to exceed the limit, and there were a lot of other reasons why you were against that bill. But those reasons do not apply to this proposal, because this proposal, you will note, will not unbalance the budget. You will

not go over the debt limit with it. You will not incur additional obligations. You will not have to pay extra interest.

So you do not think it is an entirely different proposition, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. I think there is that—

The CHAIRMAN. Using the surplus funds.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there is that difference. I think there are some questions, questions of judgment involved in it. I think they are raised in that statement which you have got in the Record. I do not want to commit the board of governors in either direction on it at this time. They have not considered it.

The CHAIRMAN. I will get back to that later, Mr. Martin. I will answer you on that in a minute. But now on the Boston bank, for instance, it has \$43,948,000 surplus, an increase of \$3 million last year. The New York bank has \$208 million in surplus funds, just under section 7. Now, that money is not being used for any purpose; \$10 million from that would not hurt them any. And on Philadelphia, \$52 million; and Cleveland, \$66 million; Richmond, \$37 million; Atlanta, \$33 million, an increase of \$3 million last year; Chicago, \$110 million; St. Louis, \$29 million; Minneapolis, \$18 million; Kansas City, \$27 million; Dallas, \$37 million; San Francisco, \$82 million. I have a little news for you on San Francisco. They earned over \$10 million last year; so what they earned last year would supply the capital of that bank. They earned \$11 million.

Now, how did they earn that \$11 million? It would be interesting to go into that and find out. Did they do it making discounts, lending money? No, they did not do it that way. You know how they made that money. They made \$63 million last year, \$63,479,000, and that is interest on Government securities.

Follow this closely; it is very important. It goes to the whole Federal Reserve Banking System. The San Francisco bank, although it earned net profits, after paying all expenses of all kinds whatsoever, earned \$11 million last year. It only made gross \$765,000 in discounts. So the money for all practical purposes, 98 percent of it, came from interest on Government securities. Now, those Government securities on which they earned that interest they did not touch. All those bonds were in New York, were they not?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not guarantee every one of them was, but the majority of them were.

The CHAIRMAN. The open-market account of the New York bank has charge of them, does it not?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; the account has charge of them, but they are prorated through the System.

The CHAIRMAN. I know they are prorated, Mr. Martin, but you know what the score is. I do not have to just keep on asking you. You know. And the Federal Reserve bank in New York has complete charge of all these bonds for all the banks. The Dallas bank cannot touch one of them in the open-market account. The San Francisco bank cannot. It is only the Open Market Committee operating in the New York bank in charge of an officer of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, not even under your direction, not even hired by you, not even paid by you, but hired and paid by the New York bank. It has charge of every one of those bonds, and each year they just remit or credit the San Francisco bank its part of the interest. Is that not true?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I think that the account operates the way you say it does. All of the Federal Reserve banks participate in it. The New York bank handles the account as agent for the Federal Open Market Committee, and we have to approve the manager of the account.

The CHAIRMAN. So you are making \$10 million a year on that exchange. That would

be enough to capitalize one of these banks, the profits on one transaction.

Mr. Martin, since you testified carrying out the resolution of the Board against the Sparkman bill in the Senate, I am not discouraged. I feel like that you had a different proposition to consider, because it involved raising the money and interest rates and the debt ceiling and budget and unbalancing the budget and all those questions.

I can see where you would be against that bill, and maybe not be against the bill that I have suggested, and would you mind taking up with your Board the proposition that I have submitted, and give it earnest, careful consideration?

Mr. MARTIN. We will give it earnest, careful consideration.

CED'S PRESIDENT APPROVES PLAN FOR SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS

Then, we had before us the president of the Committee for Economic Development, Mr. Alfred C. Neal, former executive vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Mass. That is Federal Reserve District No. 1. Mr. Neal had some encouraging and heartening information in connection with our proposal.

ALFRED C. NEAL, PRESIDENT, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, FORMER EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, BOSTON, MASS., FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT NO. 1—QUOTATIONS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF MR. NEAL'S RECORD, PAGES 91-93

Mr. NEAL. Mr. PATMAN, without answering your question directly, I would go so far as to say that the \$120 million that you envisage probably could be made available by the Federal Reserve, but the question I would like to—

The CHAIRMAN. No; it would not be made available by the Federal Reserve. We will not ask them to make it available. We will pass a law to appropriate the money. It is the Government's money.

Mr. NEAL. You can do that, but the thing I am getting at is why should not the individuals and businesses who, after all, are going to be benefited at least indirectly, why should not they put up some of the capital for this capital bank?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly they should, and that should be arranged, and with this in view: that eventually the banks will be owned by individuals. That is the way to work it. We do not want the Government to own it.

Mr. YATES. Is that something like the FNMA setup? Is that what you had in mind?

The CHAIRMAN. This is like the joint stock land banks and the Production Credit Corporation. The associations of the Production Credit Corporation. A lot of them have paid out and they are owned by individuals. And that is the way we would anticipate that this would be done, and it would eventually be owned by small-business concerns.

Now, you look with favor on that, I know.

Mr. NEAL. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I am referring to the surplus, which is \$800 million.

Mr. NEAL. Now, I know what you are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. Now, answer my question. That fund is idle and unused; is it not?

Mr. NEAL. That fund, sir, is, as you know, a bookkeeping entry.

The CHAIRMAN. Most banking is bookkeeping entry.

Mr. NEAL. Yes; but I mean that surplus stands on the books as a difference between the total of the assets and the liabilities and capital.

The CHAIRMAN. No, Mr. Neal, that has nothing to do with the assets. It is not

used as an asset. You know too much about it.

Mr. NEAL. I am only trying to answer your question. I do not know which specific assets in the Federal Reserve statement—

The CHAIRMAN. It is not an asset.

Mr. NEAL. No, but I do not know which assets correspond to that surplus.

I would assume, sir, if the Federal Reserve bank had to make available, subject to a law passed by the Congress, \$10 million, that it would decrease surplus by \$10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. NEAL. And it would set up probably a deposit to the account of your capital bank.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, it would.

Mr. NEAL. For \$10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Which could be carried in the Federal Reserve.

Mr. NEAL. Or that could be carried in the Federal Reserve. You would thereby have \$10 million which was previously, as you say, idle and unused.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. NEAL. Becoming activated.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

I am giving you that information to let you know that this is not just an idea that someone has. It has been thought out over the years. It is fundamentally and basically sound and something that should be adopted by this Congress.

FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUS FUNDS NOW IDLE AND WILL REMAIN UNUSED UNLESS TRANSFERRED TO SMALL-BUSINESS BANKS

In the consideration of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, the bill now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, hearings commenced in July 1957. I had the privilege and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], also a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, had the privilege of interrogating certain witnesses about proposals of this kind and other similar proposals, and I am inserting the testimony. You take, for instance, Mr. Martin was before our committee on July 31, and I asked him about the stock that the Federal Reserve banks had sold, and he stated it was not needed. I am bringing that up in connection with the surplus funds, and I am putting his testimony in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve earnings that are mentioned in this bill, the division of the earnings as between 90 percent and 10 percent, is there any reason why you should have 10 percent go into the Federal Reserve bank surplus fund, when the Reserve banks have an amount in their surplus equal to their capital stock? Is there any reason for putting more money in these surplus funds, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. Beyond what we presently have?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, we are not just building it indefinitely. We have a stop-out point, and the Treasury gets all of the balance.

Mr. PATMAN. Ninety percent, but why should they keep the 10 percent when they don't need it for any purpose at all?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, we thought it was a normal contingency. We don't know what will happen over the years.

Mr. PATMAN. You have three-quarters of a billion dollars now. Do you think that should be paid on the national debt or retained with these banks? If you are going to insist on 10 percent, we could take three-quarters of that billion dollars and pay it on the national debt, couldn't we?

Mr. MARTIN. I think it would be sounder to follow the ordinary business practice of setting up a reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Although you can't name a single purpose that you would probably need the money for.

Mr. MARTIN. Not at the moment, no.

Mr. PATMAN. And that stock cannot be sold, as Mr. MULTER brought out, and cannot be hypothecated?

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. And it cannot be voted except according to the rules that you explained to him.

For what purpose is that money used, Mr. Martin? Can you name one purpose for which that money is needed, except as you said, that it creates a good relationship with the banks and makes them feel they are part of the System. Outside of that, what purpose does that capital stock serve?

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think it has any purpose at the moment. I think originally it was part of the organization capital of the Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. PATMAN. To set up the Reserve banks?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. But now it is not needed at all, is it?

Mr. MARTIN. I think we could get along without it today.

Mr. PATMAN. All right.

Neither the stock nor the surplus funds are needed in connection with the operation and administration of the Federal Reserve banks. All these funds are idle and not used. You take the so-called capital stock of \$342 million. It does not mean anything; it is not used for anything. The banks get 6 percent interest on it every year, but the money is not even invested; it has never been invested in Government bonds or anything else. It has been idle all these years and unused. You take the near \$1 billion in the Federal Reserve banks of the country. It is just like Secretary Humphrey says; it is idle money; it is unused money, and certainly it is not going to hurt those banks to have \$120 million of it used for small business capital banks purposes, just like it was used to set up the FDIC.

When Mr. Martin was on the witness stand I asked him this question:

You have three-quarters of a billion dollars now. Do you think that should be paid on the national debt or retained with these banks? If you are going to insist on 10 percent, we could take three-quarters of that billion dollars and pay it on the national debt, couldn't we?

Mr. MARTIN. I think it would be sounder to follow the ordinary business practice of setting up a reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Although you can't name a single purpose that you would probably need the money for.

Mr. MARTIN. Not at the moment, no.

No one could name a single purpose for which that money could be needed for. It is idle and unused and should be put into use.

Then we had Governor Robertson. He was asked a similar question. He is a member of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. PATMAN. \* \* \* I wonder, however, since you have about three-quarters of a billion dollars in the surplus fund of the Federal Reserve banks, why you want 10 percent more each year. What will you do with it? It doesn't serve any purpose. It is idle, unused. What do you want to put it aside for?

Governor ROBERTSON. May I answer that?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Governor ROBERTSON. There is no magic in any 90 percent or 10 percent or anything else.

Mr. PATMAN. Why do you want any percent? Why do you want any amount, as long as you have a certain amount in the surplus fund of a bank? Why are you not satisfied with that? Why do you want to keep piling up more money, which is unused and doesn't serve any purpose?

Governor ROBERTSON. The only thing we were trying to do here was to follow out the original concept of the statute. It did provide for a surplus. This contemplates building up the surplus, not because you needed it today but because you might need it some other time.

Mr. PATMAN. What would you need it for?

Governor ROBERTSON. I can't imagine. I hope there is never a situation to need it.

When he appeared before us, the following colloquy took place:

Mr. PATMAN. Why do you want any percent? Why do you want any amount, as long as you have a certain amount in the surplus fund of a bank? Why are you not satisfied with that? Why do you want to keep piling up more money, which is unused and doesn't serve any purpose?

Governor ROBERTSON. The only thing we were trying to do here was to follow out the original concept of the statute. It did provide for a surplus. This contemplates building up the surplus, not because you needed it today but because you might need it some other time.

Mr. PATMAN. What would you need it for?

Governor ROBERTSON. I can't imagine. I hope there is never a situation to need it.

There are two members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, including the chairman, both of whom say that they cannot conceive or imagine any purpose for which the money will ever be needed. So what are we waiting on as a Congress? Why should we not use it for a good purpose?

Mr. Multer interrogated Mr. Martin as follows:

Mr. MULTER. The moneys that are deposited by the members of the Federal Reserve System with the Federal Reserve banks, which are the moneys paid on their subscriptions to the stock, are immobilized almost to the same extent as their reserves, are they not? That money is held by the Federal Reserve bank, and it is immobilized the same as you immobilize the reserves. Am I right?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; that is right.

I think the point was made here in discussing those stock subscriptions—Mr. PATMAN made the point—that in the early days those stock subscriptions were part of the organization, the corporate organization of the banks, and they could have been used for operating expenses or anything else at that particular time, by the System.

As time has gone on, they have become an insignificant amount of money against the general operations.

I don't think that is any justification for eliminating them.

On July 15, Mr. Martin was testifying, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin, I want to ask you some questions about your statement, first. Now, on the expenditures for Federal Reserve bank buildings, there will be no limit as to Federal Reserve buildings, will there?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. And this bill would take the limit off the branches too?

Mr. MARTIN. That is right. It would be capitalized.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice the Senate committee said that the money you will spend

is the Federal Reserve's money, anyway. Don't you consider this Government money, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. I most certainly do.

On July 15, 1957, Mr. Martin further testified as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. \* \* \* These statements of the Federal Reserve Board, covering the 12 Federal Reserve banks, show that 96 or 97 percent of all the earnings of all the Federal Reserve banks comes from interest on Government bonds.

Now, Mr. Martin, in acquiring those bonds for the 12 Federal Reserve banks, isn't it a fact that you don't use as backing for the money which you exchange for those bonds, for instance \$23 million worth for the Dallas bank, you didn't use the reserve of the member banks, did you?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. You did not use the capital stock of the members banks, did you?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. You did not use the reserves or the surplus funds of the member banks?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Isn't it a fact that the only thing you used was money that you created which, of course, you have a right to do under the law? You created \$23 million in Federal Reserve notes. Whether you actually transferred them physically or not, the result was that you created that much in Federal Reserve notes and traded them for United States Government bonds. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MARTIN. That is one way of stating it.

**THE NEED FOR SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS IS CLEAR**

Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee has devoted considerable time and study to the problems of small-business financing. It is studying that matter intensively at this time. Recently, the full committee heard testimony from a number of experts who presented their views on what to do about solving the problems of small-business financing. Those experts included high-ranking, policymaking officials of the Federal Government—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and others—and experts who are leaders in private financial institutions. The latter included Mr. Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange and Mr. G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

We who are interested in alleviating the problems of small-business financing found much of value in the testimony of these experts. Mr. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, proposed that Congress act to establish an agency and system for providing small business with equity capital. In the December 1957–January 1958 issue of the American Investor, an editorial was presented dealing with the proposals made by Mr. McCormick. That editorial is quoted as follows:

Small business has usually solved the problem of getting money to expand capacity or increase its sales volume by going to the bank. More than 95 percent of its capital requirements for growth have been met since the war through loans, whether from banks or others. However a permanent solution of the problems of growing small business firms does not lie in loans. They need permanent capital which they may keep in operation without meeting the recurring call for interest payments. The incurring of debt too often results in smaller

firms being driven to the wall by the slightest local or national economic adjustments.

The conclusion expressed above appears more and more to be winning acceptance by students of small-business problems. How to effect the accumulation of needed capital is a vital subject to which the House Select Committee on Small Business has been giving its sympathetic attention in recent hearings. The necessary capital build-up can be accomplished through the accumulation of company savings, or through the subscription of equity capital by individuals or institutions willing, as partners, to share the risks as well as prospective profits of small business. On these points, Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, suggested in his recent appearance before the committee:

"Under this form of taxation [double taxation of corporation income] a shareholder is taxed not only on the net income of the corporation in which he holds his shares, but again when a portion of that income is distributed to him as a dividend. I believe that, because of the greater risk involved in investment in new and small enterprises, the impact of this tax policy is even more severe in restricting the acceptance of the securities of these companies.

"I [also] believe that this committee should explore the possibility of setting up an investment trust or group of investment trusts of the closed-end type which would provide equity capital to small business and be jointly financed from governmental and private capital resources."

**SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS CAPITAL TO FIGHT MONOPOLY**

I can assure you that this is something the small-business concerns of the country need badly. It is needed in the fight against monopoly. Many of us can remember that over the years we have had, for instance, 2,000 manufacturers of passenger automobiles according to testimony presented to a Senate committee. We can remember when there were 50 or 100, easily, but now there are 4. Out of 2,000 they are down to 4. That is an unhealthy situation. There are 3,200,000 business concerns in the United States of America. Most of them, over 3 million of them, are small-business concerns. They are the backbone of the country. If we do not do something to help them they will soon fade away and that will be crushing to the economic system which we have enjoyed so long and so well. It is necessary in order to save our country, to save the backbone of the country, the small-business enterprises of the United States, and I hope that this bill receives favorable consideration.

In conclusion, may I say that the majority leader in 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 joining and associating themselves with a proposal to create a small-business banking system. A number of Members of the House have likewise interested themselves in this proposal. A number of them have introduced similar bills.

**WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE**

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense was held in Washington, D. C., on January 30–31, and February 1, 1958.

During this conference, the women attending adopted a series of resolutions and it is my desire to call the attention of Members of the House to the position taken by this patriotic organization on many of the important issues confronting the Nation.

Here are the resolutions:

**RESOLUTION No. 1**

**GREETINGS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER**

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., extends to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, its greetings.

The conference offers its prayers for his guidance to the end that this sovereign Nation, under God, may not perish from the earth; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pledges its support and cooperation to this purpose.

**RESOLUTION No. 2**

**GREETINGS TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR**

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., sends greetings to Gen. Douglas MacArthur with assurance of continuing esteem and confidence in his courage, his wisdom and his unmatched moral and military leadership.

**RESOLUTION No. 3**

**COMMENDATION OF FBI HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE**

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., gratefully thanks the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their ceaseless and invaluable vigilance in detecting subversive individuals and organizations in the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., expresses its continued support of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

**RESOLUTION No. 4**

**IN MEMORIAM**

Whereas, the Nation has suffered grievous loss in the deaths recently of three great patriot leaders, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Senator Herman Welker, and Representative Lawrence H. Smith: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pays tribute to the courage, wisdom, and patriotism of these three great national leaders and expresses to their families its deep sympathy and sense of personal loss.

**RESOLUTION No. 5**

**PRESERVING THE SOVEREIGNTY OF CONGRESS**

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges that the Congress be imperturbed to prepare and enact all appropriate legislation to—

1. Strengthen the internal security of the United States,
2. Preserve the integrity and autonomy of the Congress and each of its Houses in the conduct of their own affairs, and
3. Protect the rights of the States, as guaranteed under the 10th amendment of the Constitution, especially with respect to investigation and legislating against subversion.

**RESOLUTION No. 6**  
**RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS**

Whereas the increasing popularity of all forms of international organizations present special problems affecting the national security and defense; and

Whereas the possibility that subversive foreign infiltration could hamper or cripple production in key industries is an ever present danger: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges that all States adopt right-to-work laws so that the American worker can always be master in his own home.

**RESOLUTION No. 7**

**IN SUPPORT OF HOOVER REPORT—SUPPORTING H. R. 8002—TO PLACE THE FEDERAL BUDGET ON AN ANNUAL ACCRUED EXPENDITURE BASIS**

Whereas firm Congressional control of space-age spending by modern budget methods is essential; and

Whereas Congress, under present obsolete methods, makes lump sum appropriations for projects running over a period of years; and

Whereas the agency which gets the money does not have to report back on the cost of the program or its progress from year to year and in this way huge carryover funds become lodged in the agency beyond further Congressional review, and it is estimated by the Hoover Commission there is a carryover of 70 billions—almost a year's budget—as a result of this wasteful practice; and

Whereas under H. R. 8002 the Government would pay in a given year only for the goods and services received in the year, thus enabling Congress to check programs annually: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., supports in principle H. R. 8002 so that modern businesslike methods may be used and that legislative control of the purse strings, which is a basic keystone of any free self-governing nation, may be strengthened.

**RESOLUTION No. 8**  
**INFLATION**

Whereas the purchasing power of the United States dollar has already declined to about one-half of its 1939 value; and

Whereas the major cause of this inflation is deficit financing and ever-rising Government indebtedness; and

Whereas under the present administration, after an initial period of genuine effort toward economy, a balanced budget and reduction of indebtedness, strong evidence is accumulating that a new cycle of inflation resulting from high Government spending is about to begin; and

Whereas preservation of the financial solvency of the United States is an absolute essential for victory in the world struggle against socialism-communism: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges all individuals and organizations within and without the Government to support sound efforts toward economy in all phases of Government activity, foreign and domestic, in order to control indebtedness and maintain the purchasing power of the dollar; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., is adamantly opposed to any raise of the debt limit.

**RESOLUTION No. 9**  
**BUDGET**

Whereas the \$73.9 billion budget presented to the Congress of the United States for the next fiscal year is \$2.1 billion more than the recordbreaking peacetime budget asked for last year; and

Whereas excessive taxing and spending is rapidly bringing about the triumph of world socialism and the breakdown of morality in the exact manner spelled out in Communist writings: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions that a strong Congress refuse to appropriate additional money until the waste, extravagance, and boondoggling in the United States national and international spending programs is eliminated and a proper accounting made to the American people for money spent and benefit to the United States received.

**RESOLUTION No. 10**

**COMMENDATION TO LT. GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN**

Whereas at a time of great national peril when powerful forces are endeavoring to curb and silence all disclosures of facts involving the administration of our national-defense program in recent years, a certain general of the United States Army has had the courage to speak without fear of consequences, and to resign from his high position in order to preserve his right to speak, in order to bring to light facts essential to the security of our country: Now be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., hereby expresses its commendation to Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin for his admirable conduct and unselfish action on behalf of his country, expressing the hope that he will at all times maintain himself free of any forces—Government or private—which might deter him from the objective which he has pursued so courageously.

**RESOLUTION No. 11**

**OPPOSITION TO ABRIDGMENT OF NATIONAL ANTHEM**

Whereas House Joint Resolution 17 is before the Judiciary Committee to standardize the national anthem by omitting the third stanza of Francis Scott Key's historic poem and removing the capital letter P referring to Divine Power, together with certain punctuation and music changes: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions the Congress of the United States to oppose any change or abridgment in the words or music of our national anthem.

**RESOLUTION No. 12**

**SUPREME COURT SHOULD NOT USURP LAWMAKING POWERS OF CONGRESS**

Whereas our unique system of Government by laws, not men, in its division of powers gives great importance to our Federal Supreme Court; and

Whereas the Supreme Court must give judicial decisions; and

Whereas their judicial decisions become part of the supreme law of the land; and

Whereas to permit the Supreme Court to usurp the lawmaking powers of the Congress, even by writing implementing legislation, injures the basic fabric of our Government, as laws made by a majority of the Court with life tenure in office could reduce this Nation to rule by a five-man oligarchy, instead of a Nation governed by our own Constitution: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges all citizens to petition the Congress to stand firm and to refuse to acquiesce in any encroachment by the Supreme Court on the lawmaking function bestowed on Congress by the Constitution.

**RESOLUTION No. 13**

**REAFFIRMATION OF SUPPORT OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT**

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act was overwhelmingly passed by more

than a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress over the veto; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act represents the first thorough and complete codification of our immigration and naturalization laws in more than a century; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act has preserved our traditional and equitable national origins quota principal for determining the number of immigrants admitted yearly to the United States from each foreign country—a realistic recognition of the fact that certain nations are much closer to our American way of life than other nations in their economic living standards, Christian customs, culture, ideals, respect for law and order, and experience in self-government; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act forbids the entry into the United States of criminals, Communists, subversives, and other undesirable aliens; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act has been highly commended by competent immigration authorities, is heartily endorsed by the rank and file of the American people, and is opposed only by some groups who seek to dictate our national immigration policy: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., reaffirms its approval of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and will vigorously oppose any attempt by opponents of this act to repeal it or to weaken it in any way, and believes that the preservation of this act is a matter of primary concern to every patriot, if our country is to avoid being conquered by massive and uncontrolled immigration.

**RESOLUTION No. 14**

**OPPOSING FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION**

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., hereby reaffirms its strongest opposition to Federal aid to education and to the consequent inevitable Federal control of education within the States as demonstrated in other Federal-aid programs.

**RESOLUTION No. 15**

**CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION**

*Resolved by the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc.*, That it is our solemn and unalterable conviction that investigations by the Congress are not only the prerogative but a constitutional obligation of that body, the discharge of which is indispensable to adequately informed and orderly legislation, for the execution of powers vested in the Congress, and that of all other powers vested in the Government of the United States, or, in any department or officer thereof; and be it further

*Resolved*, That it is undisputable teaching of political history that, whenever the executive has exerted the power, or been permitted to interfere with the legislative processes, liberty has been immolated; that any attempt of any other department of Government or officer thereof, whatever his rank, to interfere with the Congress in the discharge of this high obligation; to instruct it as to its conduct, or in any other manner hamper its operations, is a constitutionally unjustifiable intrusion upon the legislative prerogative and should be sharply rebuked and repudiated.

**RESOLUTION No. 16**

**NATIONAL DEFENSE**

Whereas the impotence of the United Nations as a bulwark of peace and security for freedom-loving people has been manifested by recent events in Hungary; and

Whereas the specialized agencies of the United Nations are continually strengthening their hold upon our institutions and our economy; and

Whereas the present Congress of the United States will be reevaluating our commitments within the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and foreign aid; and

Whereas the age of Sputnik, Muttnik, and Goofnik has demonstrated the importance of reevaluating our present world position: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges upon the Congress of the United States the necessity of conserving our resources, building up our own defenses and those of the Western Hemisphere and curbing our disproportionate contributions to the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

#### RESOLUTION No. 17

##### STRENGTHENING THE CURRICULUM OF TEACHERS' COLLEGES

Whereas the startling shortage of properly prepared teachers in chemistry, physics, and mathematics affects our future national defense: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges all State legislatures to require tax-supported teachers' colleges to include in the requisites for a master of arts degree, a course in United States history and a course in the subject which the teacher will actually teach.

#### RESOLUTION No. 18

##### PROTECTING THE INDIVIDUAL'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER OUR MENTAL HEALTH AND COMMITMENT LAWS

Whereas our unique system of justice protects the individual by assuming he is innocent until proved guilty by the State; and

Whereas this protection against search and seizure without a warrant and an immediate court hearing is especially important to protect the individual from incarceration in an insane asylum before close relatives have signed commitment papers in court; and

Whereas some pending laws in some States attempt to bypass the important safeguard of immediate formal court hearings and the signing of commitment papers by a close relative before an individual can be restrained; and

Whereas present techniques of diagnosis and treatment are frequently unsatisfactory and investigations have disclosed barbarous conditions in some mental institutions due to overcrowding and the low grade, sometimes brutal, attendants who have hourly control over patients—except for occasional interviews by psychologists or psychoanalysts with patients and relatives: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges the public to oppose changes in our State mental health and commitment laws which would increase the dangers of unjust or malicious detention of persons in public or private institutions, pending formal public court hearings at which the citizen's constitutional rights may be fully protected and the burden of proof must rest on the shoulders of those who dare to challenge another's sanity.

#### RESOLUTION No. 19

##### ENCOURAGING AND PROTECTING YOUTH'S ACTIVITIES IN ROCKETRY

Whereas the youth of these United States today, in their enthusiasm over rockets, are acquiring chemical compounds to be used as fuel for rockets and missiles, and men with little or no supervision or knowledge of safety measures are making rockets and firing same throughout these United States; and

Whereas concurrent with youth's learning the science of rocketry, this unsupervised preparation and firing is causing the loss of life, limb and property: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., supports all Members of Congress who are urging that the Congress immediately request the Department of Defense to help the American Rocket Society in education for this youth activity, by coordination with the request of the Department's three services to cooperate with the American Rocket Society's program, which is to help the rocket clubs of the high schools and the science clubs throughout the country so that the United States may, in the years ahead, profit from this timely Congressional action by acquiring a larger reservoir of talented scientists and engineers.

#### RESOLUTION No. 20

##### OPPOSITION TO INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Whereas the Declaration on Human Rights is a vague expression of good will and the pending "International Covenant on Human Rights" as proposed by the United Nations, is a different document, which if and when ratified, would be a binding treaty; and

Whereas the American people are not aware of the inherent dangers in this covenant which could supersede our Bill of Rights and our State laws by a stroke of the pen; among other losses all American citizens would lose the right of trial by jury and the right to own property: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., again urges public education and active opposition to United States ratification of the International Covenant on Human Rights.

#### RESOLUTION No. 21

##### OPPOSITION TO SEATING RED CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., strenuously opposes the recognition of Communist China by the United States and/or its admission to the United Nations; and further

*Resolved*, That the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed accordingly; and further

*Resolved*, That the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to use the veto power if necessary to prevent the seating of the Red Chinese delegation in the United Nations; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges our Government to continue to support Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Government and Syngman Rhee, President of South Korea.

#### RESOLUTION No. 22

##### STATES RIGHTS

Whereas the Federal Government has, through the years, made progressive encroachments upon the constitutional rights of the several States of the Union, with devastating destruction of their vested rights, abridgment of their liberties and control of their institutions; and be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges a cessation of these destructive practices and a return to the 48 States of their sovereign rights as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States of America.

#### RESOLUTION No. 23

##### PRESERVE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

Whereas the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., recognizes that the Lincoln Memorial in the National

Capital is one of the greatest of our national memorials and one of the outstanding beauty spots in the city and affords inspiration and a lesson in patriotism to over 2,300,000 visitors annually; and

Whereas any structure which crosses part of the Lincoln Memorial grounds, and screens any part of it from the related nearby memorials, will inevitably be very harmful to its superb setting and an encroachment upon its dignity and serenity: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., hereby respectfully petitions the President and the Congress to prevent the construction by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the so-called Constitution Avenue Bridge pending further consideration by Congress of legislation still pending for location of the crossing elsewhere or the substitution of a tunnel in lieu of the bridge.

#### RESOLUTION No. 24

##### OPPOSING UNITED NATIONS ARMED FORCES

Whereas history has shown that the control of the armed forces by the people is essential for freedom and sovereignty of a nation; and

Whereas the lesson of Korea is that the United States while bearing 90 percent of the cost in American lives and dollars was denied victory by an international body; and

Whereas continued surrender of control of our Armed Forces to an international body would destroy the very fabric of our Constitution: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges upon the President and the Congress not to transfer any of our United States forces to any international command.

#### RESOLUTION No. 25

##### ENDORSEMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3, CURRENT BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas our liberties as individuals and our sovereignty as a Nation are being constantly threatened by executive agreements and by treaties drawn up by international groups, the members of which have little understanding of our system of government and little regard for our welfare; and

Whereas such treaties when ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting become the supreme law of the land, thus supplanting our Constitution and superseding our domestic laws by taking powers away from Congress and giving them to the President, by taking powers from the States and giving them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and can thus cut across the rights assured our people by our Bill of Rights; and

Whereas executive agreements do not now require ratification by Congress: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pledges itself to a crusade to close these dangerous loopholes in our Constitution so that we may preserve our liberties as individuals and maintain our sovereignty as a Nation and our strength as a world power; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., calls upon our legislators to join with us in supporting the principles of the Bricker amendment to our Constitution (S. J. Res. 3).

#### RESOLUTION No. 26

##### DANGERS DUE TO TREATIES SUCH AS NATO WHICH ARE SUBSERVIENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Whereas the current situation in Asia has awakened the American people to the possibility of an endless series of military defeats similar to Korea with their terrible price in American blood and treasure; and

Whereas the possibility of sending United States troops to the Far East or Europe without consent of Congress might be justified by interpretation of certain clauses in the Status of Forces Treaty, defining United States military obligations as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., again urges a national campaign to acquaint the American people with the dangers they face because even NATO (see articles I, V, VII, IX, XII) is set up as subservient to the United Nations Charter and, therefore, the United States, without its consent, can become involved in Asia and other troubled areas all over the world.

#### RESOLUTION No. 27

##### NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas until July 15, 1953, American service personnel on duty in foreign countries were under United States military courts, thus retaining their rights as United States citizens while serving our country abroad; and

Whereas the ratification on July 15, 1953, of the Status of Forces Treaty of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has deprived our servicemen of the traditional protection extended by our Constitution and enjoyed by United States servicemen on foreign soil, and now subjects our men to trial, imprisonment, and even the death penalty under foreign laws in foreign civil courts and prisons: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions the Congress of the United States to support legislation which would nullify that part of the NATO treaty referring to the status of forces which deprives American servicemen of the protection of the United States Constitution when serving in more than 50 countries of the world.

#### RESOLUTION No. 28

##### REAFFIRMATION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Whereas the United States of America was founded as a Christian country by men and women seeking freedom from oppression in their native countries in Europe; and

Whereas past events have shown the prevalence of organized crime and subversion in our country, and have also shown the lack of moral integrity in high places: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pledges itself to devote its every effort to furthering a return to the vision and ideals of our forefathers, courage, integrity, self-reliance, and faith in God.

#### RESOLUTION No. 29

##### FOUNDATIONS

Whereas there has arisen in this Republic a large number of so-called educational foundations; and

Whereas investigations of these foundations have shown them to be, among other things, holding companies to escape proper taxation; and

Whereas many educational foundations are using their tax-exempt funds to subvert our youth through control of our public educational system: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., goes on record as favoring legislation which will require all such foundations to file full and complete records as to personnel, expenditures, and scope of their educational work; and that they be required to pay taxes the same as all other corporations and individuals.

#### RESOLUTION No. 30

##### IN SUPPORT OF THE DIRKSEN-GWINN AMENDMENT

*Resolved*, The 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pledges its strong support to House Joint Resolution 123, Dirksen-Gwinn amendment, to the Constitution which would prohibit the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens.

#### RESOLUTION No. 31

##### PRESERVATION OF NATIONAL PARKS

Whereas America's national parks and monuments have been reserved from commercial use and other exploitation because their highest value and the wisest use of their natural resources is for the inspiration, education and enjoyment of all the people for all time: Be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., opposes all pressures to expose any national park or national monument to exploitation, to changes for commercial purposes, or to transfer jurisdiction of them, or any parts of them for such purposes; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this conference urges the American people to use every means available to them to prevent desecration of national park and monument areas for any reason whatever.

#### RESOLUTION No. 32

##### PRESERVE UNITED STATES RIGHT OF VETO IN SECURITY COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS

Whereas frequent abuse of its right of veto by Russia cannot change the fundamental fact that proper use just once of the veto by the United States as a permanent member of the Security Council for the United Nations might save ourselves and the world from catastrophe; and

Whereas events demonstrate that the United States may be outvoted in the Security Council as well as in the Assembly of the United Nations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges the public, the Congress and the President to resist all attempts to weaken by omission or evasion our right of veto in the Security Council of the United Nations.

#### RESOLUTION No. 33

##### OBJECTION TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., condemns the proposed International Criminal Court as unconstitutional and a serious threat to United States citizens accused of international crimes; and be it further

*Resolved*, That citizens be urged to petition the Congress and the President not to be a party to the protocol of signature and to refuse to ratify the International Criminal Court as a treaty, special agreement, or Executive order recommending that copies of such petitions be sent the Judiciary Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

#### RESOLUTION No. 34

##### OPPOSING ADDITION OF MEDICAL CARE TO SOCIAL SECURITY

Whereas forces abroad working for the creation of completely socialized economies have forced the adoption, in many countries, of socialized medicine with all its tragic results; and

Whereas these same forces are currently endeavoring to lead our country further into socialism by the inclusion of medical care in social-security programs: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., op-

poses this step toward further socialism in our country by the inclusion of medical care in social-security programs.

#### RESOLUTION No. 35

##### MAKE FEBRUARY AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the 48 States to proclaim February as American History Month, so that the enduring heritage of our immortal past may serve as a chart and compass for a happier present and a more glorious future for our beloved Republic as a great and sovereign nation.

#### RESOLUTION No. 36

##### IN FAVOR OF SEVERING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH U. S. S. R.

Whereas recognition of the Soviet Union was predicated upon the noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States by international communism; and

Whereas investigations by agencies of Federal, State, and local governments have established that this pledge has never been kept: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges immediate severance of diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to remove the shield of diplomatic immunity from Communist subversion and espionage aimed at the destruction of the United States of America.

#### RESOLUTION No. 37

##### PAN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Whereas the 21 independent sovereign Republics of Pan America including our own, all fought for their independence from nations of the Old World and all have a republican form of government; and

Whereas the Organization of American States, formerly the Pan American Union, has established the principle that an attack upon a member nation is an attack upon us all; and

Whereas our Nation has a tradition of friendship with other Pan American nations and we have a mutual need of each other, our Nation needing their trade and raw materials and their nations needing our trade, our markets, and our scientific knowledge in mechanics and agriculture; and

Whereas the Pan American nations are targets for Communist infiltration and acts of sabotage such as blocking the Panama Canal, or destruction of the oilfields of Texas, Mexico, or Venezuela, which are parts of the Marxian plan to destroy the United States and all nations in the Western Hemisphere: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., recommends the study of all the Pan American Republics, their history, their geography, and their customs and that each individual member make a definite effort to encourage friendly relations with our neighbors of Pan America.

#### RESOLUTION No. 38

##### SCHOOL REPORT CARDS

Whereas even before our present overcrowded classrooms, a pupil's progress was not restricted to the personal opinion of the teacher, but also included the impartial and unbiased records of achievement as recorded by written examinations capable of evaluation by experienced educators and also understandable to the parents; and

Whereas present professional terminology is so vague as to be sometimes contradictory as interpreted by different teachers and because even a conscientious teacher's personal

impressions could be somewhat superficial due to our present-day large classes: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., urges the continuance of report cards which include not only the teacher's opinions but also include definite grade marks based on written examinations corrected by the teacher and capable of factual evaluation of accomplishment by other educators as well as being understandable to the parents.

#### RESOLUTION No. 39

##### OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT AND ATLANTIC UNION

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., reaffirms its steadfast opposition to any form of world government, or partial world government or Atlantic Union, and to any impairment of the national sovereignty of our representative Republic, by convention, covenant, treaty, or executive agreement.

#### RESOLUTION No. 40

##### OPPOSITION TO FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Whereas research is establishing that the addition of fluoride compounds to drinking water has many harmful effects: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., opposes forced mass medication by the addition of any of the fluoride compounds to drinking water.

#### RESOLUTION No. 41

##### TO PREVENT TAX EXEMPTION FOR PROPOSED FOUNDATION TO POPULARIZE THE ICA

Whereas Congress, through the Dworshak amendment, has wisely and specifically forbidden the use of Federal funds for the promotion or publicizing of the activities of the International Cooperation Administration; and

Whereas efforts are now underway by a group of citizens to obtain a fund of \$1,500,000 for the purpose of coaxing the American people into supporting a continuation of the multi-billion-dollar foreign aid program; and

Whereas, it is proposed that contributions to this \$1,500,000 propaganda campaign be tax-exempt thus circumventing and nullifying the clear intent of the Dworshak amendment: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., vigorously opposes any action on the part of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue which would provide tax exemptions for funds made available for this purpose, and we oppose as unwarranted the proposed campaign of propaganda and pressure upon the American people and Congress, in an effort to secure approval of another huge appropriation for foreign aid.

#### RESOLUTION No. 42

##### OPPOSITION TO RENEWAL OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., reaffirms its opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and urges the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the 1943 Trade Agreements Act to expire June 30, 1958; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., reaffirms its opposition to United States participation in the proposed Organization for

Trade Cooperation (OTC) which is designed to administer and enforce the regulations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), thus bypassing Congressional approval of United States participation in GATT itself.

#### RESOLUTION No. 43

##### IN SUPPORT OF JENNER BILL TO LIMIT APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

*Resolved*, That the 32d Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., pledges active support to the principles of Senator JENNER's bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

#### INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, ever since the proposal was first made for the completion of the Interstate Highway System in 1955, I instituted a program of continuous study of the proposal and program. These studies have been continued up to the present date.

I would like to call the attention of the Members to the broad basic findings or conclusions I have reached that epitomize in the broad general statement that this great highway program is not being established with the sureness of perception and efficiency which the Congress should reasonably expect, and point out to you that the House Committee on Public Works which did such a splendid job in building the law under which this program now operates, is faced with the difficult task of amending and strengthening this law so that it will more directly reflect the intent of Congress.

There is growing evidence that some State governments who are partners in the great program are not sufficiently aware of the program to properly carry out their part therein. There is substantial evidence of weakness in administering the law on a Federal level, and at present there is no well-established procedure for correcting these basic faults.

If we are to have a sound and well-established Interstate Highway System of at least 41,000 miles by 1975 to meet the needs of the country at that time, this program must be strengthened by correcting the administrative decisions and practices that have been followed since the passage of the act in July 1956.

A closer, better and more integrated relationship must be developed between the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and all of the States, and a more equitable distribution of Federal funds and allocation of mileage be made.

I am very confident that through the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, that these major faults that have developed in the operation of the law will be corrected

this session; at least I hope so. I particularly want to call your attention to the fact that we have placed a tremendous burden on these two committees which will tax the capacity of these committees if they are to complete this work this session.

I have had prepared a thorough study of the present operations of the Highway Act of 1956 and I present the same to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Highway Act of 1956 was probably the most important and far-reaching domestic legislation affecting our national economy passed in recent years. It involved the largest single commitment of funds by the Federal Government ever passed by Congress in our national history, with the exception of our war appropriations.

I closely followed this legislation through all stages of its enactment and I have been very much interested in its administration during the 19 months it has been in operation. I have only the greatest praise for the Committee on Public Works under the chairmanship of my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman BUCKLEY, and the Subcommittee on Public Roads under the chairmanship of my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman FALLON, for their most effective work and the great contribution they made in establishing the present law.

Before and since the act was passed I have been engaged in quite an extended correspondence with Secretary of Commerce Weeks, because of what seemed to me to be unfair treatment to Massachusetts in the allocation of Federal mileage.

I am disturbed with the administration of this law up to now by Secretary Weeks and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads because of the great concentration of power that has been placed in the hands of the Administrator and his assistants, the questionable exercise of this power in the allocation of new mileage and Federal funds without proper consultation with the various States, and the arbitrary manner in which decisions have been made, which seem to me to be at serious variance with the meaning of the law and the intent of Congress, especially that understanding that all allocations of mileage and Federal funds shall be made in an equitable and efficient manner to achieve the greatest benefit to our country and the States which are partners in this program.

Even before the act of 1956 was passed we had a clear demonstration of this arbitrary exercise of power in the action of former Commissioner C. D. Curtiss on September 15, 1955, allocating 2,300 unassigned miles of interstate highway without properly consulting with the various States, even though the Federal Highway Act of 1921, which is still in force, provides that all Federal-aid highway projects shall be initiated by the States, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Bureau only have the right to accept or reject the State proposals.

We have another example of arbitrary and inequitable distribution of interstate mileage in the action of Secretary Weeks and the present Administrator of the Bu-

reau of Public Roads on October 18, 1957, in allocating 2,102 additional interstate miles provided either in the act of 1956 or from savings made in the system.

You are all familiar, I am sure, with the fact that 1,378 of these new interstate miles were allocated to 4 new interstate highways that do not seem to meet the various and shifting criteria established by the Secretary of Commerce as the reasons for these allocations.

There is considerable evidence that no State involved in any of these allocations was consulted in advance. On the other hand, strong protest has been made by several of the States involved, not alone because the routes were laid out by the Federal Bureau but particularly because they do not meet with the States' needs, and compelling the State governments involved to pay 10 percent of the cost, if they are now accepted, under the threat that if they do not accept the Federal Bureau will withdraw the allocation for them.

I am reliably informed that more than 100 complaints have been made by governors, Senators, and Representatives in Congress, and State officials, either against the specific routes made to their States, against the injurious effects of these allocations to neighboring States, or because the States believe they did not receive fair treatment in the allocations.

Some governors, I am informed, have not come out publicly against the allocations made to their States, because of fear that they will be accused of turning down 90 percent of Federal contributions, but they have written letters of protest.

Since the allocations made by the Bureau in October, last year, I have had several studies made which serve to illuminate the situation and prove that there is a complete lack of an adequate master plan for building and completing the Interstate System.

A map of the United States is very misleading if it is used as an illustration of the economy and the population of our country, because the growth of our United States is from east to west, and the great tide of immigration was from Europe; the density of our population and industry is concentrated in the eastern part. It always was that way from the beginning and it is so today.

I call to your particular attention the fact that the eastern Atlantic States of New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, which contain almost 40 percent of all manufacturing plants and manufacturing workers in the country, received a total allocation of approximately 140 miles or 7 percent of the total allocation of 2,102 miles made by Secretary Weeks and the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads last October. New England received a total of 10 miles, 5 for a Springfield-Holyoke bypass highway and 5 miles for a Hartford bypass, and there is some question as to the validity of the Springfield bypass.

These eastern States are densely populated, and many industrial plants vital for defense production are located there. They also have greatly congested highways, in many cases well beyond the sat-

uration point. As a large area of country there is probably more highway congestion in these States than in any other section of our country, and the situation is steadily getting worse. They received a totally unrealistic 7 percent of the total allocation of new mileage in October last, far below the present growth needs.

The inevitable deduction must be drawn that these States are expected to build themselves the expansions of the Interstate Highway System needed to meet the requirements of 1975, or at least most of the new mileage. It is extremely difficult to follow the reasoning that would justify such a small allocation, in view of the large segments of new mileage allocated in some cases to very sparsely populated areas with few industrial plants, where the use of these new highways will be for light traffic for at least a long time to come.

If highway congestion or industrial densities now or expected are factors in this decision, and if these allocations were made to meet highway and economic conditions that will prevail in 1975, it is at least difficult to understand how such a decision was made. If the major consideration was to connect major cities of the country it should be pointed out that the two largest allocations of 978 miles do not connect large cities. If military needs were a major factor there is no evidence that the military complained about the need for these new highways.

If the justification as explained by the Bureau was to make necessary connecting links, the justification and necessity was purely a matter of judgment, and the decision was made by 2 or 3 officials, without holding open hearings or conferences with the States involved or their neighboring States.

In a recent letter I sent to Secretary Weeks, I made the following statement:

I know of no other expenditure of billions of dollars by the Federal Government determined solely by the opinion of 2 or 3 men, without giving an opportunity for all States involved to submit in open hearings their needs, desires, and justifications. It is not possible for three men to know enough about the United States to give efficient and fair allocations for a highway system which will not be completed for 15 years to fill the needs of 1975, without establishing exhaustive and thorough study of all factors.

I have not yet received a reply from the Secretary of Commerce commenting on this contention of mine, but in his reply I received assurance that because the cost to build interstate mileage in Massachusetts is higher than in some other States, we would benefit.

This is the form of explanation that seems at great variance with the purposes of the act and the intent of Congress. This is the first time I have received the intimation that because it would cost more to build interstate mileage in the congested or densely populated States, than in the sparsely settled States where the cost per mile would be less, it would have an influence in determining what the country needs from the Interstate System.

I know that when the legislation was being prepared by the House subcommit-

tee the committee members were thoroughly aware of the differing costs of construction between the densely populated and industrial areas and the rural or barren areas of the West, and this consideration was well in mind when the cost estimates were established.

In the allocation of funds to the States and the acceptance of the States' estimates of needs, there is plenty of evidence that the plan for the Interstate System is not thoroughly understood.

In the summer of 1953 a representative of the present Secretary of Commerce advised a subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee that the needs on 37,800 miles of the Interstate System were \$11,300,000,000—see page 14, national highway study summary of subcommittee hearings, House Print No. 9, Committee on Public Works.

Section 13 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1954 directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of the cost of completing the Interstate System and to make a report of his findings to the Congress. The Secretary submitted such a report on March 25, 1955, in which he advised that the cost of completing the Interstate System would be \$23,200,000,000 for 37,700 miles.

Again, in section 108 (d) of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956 the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study and report to the Congress, the needs of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Secretary submitted such a report to the Speaker of the House on January 7, 1958.

The first three columns of table C in that report list these highway needs as of July 1, 1956. The total is \$39,500,000,000, the estimate applying to 38,548 miles of the 41,000 miles authorized for the Interstate System.

It would be interesting to find out how these relatively comparative estimates increased from \$11,300,000,000 in 1954 to \$93,500,000,000, the first week of 1958. The somewhat inevitable conclusion is that the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads do not have a clear understanding of the needs of the Interstate System, and have not yet made a true Federal estimate, relying solely on the individual estimates made by the 48 State highway departments. There is evidence that some of these State officials do not have a completely clear knowledge of which is involved in the Federal program.

The Secretary of Commerce in his January 7, 1958 report, states that the latest increases in cost of the Interstate System amount to 37 percent on a nationwide average. Of this, 5 percent is charged to traffic increase, 15 percent is the additional cost of compliance to the directive of Congress in section 116 (b) of the act of 1956 to take care of local needs, 3 percent is the additional cost of utility adjustments and 12 percent to the increased cost of building the highways.

The attached table shows a comparison of interstate needs as reported by the Secretary for the \$23,200,000,000 estimate of March 1955 by States and also for the \$39,500,000,000 estimate of July 1, 1956. These figures are illuminating,

showing that while the estimate for Connecticut was cut \$71 million, other States' needs were greatly increased. Texas' needs are increased \$1,754,000,000, Virginia's needs are increased \$1,562,000,000, California's needs increased by \$1,481,000,000, and New York's estimate of cost is increased by \$1,323,000,000.

I think that this latest estimate of interstate highway needs proves quite conclusively my statement to Secretary Weeks that the problems of allocation of mileage and distributing the funds are altogether too vast for any 2 or 3 men to make equitable decisions, at least without thorough study and public hearings at which the States will submit their need justifications. To this I might add, it demonstrates the need of a clear definition of what the interstate program seeks to accomplish, which is thoroughly understood by the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Public Roads, and every State highway department.

Of equal or even greater importance in building the Interstate System than the allocation of mileage or the distribution of funds, is the effect on urban living and growth that will come from the erection of these limited-access highways. How they will be built through our cities and congested areas, the effect they will have on mass transportation, the isolation of one area of a city from another, the barriers created between schools and schoolchildren, between churches and congregations, the local loss of tax revenues, as well as the expansion and growth of communities for the next 25 years, are all problems vitally important to a majority of the American people who live and work in cities and towns on the Interstate System.

These problems and others emphasize the need of thorough local and national study for routes that must pass through our large cities, particularly. In the meantime the problem of urban connections through cities on the Interstate System, the location of stub or spur highways to connect cities with nearby interstate through highways are almost all in the future, and indicate the necessity for a new body of definitions and regulations with stronger controls at the Federal level, the expansion of State highway departments, the adoption of new engineering methods, local public hearings, and an appellate body in Washington that can settle disputes.

When States' needs provide the measure of distributing mileage and Federal aid for highways in the next year or so, then I believe we can get down to the practical problem of building the Interstate System in a manner which will be the most efficient and helpful for our country, the States and communities through which this system will pass, and provide the transportation facilities that will bring greater success, safety, and comfort to our people.

I am convinced that if we had the kind of deliberative understanding and equitable controls I have advocated above, Massachusetts and other States would have received far better treatment in the allocation of new miles to the Interstate

System. I am hopeful that in the next years these wrongs will be righted.

For the Subcommittee on Public Roads, under the chairmanship of Congressman FALLON, I am hopeful that in its deliberations seeking to improve the operation of this great National and State venture, which are about to start, the committee will be able to correct the faults and bad administration of this act, which means so much to our future prosperity and coming generations of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the present recession, it is of great importance that early action be taken which will enable the several States to start roadbuilding projects that will be a stimulant to business and reduce unemployment.

Estimated cost of completing Interstate Highway System  
(Millions of dollars)

State	Estimate of cost		Increase	Percent increase
	Mar. 25, 1955	July 1, 1956		
Alabama.....	366	755	389	106
Arizona.....	210	497	287	137
Arkansas.....	203	401	198	98
California.....	2,321	3,802	1,481	64
Colorado.....	157	324	167	106
Connecticut.....	555	484	1-71	1-13
Delaware.....	66	199	133	202
Florida.....	496	929	433	87
Georgia.....	700	906	206	29
Idaho.....	107	277	170	159
Illinois.....	1,065	2,266	1,201	113
Indiana.....	867	1,068	201	23
Iowa.....	275	428	153	56
Kansas.....	207	382	175	85
Kentucky.....	492	669	176	36
Louisiana.....	493	940	447	91
Maine.....	147	214	67	46
Maryland.....	434	831	397	91
Massachusetts.....	838	1,053	215	26
Michigan.....	1,295	1,457	162	13
Minnesota.....	483	728	245	51
Mississippi.....	246	441	195	79
Missouri.....	599	1,063	464	77
Montana.....	153	447	294	192
Nebraska.....	106	283	177	167
Nevada.....	73	222	149	204
New Hampshire.....	66	217	151	229
New Jersey.....	1,357	1,412	55	4
New Mexico.....	235	447	212	90
New York.....	1,336	2,659	1,323	99
North Carolina.....	247	315	68	28
North Dakota.....	107	205	98	92
Ohio.....	1,361	2,328	967	71
Oklahoma.....	377	390	13	3
Oregon.....	319	628	309	97
Pennsylvania.....	760	1,682	922	121
Rhode Island.....	123	183	60	49
South Carolina.....	183	341	158	86
South Dakota.....	95	200	105	111
Tennessee.....	380	1,076	696	183
Texas.....	872	1,754	882	101
Utah.....	238	349	111	47
Vermont.....	178	339	161	90
Virginia.....	569	1,562	993	174
Washington.....	467	674	207	44
West Virginia.....	258	472	214	83
Wisconsin.....	323	469	146	45
Wyoming.....	296	388	92	31
District of Columbia.....	152	355	203	133
Total.....	23,253	39,511	16,258	70

<sup>1</sup> Decrease.

A SALUTE TO THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. NATCHER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, most of us are familiar with our first President's love of the land. It was on his

farm called Mount Vernon that he practiced contour planting, crop rotation, and other soil conserving methods. Each year, near the anniversary of the birth of George Washington a period of time is set aside which is called National Future Farmers of America Week. The setting aside of this particular week is for the purpose of focusing attention on the work of the future farmers of today who will be the successful farmers of tomorrow.

Vocational agriculture and the FFA constitute a most effective program for training boys to be good farmers and helping them to become established in the farming occupation of their choice. In view of the Nation's need for new farmers, it is quite fitting that recognition be given these young men, while, at the same time, such encouragement be offered as to stimulate them to harder work and greater achievement.

It was our third President, Thomas Jefferson, who said, "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God." Our early farmers came from a working class of people in Europe and early frontier life helped to develop a democratic spirit and pride in the virtues of industry, thrift, and labor which is present today in our American farms. Well did our forefathers know that agriculture must prosper if our Nation is to prosper. It was during the Second Continental Congress that a move was started to set up a Department of Agriculture where problems confronting our farmers could be studied and properly researched. Then, as today, the results of research and control achievements were carried directly to the farmer in order to be properly utilized. At the present time this mission is assigned to our county agents and home demonstration agents. These dedicated men and women render untold assistance, not only to our farmers and their wives, but to our Future Farmers of America. Also our vocational agricultural teachers are performing outstanding work. They are not only instructors, but they set examples of personal inspiration in working with the young people of the FFA on the farms and in schools. In my Congressional District the FFA organization is composed of intelligent, energetic young men who are the recipients of benefits gained through services of their county agents, home demonstration agents, and vocational agricultural teachers.

Through participating experiences in the various chapters of the Future Farmers of America, members learn how to take part in meetings, to follow parliamentary procedure, to speak in public and to cooperate with their fellow students in programs for individual and community betterment. Local chapters sponsor recreational activities, safety campaigns, hold parent-son banquets, and so forth. The achievements recorded by the farm youth in all the counties of the Second District of Kentucky can be pointed to with pride by the people of Kentucky generally. And any demonstration of interest in their accomplishments only spurs them on to increased efforts.

In this crucial period now facing us, it is comforting to dwell on the thought

that in the years to come the welfare of our country will rest in the hands of such young people as those affiliated with the Future Farmers of America. They have learned to find themselves as individuals and to lose themselves in interests, causes, and enduring ideas. Our country will always have room for imaginative, reasonable, and responsible men and women. In this respect the members of the FFA are fulfilling themselves so that they can fit into the world creatively and significantly.

I not only salute the Future Farmers of America but express my personal appreciation for their vigilant efforts toward the advancement of agriculture.

#### THE LIVING UNKNOWN SOLDIER

Mr. SILER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, over yonder across the river in the Arlington Cemetery is the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It is of white marble. The inscription says:

Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God.

No one really knows, but he may be white or colored, rich or poor, Catholic, Jew, Protestant or none of these. He may come from Briar Creek in my home county in the mountains of Kentucky or he may come from the great, throbbing city of New York. God only knows. But we do know he is dead and my present remarks are not about him at all. However, I want to talk a little right now upon "The Living Unknown Soldier," the one still breathing and keeping house somewhere in our country up at the head of the hollow—the doughboy, the GI, the one Ernie Pyle sometimes referred to as the dogface. My man is still alive. He is still with us. Now the frost of many winters may be upon his head above those stooping shoulders. His cough may be asthmatic. His palsied tremor of hands may be pronounced. His eyes once keen upon a gun barrel may be quite dim in these days of 1958. Yet he is still around here in our land and he is supremely worthy of our thoughtful consideration in the Congress of the United States as we ponder many grave problems in our present day and age.

There has been a considerable amount of callous talk about cutting down or cutting out the pension of that living unknown soldier. And some have even thought of economizing on the service-connected compensation now provided by laws previously enacted by this body in behalf of that same living unknown soldier. The Bradley Commission has made its report. And some people may be about ready to change the symbolic cognomen of our country from Uncle Sam to Uncle Judas, the ungrateful betrayer for thirty pieces of 1958 economy as the price upon the living unknown soldier—sold out by acceptance of the Bradley report by this Congress. I, for

one, refuse. I, for one, feel that this Living Unknown Soldier should keep his benefits until the sun grows cold and as long as the years shall fall like grains of sand through the fingers of God Almighty upon the seashores of time.

The Living Unknown Soldier was 22 million strong in this past September of 1957 but was not very strong in body or physical prowess at that time. Yet when he came forth in the flower of his young manhood from the Old Kentucky Home, where the sun shines bright, or from Deep in the Heart of Texas, or from Oklahoma, where the corn is as high as an elephant's eye, back in the days of conflict, this living unknown soldier could have asserted his own strength as David asserted his to King Saul:

Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock: and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth: and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him, and slew him.

Surely we remember. It was when night had almost blotted out the light, when might had almost supplanted right, when horror gripped the hearts of men, that the American GI struggled up the hill of Golgotha and told the world "This is my body broken for you." And I say to you now that any nation great enough to muster them and send them out should be great enough to continue their benefits when war drums no longer roll.

It is timely to note that in the past 15 years United States taxpayers have paid over \$60 billion in foreign aid programs, while the total cost of pensions and compensations to veterans and their dependents during the entire history of the United States is less than \$40 billion. United States taxpayers are spending less today in proportion to national income for pensions and compensation than they were spending some 60 years ago when the veteran population represented less than 3 percent of the total compared to over 13 percent today.

The great poet, Edwin Markham, wrote these lines:

We are all blind, until we see  
That in the human plan  
Nothing is worth the making if  
It does not make the man.  
Why build these cities glorious  
If man unbuilded goes?  
In vain we build the work, unless  
The builder also grows.

Our Uncle Sam is the most successful builder on earth and yet he cannot build at all nor grow one inch if the day should ever come when he neglects or repudiates or sells out the Living Unknown Soldier.

I am most happy to speak today for the legendary but real character I have been talking about, and I hope this greatest lawmaking body in the world will not seriously consider any plan to terminate nor decrease his pension or compensation benefits as they now exist. To do so would be entirely unseemly for three very good reasons:

First, it would be an ungrateful gesture; second, it would be a most inconsistent act to restrict American home-folks aid of this kind while continuing our foreign-aid programs abroad; third,

it would be a detrimental factor upon consumer demand which is the fundamental basis of our domestic prosperity here in America at the present time.

Now, here is a truly humble, loyal, brave, patriotic citizen from Main Street, Wall Street, head of the creek, down in the delta, up on the mountain, out on the plain; a legendary but real character, the Living Unknown Soldier. He should always be wholeheartedly endorsed and aided by the Congress of the United States because he wholeheartedly endorsed and aided the Congress of the United States when darkness descended and covered the ailing earth.

#### GAS LOBBY AT WORK

Mr. MACDONALD. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Harris-O'Hara gas bill is one of the most controversial measures in Congress, and has been for a long time. Similar bills have been vetoed twice. Once by the Democratic President Truman on the grounds that such a bill is not in the public interest.

Republican President Eisenhower vetoed it, in protest against what he termed "arrogant lobbying tactics" by the bill's proponents. His veto came at the height of a storm over disclosure by Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, that representatives of the Superior Oil Company of California attempted to put \$2,500 into his campaign fund in what CASE interpreted as an attempt to buy his vote in favor of the bill.

A similar bill was reintroduced in the House last May. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, reported the bill after lengthy public hearings last summer. The committee vote was 15 to 13 in favor of bringing the bill out. As my colleagues know, I voted against reporting the gas bill out of committee and testified before the Rules Committee against the bill.

The oil and gas lobby, which in 1956 spent a declared \$2 million lobbying for the bill, not counting the tax deductible amounts spent by companies to educate the public and Congress on the need for higher gas prices, still is at work. In fact, they are so much at work that last Monday night Texas Republicans raised \$100,000 through a \$100-a-plate dinner in Houston, Tex., for the avowed purpose of getting the Harris-O'Hara gas bill through the Congress this session. H. J. Porter, Texas Republican national committeeman, urged contributors to purchase tickets because as he said in a letter to them that Mr. Martin had helped to pass a natural gas bill in 1955 and would need to muster support of 65 percent of the GOP Members of the Congress to pass the bill this year. What this means is that the Republicans of

Texas were not only showing their appreciation for past favors done for them in Washington, but they were also counting on further Republican help to put through the Harris-O'Hara gas bill which would ease Federal control over producers of natural gas and cost consumers of the country literally billions of dollars in added costs.

It is interesting to note that immediately after the dinner both the White House and the Republican National Committee washed their hands of any connection with the Republican fund appeal in Texas. Mr. Alcorn, Republican national chairman, stated that the Republican National Committee would not accept any funds from the proceeds of the Houston dinner. This sounded as though the Republican high command realized that this was an arrogant attempt by the Texas oil millionaires to influence the Republican House Members. However, these moral scruples seem to have faded away in a few hours. The next day the chairmen of the Republican House and Senate campaign committees proclaimed that they would be glad to have this gas and oil money. The Republican national committeeman of Texas must be happy over the turn of events because now he knows that the money will go where he intended it to go; namely, to help pass the natural gas bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these tactics on the part of the gas lobby are as offensive as the reported bribe by Senator CASE 2 years ago.

I am positive that the majority of my colleagues will agree with me that the editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Friday, February 14, 1958, very lucidly sets forth additional reasons why the Harris-O'Hara gas bill should be given as quick a burial as possible.

The editorial follows:

#### THE DIFFERENCE

"Some of this money was contributed by persons who wished to get a legislative decision on a matter that I believe the Supreme Court unfortunately decided the wrong way. I see no reason why the contributions should not be accepted by our committee."

In these words, Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the House Republican campaign committee, demonstrated clearly exactly why his committee should not accept any of the funds raised at the Texas appreciation dinner for Republican efforts on behalf of the gas bill. Unfortunately the impropriety of doing so, which was plain enough to the Republican National Committee and the White House, seems wholly to have escaped both Mr. SIMPSON and Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL of Kansas, who says his Senate Republican campaign committee also will take some of the money.

Acceptance of campaign money offered on the basis of campaign promises and past voting records is one thing. With adequate disclosure of contributions, the voters can decide for themselves whether a candidate is compromising his ability to make independent judgments. But the acceptance of money raised for the specific purpose of getting a legislative decision on a matter pending before a sitting Congress is impossible to distinguish from a sellout, whatever the recipient's inner motives may be.

The Republican Congressional committees contribute to the campaigns of all Republican Members. Some are opposed to the

gas bill. Others might be if they did not believe the party was obligated to the gas interests. They might of course accept the Texas money, through their campaign committees, and still vote against the legislation to ease Federal controls over natural gas. Such a course would perhaps be more defensible than a sellout, but it would also be supremely cynical.

Commingleing of the Texas money with Republican Congressional campaign committee funds would taint the entire kitty. If Messrs. SIMPSON and SCHOEPEL cannot see this, perhaps their colleagues will repudiate the unwise decision to accept the boodle from Texas.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND A PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today two bills grounded firmly in the best economic knowledge and designed to combat the dangerous, spreading unemployment which now imperils our economy. The first bill provides for a substantial public-works program to provide jobs and opportunity. The second offers a large increase in unemployment compensation.

This latest so-called readjustment, Mr. Speaker, has now rolled over the edge. Already it brings misery and despair to at least 4.5 million Americans and their families. I say at least 4.5 million because this figure, made public just last Tuesday by the Commerce and Labor Departments, tells only a partial truth. The full facts are grimmer yet. This army of unemployed is expected to rise to a figure of 6 million or more by fall.

We must add to the 4.5 million figure those thousands who, all unwillingly, have been separated from their livelihoods in the near month which has passed since the Bureau of the Census collected its statistics. Also add to the 4.5 million the concealed unemployment to be found among those youngsters who, matured to the age of self-dependence, still find themselves obliged, by lack of job opportunities, to remain technically outside the available labor force. Add, too, the older workers who have been forced to put aside their tools, although they may be dependent upon the extra income to supplement meager pensions. Technically, they too are no longer part of the labor force and so are not counted as unemployed.

These groups are, in fact, the invisible unemployed, present in our national calculations not even as statistics. Yet they, like the 4.5 million, are able bodied and willing, even if our statistics do not show it. Like the 4.5 million, they have been rendered unemployable by forces which, so far as they personally are concerned, are no more controllable than an earthquake.

Nor is this all. The Census Bureau tells me that as of January 18, 1958, the

average workweek in the United States was 39.9 hours. This is a drop of six-tenths of an hour since January 1957. It represents a dollars-and-cents reduction in take-home pay, a kind of shadow unemployment which drops approximately 40 million hours out of our national workweek, effectively reducing the work force by an additional 1 million workers. Who considers a man working a day a week, or 2 days a week as employed?

Four years ago, Mr. Speaker, in The Hard Money Crusade, Bertram Gross and Wilfred Lumer wrote the following bitterly prophetic sentence:

In large enough doses, a hard money program may succeed in curbing inflation—but only at the cost of precipitating a decline in production, employment, and incomes, redistributing income away from lower to higher income groups, and forcing undesirable changes in the structure of the economy.

The consequences of tight money are plain enough. They could have been foreseen. They were foreseen; I have damned the administration's hard money policy as often and vigorously as I could. One is tempted to conclude that they were foreseen as clearly by those who perpetrated this policy as by those, like Mr. Gross and Mr. Lumer, who argued passionately against it. The difference is that there are few millionaires among the unemployed—and what is regarded as catastrophic is received by others with hardly a ripple of anguish, a rolling readjustment they term it.

This so-called rolling readjustment has caused in the city of Detroit unemployment in excess of 200,000 and in the State of Michigan in excess of 320,000. This is an unemployment in Detroit of between 1 in 8 and 1 in 7 and puts Detroit over the red line into the category used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to designate those areas where job seekers are in substantial excess of job openings. This is the most serious term used in reporting unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and I am told that Detroit is the first city in the continental United States to qualify for this unpleasant distinction. Unless direct and wholehearted action is taken to interrupt this rolling readjustment before it turns into a one-way skin dive, I am desperately afraid that Detroit will soon have company in its misery. I am also afraid that, unless this action is taken promptly, the misery of Detroit and other depressed areas may be just beginning.

The February 14 issue of U. S. News & World Report, in a special article entitled "The Detroit Story: How a City Gets Along With 1 in 8 Out of Work," tells us:

At present . . . Detroit is holding up much better than job figures alone would indicate. Here you see the evidence of how unemployment programs can cushion the shock of a business downturn. It's a far cry from the 1930's.

It is indeed a far cry from the 1930's, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Detroit are grateful to those social visionaries, some of them still serving their country in this House, who built their vision and their wisdom into the State and Federal unemployment compensation laws. We

of the present generation are in their debt.

But today these laws offer inadequate protection. At least one-third of the Nation's unemployed do not fit within the terms of the compensation laws. Some are excluded because their occupations are not covered. Some are disqualified by eligibility requirements which differ sharply and illogically from State to State. Some have exhausted their benefit rights and are still unemployed.

Even where coverage is complete, the compensation program replaces less than 20 percent of the wages lost to the community and only about 33 percent of the amount lost to the individual worker. If this rolling readjustment long continues, the percentage will shrink to nothing. Already, the wage replacement average has fallen to 10 percent in some of the areas more seriously affected.

The White House offers to change this black picture with a \$2 billion program to modernize the obsolete physical plant of the Post Office Department. This is to be accomplished over a 3-to-5-year period and financed partly by private investors, partly by a mail rate increase. I have no time here to detail my objections to this scheme. May I say, however, that it is not sound either as economics or as public policy. It ties together with tinsel and ribbon a program that looks as if it might be a public-assistance program but is not, with an economic policy designed to lay a few more knout strokes on the bleeding back of the consumer. I am certainly in favor of a genuine public assistance program, but I will not be blackmailed into supporting the insupportable. I was interested in noting that Mr. Summerfield admitted this is not an adequate public works program to solve our country's unemployment; and worse, that it was not conceived as such.

Mr. Speaker, the two bills which I am introducing today combine an extension of the unemployment compensation program with a genuine and economically sound public works program. The first would establish Federal standards for compensation coverage in place of patchwork State regulations. It would extend the period of coverage to 39 weeks and bring the level of compensation up to no less than 50 percent of the worker's actual wage or two-thirds of the average wage paid all workers in the State, whichever is the smaller amount. It would encompass all employers of one or more persons—in other words, all but the self-employed. The second bill would establish a Federal public works administration and authorize the appropriation of \$500 million to be apportioned out to the States for use in combating unemployment.

This money would be allotted on the basis of \$9 from the Federal Government to each \$1 of State or local funds, and construction would be under the direct supervision of State or local authorities. Except for technical, administrative, and supervisory personnel, only workers on the jobless roll would be eligible for employment under this program.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have heard enough expressions of confidence,

expressions might I add that are peculiarly and unwholesomely reminiscent of the time when it was said, a little wistfully, by another resident of the White House, that "prosperity is just around the corner." Just a week ago, the Washington Star pointed out editorially that "those economic indicators that provide a key to the long-range behavior of the economy have not been as encouraging as the forecasts of administration officials. Weakness is still evident."

We have had a try at wishful thinking and at promising our way to prosperity. Neither has taken us very far. I think the time has come for action.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for the week of February 17, on account of death in family.

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

Mrs. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

#### 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. GROSS for 30 minutes today.

Mr. PATMAN for 30 minutes on Thursday next, and to revise and extend and include related matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and include related matter.

Mr. MULTER in two instances, in each to include related matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include two editorials.

Mr. RAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include a speech.

Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks made today to include certain pertinent information.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 18, 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:

1610. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 3, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Berrien County, Mich., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 336); to the committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1611. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to encourage private participation in financing the loan programs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1612. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1613. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 42d Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1614. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a list containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1615. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of insurance on Government-owned facilities in possession of Chance Vought Aircraft, Inc., Dallas, Tex., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 65), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in title 10, United States Code, section 2313 (b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1616. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 37th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1617. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1957, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1618. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the El Jardin division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project in Texas, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1619. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the governor of Alaska, transmitting a certified copy of the Session Laws of 1957, including memorials and resolutions, pursuant to the provisions of the Organic Act of Alaska, approved August 24, 1912 (48 U. S. C., sec. 90); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1620. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by this Department under section 2673 for the period January 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1621. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities pertaining to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1957, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of positions in grades other than those covered by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503, title V, Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1623. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportations as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportations as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on February 13, 1958, the following bill was reported on February 14, 1958:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10746. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted February 17, 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. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H. R. 5538. A bill to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1347). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on Arctic and Antarctic International Geophysical Year programs pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Public Law 601, 79th Congress (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 13, 1958, the following bill was introduced on February 14, 1958:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 10746. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred February 17, 1958]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 10747. A bill to amend section 402 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 with respect to determinations of permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10748. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10749. A bill to permit Indians to secure refunds of income taxes paid to the United States on income which was from allotted and restricted lands held in trust by the United States and which has been held exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 10750. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage-reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10751. 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. 10752. 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. ENGLE:

H. R. 10753. 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. FORD:

H. R. 10754. A bill to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 10755. A bill to provide \$250 million additional funds for the 1958 acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10756. A bill to exclude from the commercial corn-producing area 38 counties in the United States during 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10757. 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. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 10758. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10759. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 10760. 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. McFALL:

H. R. 10761. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10762. A bill to amend section 114 of Soil Bank Act for purpose of excluding certain counties in United States from the commercial producing area during 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10763. A bill to authorize assistance to States and local communities in remedying the inadequacies in the number of their teachers and teachers' salaries and the shortage in classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10764. A bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide direct loan funds to meet the emergency in the veterans' housing program, to extend such program for an additional year, and to reactivate and revise such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 10765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion rate for iron ore from deposits in the United States to 27½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10766. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10767. 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. 10768. A bill to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10769. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for retired employees of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10770. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of identified merchandise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 10771. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 542. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate

provision for such support prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. J. Res. 544. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Senate of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring therein, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation during the present session of the Congress requiring as a condition precedent to the appropriation of water by the Federal Government or any agency thereof within States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th principal meridian, whether such appropriation be for irrigation, domestic, industrial, manufacturing, or other purposes, to comply with the provisions of the constitution and laws relating to the appropriation of water of the State within which such appropriation is made, and that upon such appropriation having been made in conformity with the laws of any such State, the Federal Government or any agency thereof shall be subject to and required to comply with the constitution and laws of such State in the use and distribution of such water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation during the present session of the Congress requiring as a condition precedent to the appropriation of water by the Federal Government or any agency thereof within States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th principal meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of those farmers under the 1958 cotton acreage reserve agreement who have planned to place cotton acres in the soil-bank program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States condemning the administration of the soil-bank program and requesting the Congress to appropriate additional funds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10772. A bill for the relief of Gus Nihoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10773. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ryo H. Yokoyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 10774. A bill for the relief of Makoto Yabusaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

402. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. S. H. Lee, and others, of Cokato, Minn., in support of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

403. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Schenectady, N. Y., relative to stating opposition to the passage of H. R. 8525, the so-called Harris-O'Hara natural gas bill and all similar bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

404. Also, petition of the city clerk, St. Paul, Minn., relative to stating opposition to the passage of the Harris-O'Hara bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

405. Also, petition of the city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to continuing in force provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 regarding apportionment of funds for constructing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Warning No. 3

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today my third warning on the condition of the United States economy. That the situation is serious and requires more than mere platitudes about prosperity is clear from the record. Keep in mind the meaning of the following statistics—they are not only a warning, they reflect idle manpower and human hardship.

The following conclusions and data are from the January Area Labor Market Trends, published by the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

Unemployment has risen to above year-ago totals in nearly all of the 149 major centers regularly surveyed. In some areas, joblessness has reached the highest level for this time of the year since the business downturns of 1949 and 1953-54.

Unemployment is nationally already averaging approximately 5.2 percent and is still rising.

Employers in the aircraft, auto, and electrical machinery industries indicate a further decline is expected in the next few months.

Perhaps the most startling fact is that in January 1957 only 12.8 percent of the areas had unemployment of 6 percent

to 9 percent. In January of this year 30.2—45 of 49—of the areas were in this category. Furthermore, 1 year ago 46 areas had unemployment of 2.9 percent or less. Today, there are only 13 areas in the United States with such a low percentage of unemployment.

As for the future, the report states that there exists considerable uncertainty on the part of many employers regarding future production or activity schedules.

The situation today is serious. The future is highly uncertain. As in medicine, so in business and economics—certain remedies will not work once the ailment becomes too serious. How long will we wait?

### Monument to the Solidarity of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere Proposed for Ellis Island

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, February 17, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Senator from North Dakota, introduced in the Senate a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, be sold at nominal cost to a nonprofit corporation which would utilize the island as a loca-

tion for the erection, at no expense to the United States Government, of a monument to the solidarity of the Republics in this hemisphere. Situated at the mouth of the Hudson River just north of the Statue of Liberty, and containing some 27 acres, this site should lend itself admirably to the purpose specified and that purpose is a worthy one. By arrangement with Senator LANGER, I am introducing a similar resolution today and hope that it will have early committee attention.

### Fortieth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the people of Lithuania.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

February 16 marked the anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, bringing to an end 123 years of Russian domination.

The independence of Lithuania was one of the fruits of the vision of Woodrow Wilson, who included among his 14 points the principle of national self-determination. Lithuania was one of a group of Baltic States which achieved nationhood after the first Great War; and Lithuania, along with its neighbors, was a tragic victim of Soviet aggression in the second year of World War II.

In its 22 years of independence Lithuania showed the world what a proud and industrious people can do when they are free from foreign tyranny. Improvements in transportation and education, great strides in land reform and social legislation, and remarkable gains in material and spiritual well-being were products of these golden years of independence.

No one who is familiar with the dark chapter of Soviet exploitation in the 20th century need be told what the iron-shod heels of the Red army brought to that fair and happy land.

The man who tills the land has become a serf in his own country.

The man who tends the last has become a tool for the enrichment of the foreigner.

But that is not the worst. It is not enough that the worker should be a slave in his own land; indeed, he is fortunate if his lot is compared with that of his compatriot who toils in Siberia.

I invite consideration of the humanitarianism of an absolute dictatorship. A worker is recruited to do voluntary labor in a distant and forbidding foreign land. I need hardly add that totalitarians have ways to make people volunteer. But it is a sad thing to separate a family. So the worker's family then is invited to join him in that far-away place. Last year 4,000 Lithuanian families receive such invitations in the Vilnius region alone. This is the way a slave state populates its least habitable regions.

This would be a sad day, this 40th anniversary of independence, if we believed that the Lithuanian people would wear always the yoke of Soviet tyranny. But we do not believe that. We know that the flame of freedom sometimes flickers, but once lighted it does not go out. The people of Lithuania will be free again.

Today we extend our greetings and congratulations to the nearly 1 million Lithuanian Americans who have made splendid contributions to the wealth and culture of their adopted land. We are richer for their industry and talent, for their pride and love of freedom.

We send our heartfelt sympathy to their compatriots in Lithuania. We look forward to the day when we can celebrate their second liberation from Russian misrule. When Lithuania takes once more its proud place among the free nations of the world—as it surely shall—the crimes of its oppressor will not be forgotten.

### National Beauty Salon Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, during the week of February 9, in more than 900 cities throughout our Nation, members of the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association visited over 2,000 institutions and gave about 300,000 free beauty treatments. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I pre-

pared on the subject be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

In these days of world tensions, conflicts, mistrust, and misgiving, it is refreshing to look at some of the good things we have in our country, some of the neighborly things that the people of our land do to make this a Nation of which we are proud.

I have in mind the hairdressers and cosmetologists of our Nation.

They have set aside the week of February 9 as National Beauty Salon Week and have made it an occasion for charitable service in many institutions, including hospitals, homes for the aged, and homes for the orphaned.

In more than 900 cities throughout our Nation, small towns, large metropolitan cities, rural areas, these Americans, members of the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association, are visiting more than 2,000 institutions to give some 300,000 free beauty treatments to patients and inmates, to the women and young girls who cannot go to a beauty salon. Included are the wards of many of our veterans hospitals where many of the gallant women who served our country still remain.

I would like to point out that these beauty visits have been going on for many years, since National Beauty Salon Week was first observed 8 years ago. Since then thousands upon thousands of women who cannot go to a beauty salon have been able to receive the best possible beauty care that can be given. You all know that a beauty salon is a very small business, many of them are owned by women who are the sole support of their families. They do not have much money, but they do have talent and they give it and their time. Some of them call it a time tithe, a tenth of their time to people who are less fortunate than they are. This is a noble example for us all. I want to call your attention to an editorial in the Faribault (Minn.) Daily News about this wonderful work:

#### "BEAUTY CARE WITH A HEART"

"It's the kind, unexpected, thoughtful gestures of people toward others which distinguish America from other nations as a country with a soul."

"Comments similar to this are made frequently by Europeans (not all Europeans are United States critics) when they note that Americans, for the most part, like to do 'out of the ordinary' things for others.

"Just such a gesture was made this week by members of the Riverside Hairstyle Unit as a special feature of their observance of National Beauty Salon Week, February 10-17.

"On Monday local beauty salons were closed as the operators, members of the Riverside Unit, went to the Faribault State School and Hospital to give special beauty care to women residents of the school. A total of 534 haircuts were given by the beauty operators and the thoughtful gesture was deeply appreciated by the grateful residents.

"Every person likes to feel well groomed. The lift in personal feeling and attitude has been described by some of the recipients of the special beauty treatment as a new lease on life.

"Northfield members of the Riverside Unit also spent Tuesday giving permanents, shampoos, and waves at their shops to needy girls from the grade schools. At Owatonna girls of the State school there were given special beauty care.

"The beauty business has grown by leaps and bounds in a comparatively short time into one of the Nation's leading business industries.

"Riverside Hairstyle Unit operators are to be commended for displaying, while they observe the objectives of National Beauty Salon Week, thoughtfulness for others through their novel and helpful project."

And I submit that we salute the hairdressers and cosmetologists of our Nation, and extend to them our best wishes for their observance of their celebration with special mention to a native Nebraskan, Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs of Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., who created this activity 8 years ago; and to Mr. Philip Parker of Gary, Ind., the national president of NHCA; and Mr. Max Kuck of Rockville Centre, N. Y., the national chairman of the week.

#### Pay TV

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to note my opposition to subscription television by having printed the following statement which I submitted, on January 28, 1958, to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, then conducting hearings on that subject:

#### STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE J. FLOYD BREEDING OPPOSING PAY TELEVISION

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I should like to express my appreciation to you and the other members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for your courtesy in allowing me to state, for the record of these hearings, my views with regard to subscription television.

I have received to date, Mr. Chairman, almost 3,000 letters from my constituents on the subject of subscription television; or, as it is otherwise known, pay television, pay-as-you-see television, and toll television. All but two of these communications are in opposition to any form of pay-as-you-see television.

Certainly, I must conclude that a wave of protest of such magnitude from my area, the Fifth District of the State of Kansas, reflects the thinking of a wide cross section of rural Kansans. I think an accurate summation of their thinking would be that they consider subscription television not to be in the interest of rural America.

I understand that some 50 million American families have invested an approximate total of \$16 billion in television receivers through which they are able to view, free, past the commercial price of the set, programs ranging in interest value from pure entertainment, religious and cultural programs to those which communicate the news and pertinent discussion topics of the day.

I believe that these technological and programming advancements should continue to be made available, free, to any TV set owner that chooses to view them; not merely to the relatively small percentage of those who are in a financial position to receive the more costly subscription television programs.

As a clear indication that the alleged benefits of pay TV would be restricted to the financially favored few, it is my understanding that on the basis of Columbia Broadcasting System computations the average family would be required to pay at the minimum \$100 per year for merely 4 hours of televiewing a week.

And, it has been pointed out, should subscription television be permitted to establish a foothold, and, should it thereby command the greatest percentage of the advertiser's money, surely toll television will preempt or replace choice-time programs now presented free.

I have noticed that the proponents of pay television, the motion picture and radio producers, are opposed by the existing major radio and television networks. As a casual observation, it occurs to me that since the motion picture producers apparently have failed to successfully compete with free television for America's entertainment dollar, they are now preparing to make the television communications medium pay by crippling its very basis: Freedom of the air waves and free television. The Hollywood producers appear to believe that where technicolor, cinerama, and high fidelity sound tracks have failed the television screen will succeed. Personally, I do not.

I contend that we should maintain our communications media in as free a state as possible for the maximum dissemination of information and entertainment.

### Preparing for the Astronautics Age

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the following material at this point in the RECORD:

#### PREPARING FOR THE ASTRONAUTICS AGE

Approximately a decade ago Congress was faced with the problem of deciding how best to deal with the development of atomic energy. Should it be placed under military or civilian control? What type of agency was best suited to handle the problem? What role should Congress play in overseeing any program administered by the executive branch?

Today a similar issue is facing Congress, that is, how best to handle the problem of space technology. Should the Defense Department be given exclusive control in the field of astronautics, or should overall responsibility be placed in a civilian agency? If part or all of the program is to be placed in civilian hands, what agency should be given the responsibility? Or should a new agency be created? What should be the role of Congress in developing such a program?

#### BROAD SIGNIFICANCE

As was true with regard to the postwar debate on atomic energy development, Congress is beginning to realize that space projects will have significance far beyond the military area. For this reason there is a growing feeling that responsibility for development of our space program should not be left entirely in the hands of the Pentagon.

Unquestionably the development and operation of military missiles, military satellites, and military space vehicles are a military function—and a function which the Defense Department should push vigorously. In addition, however, much will need to be done in the field of scientific research on space phenomena, and scientific exploration of the universe. A sound national program must include both nonmilitary and military aspects.

In my opinion, there is, furthermore, real danger that the nonmilitary aspects of space technology will be submerged if they are in-

cluded as a mere adjunct to a military program. If this be true, the question then arises as to what would be the best civilian agency to take on this responsibility—or what type of new agency should be created.

#### NACA

Few people have ever heard of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Fewer still could describe its work. Yet this Federal agency, established in 1915, has played a crucially important role in American aviation development. For example, NACA developed the laminar flow wing in time to enable P-51's to escort our heavy bombers into Germany at a critical point in World War II. It did outstanding work in the postwar period developing supersonic aircraft. It has solved key bottlenecks involved in the development of ballistic missiles. For more than a decade NACA has been conducting research in fields leading to man's conquest of space. Its work has, among other things, led to the development of the recently publicized X-15 aircraft. This is the plane which it is hoped will lead to manned flight beyond the atmosphere.

#### HARMONY

In all of these projects NACA has worked closely and in harmony with the military services, the scientific fraternity, and American industry. Its personnel is of the highest caliber. The chairman of NACA is Gen. James H. Doolittle, retired, who, in addition to his military fame, has an outstanding scientific and industrial record.

Considering these facts, it has seemed to me that NACA is the logical agency to be given the job of spearheading our space program. At the very least, NACA should form the nucleus of any new agency which might be developed. It would be a tragedy if NACA's large pool of talent and experience were wasted merely because its activities have not been sufficiently publicized.

In order to place this question clearly before Congress, I am developing legislation which would direct NACA to take overall charge of our astronautics program. This same legislation would establish a Joint Committee on Astronautics, made up of Members of both the House and Senate, which would act as a Congressional watchdog over the space program.

This committee would be modeled after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which oversees our atomic-energy program. The proposal constitutes an attempt to promote in the astronautical field this same type of productive legislative-executive relationship.

#### TOO SIMPLE?

Far too often when acute national problems arise Congress creates complex new organizations which add to the Federal payroll, expand Government bureaucracy, but do not effectively attack the problems they were created to solve. Today, faced with a serious problem, Congress and the President have a ready-made solution which would save the taxpayers money and get the job done. Let us hope the solution is not so simple that it is overlooked.

### The National Wool Act of 1954

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. KARL E. MUNDT**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared on the National Wool Act of 1954, together with some explanatory tables.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, recently held hearings on S. 2861, a bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954, introduced by Senator BARRETT with the co-sponsorship of 47 other Members of this body. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, a cosponsor of S. 2861, and being vitally interested in the sheep industry, I was present at the hearing.

At the time of that hearing, the Department of Agriculture had not yet issued its official inventory figures on Livestock on Farms, as of January 1, 1958. These are most important because this is the first inventory report which could show in its figures, the number of stock sheep on farms and whether or not the Wool Act was accomplishing its purpose of increasing production, as Congress intended.

I am gratified to report that those figures have now been issued by the Department and that there has been an increase of 3 percent in the number of stock sheep owned by farmers.

When you realize that the wool producers of the Nation were going out of business at the time this legislation was enacted; when you realize that no incentive payment reached a grower before mid-1956, I think it speaks well that the growers of the Nation were able to show an increase in production by January 1 of this year. This was in spite of a severe drought early in the program in many of the great sheep producing areas of the West and Southwest. It speaks well of these growers that they have used the incentive payments under the program and the self-help provision, permitting them to promote and advertise their products, to begin the restoration of this most important livestock segment of our economy.

In my own State of South Dakota, stock sheep numbers showed an 8 percent increase, 5 percent above the national average. Thirty-three of forty-eight States showed an increase in sheep numbers. The important increase in the number of ewe lambs on hand, being held over to become lamb and wool producers, a gain of 16 percent, will show up in stock sheep numbers in the inventory of January 1, 1959 and 1960.

The portion of this Department of Agriculture Livestock and Poultry Inventory as issued last Friday noon relating to sheep numbers is obvious proof that the National Wool Act of 1954 is doing what Congress intended for it to do. I include these references to sheep as a part of my statement:

Sheep: Stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranches January 1, 1958, are estimated at 27,390,000 head. This is 3 percent more than the 26,538,000 head a year earlier and the largest inventory number since January 1, 1953. All sheep and lambs, including those on feed, totaled 31,328,000 head, up 2 percent from January 1, 1957. Sheep and lambs on feed declined 8 percent to 3,938,000 head, the lowest number in 7 years.

Ewe lamb numbers increased sharply to 4,347,000 head, a gain of 16 percent from a year earlier and reached the highest level since January 1, 1952. Ewes and rams 1 year old and older increased 1 percent and 3 percent, respectively. Wether and ram lambs declined 3 percent.

Stock sheep numbers were up 3 percent from a year earlier in the 11 Western States,

Texas and South Dakota. This group of States registered a gain for the first time in 6 years. The native States, with a 4-percent increase, continued to expand their sheep numbers.

In Texas, the leading sheep State, stock sheep numbers rose to 4,700,000 head, an in-

crease of 5 percent during the year. Inventories were also up in 7 other Western States and in 21 of the 35 native States. The North Central States showed the largest percentage increase, led by Iowa with a 20 percent in-

The total value of stock sheep on farms and ranches January 1, 1958, was \$530 million 34 percent above a year earlier and compares with the record high of \$783 million in 1952. The average value per head on January 1, was \$19.40 compared with \$14.90 a year earlier and the average of \$17.50.

All sheep and lambs: Number on farms and total value, Jan. 1

State and division	Number				Total value			State and division	Number				Total value		
	Average 1947-56	1957	1958	1958 as percent of 1957	Average 1947-56	1957	1958		Average 1947-56	1957	1958	1958 as percent of 1957	Average 1947-56	1957	1958
	Thous. head	Thous. head	Thous. head	Per-cent	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars		Thous. head	Thous. head	Thous. head	Per-cent	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars
Maine.....	26	40	42	104	397	560	601	Virginia.....	308	330	327	99	6,156	6,006	6,376
New Hampshire.....	8	10	9	90	135	145	139	West Virginia.....	312	301	301	100	5,459	4,605	4,906
Vermont.....	11	13	14	105	167	177	203	North Carolina.....	43	58	61	105	808	974	1,147
Massachusetts.....	10	13	12	92	170	195	194	South Carolina.....	4	11	14	127	62	179	228
Rhode Island.....	2	2	2	100	33	30	32	Georgia.....	16	63	56	89	210	970	1,030
Connecticut.....	8	10	10	100	132	156	168	Florida.....	5	8	9	112	42	80	108
New York.....	168	188	184	98	3,072	3,042	3,145	South Atlantic.....	734	826	824	100	13,553	13,653	14,770
New Jersey.....	13	18	18	100	256	281	299	Kentucky.....	642	605	623	103	13,330	11,616	12,522
Pennsylvania.....	237	262	254	97	3,735	3,563	3,886	Tennessee.....	276	310	319	103	4,817	4,991	5,806
North Atlantic.....	483	556	545	98	8,097	8,149	8,667	Alabama.....	38	100	83	83	504	1,454	1,430
Ohio.....	1,249	1,251	1,270	102	20,823	18,560	21,289	Mississippi.....	78	105	110	105	866	1,376	1,804
Indiana.....	506	547	582	106	9,076	8,070	9,990	Arkansas.....	48	69	72	104	601	787	1,022
Illinois.....	676	740	750	101	12,473	11,520	12,465	Louisiana.....	118	99	95	96	958	881	1,102
Michigan.....	443	404	407	101	8,009	6,307	7,199	Oklahoma.....	188	245	244	100	2,718	3,063	3,701
Wisconsin.....	287	273	299	110	5,404	3,626	5,080	Texas.....	6,425	4,749	4,864	102	84,263	46,769	84,874
East North Central.....	3,162	3,215	3,308	103	55,786	48,083	56,023	South Central.....	7,813	6,282	6,410	102	108,068	70,937	112,261
Minnesota.....	893	964	988	102	15,953	14,093	17,025	Montana.....	1,846	1,650	1,691	102	36,149	28,250	36,691
Iowa.....	1,238	1,390	1,554	112	22,311	20,288	28,309	Idaho.....	1,134	1,119	1,121	100	23,782	18,623	24,170
Missouri.....	979	924	881	95	16,075	13,593	15,128	Wyoming.....	2,160	2,085	2,174	104	41,907	35,896	49,801
North Dakota.....	510	661	678	103	8,776	9,381	11,924	Colorado.....	1,804	1,766	1,756	99	36,204	27,648	38,504
South Dakota.....	1,108	1,379	1,471	107	20,106	22,746	29,445	New Mexico.....	1,368	1,189	1,208	102	22,193	16,856	24,358
Nebraska.....	759	780	739	95	13,489	11,318	13,425	Arizona.....	451	472	445	94	7,737	6,725	7,304
Kansas.....	735	606	725	120	12,000	7,800	12,086	Utah.....	1,469	1,395	1,362	98	29,487	24,272	28,969
West North Central.....	6,222	6,704	7,036	105	108,710	99,219	127,345	Nevada.....	477	451	434	96	9,670	7,928	9,249
North Central.....	9,383	9,919	10,344	104	164,496	147,302	183,368	Washington.....	328	275	275	99	6,398	4,675	5,805
Delaware.....	3	4	4	100	47	54	65	Oregon.....	761	861	881	102	14,887	14,108	18,518
Maryland.....	43	51	52	101	769	785	910	California.....	1,920	1,984	1,866	94	39,847	36,339	39,494
United States.....	32,133	30,840	31,828	102	562,525	461,361	601,929	West.....	13,720	13,257	13,205	100	268,320	221,320	282,863

Stock sheep and lambs: Number on farms and total value, Jan. 1

State and division	Number				Total value			State and division	Number				Total value		
	Average 1947-56	1957	1958	1958 as percent of 1957	Average 1947-56	1957	1958		Average 1947-56	1957	1958	1958 as percent of 1957	Average 1947-56	1957	1958
	Thous. head	Thous. head	Thous. head	Per-cent	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars		Thous. head	Thous. head	Thous. head	Per-cent	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars	Thous. dollars
Maine.....	26	40	42	104	397	560	601	Virginia.....	308	330	327	99	6,156	6,006	6,376
New Hampshire.....	8	10	9	90	135	145	139	West Virginia.....	312	301	301	100	5,459	4,605	4,906
Vermont.....	11	13	14	105	167	177	203	North Carolina.....	43	58	61	105	808	974	1,147
Massachusetts.....	10	13	12	92	170	195	194	South Carolina.....	4	11	14	127	62	179	228
Rhode Island.....	2	2	2	100	33	30	32	Georgia.....	16	63	56	89	210	970	1,030
Connecticut.....	8	10	10	100	132	156	168	Florida.....	5	8	9	112	42	80	108
New York.....	146	168	165	98	2,672	2,722	2,822	South Atlantic.....	734	826	824	100	13,553	13,653	14,770
New Jersey.....	13	18	18	100	256	281	299	Kentucky.....	642	605	623	103	13,330	11,616	12,522
Pennsylvania.....	237	262	254	97	3,735	3,563	3,886	Tennessee.....	276	310	319	103	4,817	4,991	5,806
North Atlantic.....	460	536	526	98	7,698	7,829	8,344	Alabama.....	34	77	77	100	454	1,178	1,340
Ohio.....	1,018	1,046	1,077	103	16,929	15,690	18,201	Mississippi.....	78	105	110	105	866	1,376	1,804
Indiana.....	407	455	482	106	7,215	6,598	8,290	Arkansas.....	48	69	72	104	601	787	1,022
Illinois.....	480	533	570	107	8,781	8,208	9,405	Louisiana.....	118	99	95	96	958	881	1,102
Michigan.....	353	314	317	101	6,310	4,867	5,579	Oklahoma.....	137	203	207	102	1,899	2,517	3,146
Wisconsin.....	224	213	232	109	4,187	2,726	3,874	Texas.....	6,240	4,476	4,700	105	82,194	44,312	82,250
East North Central.....	2,482	2,561	2,678	105	43,442	38,089	45,349	South Central.....	7,572	5,494	6,203	104	105,120	67,658	108,992
Minnesota.....	685	735	764	104	12,125	10,658	13,217	Montana.....	1,670	1,542	1,573	102	32,914	26,522	34,449
Iowa.....	811	937	1,124	120	14,550	13,493	20,569	Idaho.....	1,042	999	1,049	105	22,003	16,583	22,658
Missouri.....	839	794	755	95	13,753	11,613	12,986	Wyoming.....	2,038	1,980	2,039	103	39,807	34,056	47,101
North Dakota.....	435	543	559	103	7,392	7,493	9,782	Colorado.....	1,261	1,216	1,252	103	25,616	18,848	27,920
South Dakota.....	920	1,161	1,249	108	16,718	19,040	25,230	New Mexico.....	1,325	1,166	1,172	101	21,579	16,557	23,674
Nebraska.....	207	273	308	113	3,397	3,713	5,667	Arizona.....	413	421	419	100	7,175	6,062	6,914
Kansas.....	378	456	479	105	5,941	5,700	7,904	Utah.....	1,378	1,301	1,288	99	27,833	22,768	27,563
West North Central.....	4,277	4,899	5,238	107	73,876	71,610	95,355	Nevada.....	464	435	418	96	9,439	7,656	8,945
North Central.....	6,759	7,460	7,916	106	117,297	109,699	140,704	Washington.....	295	250	248	99	5,792	4,250	5,406
Delaware.....	3	4	4	100	47	54	65	Oregon.....	741	830	847	102	14,518	13,612	17,872
Maryland.....	43	51	52	101	769	785	910	California.....	1,690	1,632	1,616	99	35,567	30,355	34,744
United States.....	27,843	26,638	27,390	103	485,910	396,108	530,656	West.....	12,318	11,772	11,921	101	242,242	197,269	257,246

Livestock: Value per head, Jan. 1<sup>1</sup>

State and division	Cattle			Milk cows			Stock sheep			State and division	Cattle			Milk cows			Stock sheep		
	Average, 1947-56	1957	1958	Average, 1947-56	1957	1958	Average, 1947-56	1957	1958		Average, 1947-56	1957	1958	Average, 1947-56	1957	1958	Average, 1947-56	1957	1958
Maine	\$122	\$100	\$125	\$172	\$140	\$172	\$15.43	\$14.00	\$14.30	Virginia	\$117	\$90	\$109	\$144	\$116	\$134	\$20.01	\$18.20	\$19.50
New Hampshire	150	121	144	207	165	195	16.51	14.50	15.40	West Virginia	109	80	97	134	97	119	17.54	15.30	16.30
Vermont	154	124	154	201	160	197	15.89	13.60	14.50	North Carolina	94	76	90	122	101	118	18.56	16.80	18.80
Massachusetts	196	159	183	253	205	236	16.65	15.00	16.20	South Carolina	87	68	82	120	100	115	14.03	16.30	16.30
Rhode Island	212	176	204	256	215	250	16.70	15.00	16.00	Georgia	77	62	77	112	90	110	12.44	15.46	18.49
Connecticut	194	163	191	253	210	245	16.84	15.60	16.80	Florida	75	62	79	123	105	130	9.70	10.00	12.00
New York	177	144	175	227	189	223	18.68	16.20	17.10	South Atlantic	95.8	75.2	91.5	136	111	131	18.51	16.50	17.90
New Jersey	242	184	207	299	230	260	19.77	15.60	16.60	Kentucky	106	89	105	135	117	137	20.81	19.20	20.10
Pennsylvania	163	146	169	220	198	226	15.79	13.60	15.30	Tennessee	96	79	97	123	104	124	17.67	16.10	18.20
North Atlantic	172	144	171	226	188	222	16.84	14.60	15.90	Alabama	76	56	72	106	77	94	13.20	15.30	17.40
Ohio	133	110	127	181	159	184	16.77	15.00	16.90	Mississippi	76	59	75	104	83	100	10.89	13.10	16.40
Indiana	131	102	118	179	157	177	17.93	14.50	17.20	Arkansas	82	61	80	108	85	104	12.66	11.40	14.20
Illinois	134	103	117	191	165	178	18.51	15.40	16.50	Louisiana	81	61	83	121	102	119	8.40	8.90	11.60
Michigan	144	120	141	199	173	200	17.94	15.50	17.60	Oklahoma	100	71	108	136	105	146	14.28	12.40	15.20
Wisconsin	167	131	156	213	170	200	18.68	12.80	16.70	Texas	95	66	105	129	98	140	13.09	9.90	17.50
East North Central	144	114	133	198	167	192	17.61	14.90	16.90	South Central	92.1	67.2	95.0	122	97.8	123	13.88	11.40	17.60
Minnesota	138	102	130	195	152	187	17.81	14.50	17.30	Montana	129	87	131	194	150	182	19.84	17.20	21.90
Iowa	127	94	124	187	157	188	18.05	14.40	18.30	Idaho	126	92	125	192	153	195	21.17	16.60	21.60
Missouri	115	90	115	149	124	148	16.30	14.50	17.20	Wyoming	122	86	129	185	139	188	19.62	17.20	23.10
North Dakota	131	93	128	187	143	178	17.37	13.80	17.50	Colorado	119	82	123	183	137	183	20.30	15.50	22.30
South Dakota	126	91	132	182	143	181	18.42	16.40	20.20	New Mexico	109	72	110	172	135	150	16.20	14.20	20.20
Nebraska	121	88	128	183	151	183	16.38	13.60	18.40	Arizona	114	86	110	166	175	210	17.63	14.40	16.50
Kansas	114	83	119	175	140	185	15.56	12.50	16.50	Utah	124	91	121	188	153	186	20.24	17.50	21.40
West North Central	124	91.8	125	180	146	179	17.39	14.60	18.20	Nevada	122	92	126	196	165	200	20.27	17.60	21.40
North Central	131	99.7	128	190	157	186	17.47	14.70	17.80	Washington	130	93	128	183	138	190	19.64	17.00	21.80
Delaware	143	114	134	186	150	175	17.75	13.50	16.20	Oregon	120	86	116	161	117	152	19.82	16.40	21.10
Maryland	144	119	138	190	160	185	17.98	15.40	17.50	California	145	118	144	210	190	215	21.18	18.60	21.50
United States	121	91.6	120	177	147	176	17.52	14.90	19.40										

<sup>1</sup> Based on reporters' estimates at average price per head in their locations.

Sheep and lambs: Number on farms, by classes, Jan. 1, 1957

(Thousand head)

State and division	All sheep	On feed	Stock sheep						State and division	All sheep	On feed	Stock sheep					
			Total	Lambs		1 year and older						Total	Lambs	1 year and older			
				Ewes	Wethers and Rams	Ewes	Rams	Wethers						Ewes	Wethers and Rams	Ewes	Rams
Maine	40		40	9	1	28	2	Virginia	330		330	48	5	263	13	1	
New Hampshire	10		10	2		7	1	West Virginia	301		301	36	3	243	16	3	
Vermont	13		13	2		10	1	North Carolina	58		58	9	1	44	3	1	
Massachusetts	13		13	2	1	9	1	South Carolina	11		11	1	1	8	1		
Rhode Island	2		2			2		Georgia	63		63	4	16	40	2	1	
Connecticut	10		10	1	1	8		Florida	8		8	2		6			
New York	188	20	168	35	3	123	6	South Atlantic	826		826	109	27	647	37	6	
New Jersey	18		18	3	1	13	1	Kentucky	605		605	79	12	490	21	3	
Pennsylvania	262		262	43	22	165	9	Tennessee	310		310	40	8	247	13	2	
North Atlantic	556	20	536	97	29	365	21	Alabama	100	23	77	12	4	55	5	1	
Ohio	1,251	205	1,046	154	21	821	25	Mississippi	105		105	18	17	60	4	6	
Indiana	547	92	455	57	11	370	15	Arkansas	69		69	10	5	50	3	1	
Illinois	740	207	533	86	9	410	26	Louisiana	99		99	15	9	65	5	5	
Michigan	404	90	314	49	3	250	11	Oklahoma	245	42	203	35	4	158	5	1	
Wisconsin	273	60	213	30	2	172	7	Texas	4,749	273	4,476	672	291	3,312	125	76	
East North Central	3,215	654	2,561	376	46	2,023	84	South Central	6,282	338	5,944	881	350	4,437	181	95	
Minnesota	964	229	735	105	8	597	23	Montana	1,650	108	1,542	252	18	1,221	49	2	
Iowa	1,390	453	937	112	7	790	27	Idaho	1,119	120	999	123	8	834	31	3	
Missouri	924	130	794	90	13	667	22	Wyoming	2,095	115	1,980	328	9	1,583	59	1	
North Dakota	661	118	543	74	13	440	14	Colorado	1,766	550	1,216	144	9	1,028	32	3	
South Dakota	1,379	218	1,161	201	8	914	36	New Mexico	1,189	23	1,166	188	18	940	44	5	
Nebraska	780	507	273	33	4	227	8	Arizona	472	51	421	65	13	325	15	3	
Kansas	606	150	456	37	13	392	12	Utah	1,305	94	1,301	141	6	1,120	33	1	
West North Central	6,704	1,805	4,899	652	66	4,027	142	Nevada	451	16	435	61	2	359	12	1	
North Central	9,919	2,459	7,460	1,028	112	6,050	226	Washington	275	25	250	52	2	184	10	2	
Delaware	4		4	1		3		Oregon	861	31	830	95	10	700	23	2	
Maryland	51		51	8	1	40	2	California	1,984	352	1,632	269	30	1,336	52	5	
United States	30,840	4,302	26,538	3,743	644	21,129	825	West	13,257	1,485	11,772	1,628	126	9,630	360	28	

<sup>1</sup> Includes 14,000 lambs on feed.



These bills, like that which I introduced, H. R. 3497, would add to section 161 of the Revised Statutes the language: "This section does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public."

Careful study and review of section 161, first enacted by Congress in 1789, is most convincing of the fact that the Congress never intended to grant authority to any of the executive departments to withhold information from the public (of course, I am not now referring to those matters which might affect the national defense or security). Nevertheless, too many of these executive departments cite section 161 as authority for refusing information and withholding records both from the public and from the Congress.

The proposed amendment will help put a stop to the misuse and the abuse of the provisions of this section. At the same time, it will not interfere with the proper classification of military secrets, nor will it in the slightest degree jeopardize the national security.

As has been said so many times and so forcefully to this committee during the course of its hearings on these bills, the original enactment of the statute in 1789 intended it to be a housekeeping law. It is not the law which has caused the trouble but the rules and the regulations that have been promulgated, allegedly pursuant to the authority of that law, by the various executive and administrative departments, agencies, and bureaus.

The unfortunate part of the whole matter is that these rules and regulations are made by the lawyers in those agencies. They are then interpreted by those lawyers and enforced by them all without any judicial review. The courts refuse to review these rules, the interpretation of these rules, and even the abuse thereof.

The need for the proposed amendment is emphasized by the fact that the only opposition comes from some of these departments. There is neither logic nor reason to support their opposition, particularly since the amendment of this section will not affect any other existing statute either as it applies to the national defense and security or as it applies to the tax laws, or otherwise.

I am sure that this committee will not overlook the practically unanimous support of this amendment by the general public and the many organizations, most of them of national character, which support this proposed legislation. Radio, newsreel, television, press, and many other associations, including the American Bar Association, support my position.

In conclusion, may I congratulate the committee and its staff for their intelligent approach and consideration of this problem.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit this statement to you.

## The Space Age's Challenge to Engineers

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address prepared by me for delivery at a meeting of the Chattanooga Engineers Club on the occasion of the inauguration of National Engineers' Week in Chatta-

nooga. Incidentally, because of transportation difficulties I was unable to be present to deliver the address in person. I believe my remarks may be of interest.

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

#### THE SPACE AGE'S CHALLENGE TO ENGINEERS

(Speech prepared for delivery by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, before the Chattanooga Engineers Club luncheon, Monday noon, February 17, 1958, Chattanooga, Tenn.)

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have the opportunity to come down from Washington to help you inaugurate Engineer Week in the Chattanooga area. All over the country engineers will be having meetings like this one this week. These observances will do a lot to help the general public understand the contributions which engineering is making and has made in the development of our country. They will help point out some of the paths toward the future. That future, as we all know now and as some learned very suddenly, is greatly dependent on the engineers we have now and the training and character of the engineers we have in the future.

After returning from a visit to the Soviet and behind the Iron Curtain 2 years ago, I discussed the need for improved scientific and technical education and training in America. I came back from Russia greatly impressed with the engineering and scientific achievements I saw there. I was even more impressed by the serious purpose with which the Soviet Union was going about the job of training its scientists, its engineers, and technical people.

I said then that since it required a good many years to start at scratch and turn out these highly equipped and trained people, we had better get started if we wanted the United States to stay at the top of scientific and technical progress.

I proposed then that we set up a system of scholarships for able students and that we provide laboratory and scientific and technical equipment to schools, colleges, and universities engaged in such education and training. I have to report that such talk then fell on deaf ears. It is only now in the light of the success of the Soviet Union in putting an artificial object in orbit around the world, and what that feat told us about the progress of missile development in that powerful nation, that we have fully awakened to the challenge.

I am going to say now, and I will refer to it again a little later on, that in our desire to have more engineers, more scientists, more technicians, we must not forget that our basic need now and in the future is for quality in these fields. Quantity we need, but quality is vital.

It is obvious that we do not now have the quality of engineering, scientific and technical personnel we need. Nearly every Sunday I notice page after page of advertisements in the New York Times from corporations appealing for engineers of many kinds.

We know today that progress in many fields is being delayed because of a lack of qualified technical personnel. Even where we are making progress, the speed of that progress is being slowed down by the lack of men and women highly trained in new fields.

One of the causes of our shortage is that during the depression years engineers were hard put to find a job of any kind. Some engineers at least, left the profession entirely. I doubt that many engineers in those days would have encouraged their sons to enter the field. If it had not been for the various public-works programs undertaken in that era—and I must say that the public works of that period were one of the finest

investments the people of this country ever made—engineering would have suffered much more. But the fact remains that we are now paying the price for our lack of progress in engineering and technical education in that period.

World War II also slowed down engineering and scientific education, although the armed services then and now have had far-sighted training programs for their special needs.

The GI bill and the education it made possible for millions of young veterans is what has saved us now. The cost seemed high at the time to many people, but it accomplished two things in this field for which we have every reason to be grateful. It provided engineering and scientific training for thousands of young men to whom such education would not otherwise have been available. The influx of so many students revitalized our colleges and universities in unmistakable fashion.

If it had not been for the GI bill we would have been much further behind the Soviet Union in scientific and engineering progress than we are today.

It took two sputniks to wake America up to our needs in education. We do not want to ape the Soviet educational system, but we do want to look at our methods. We are taking a critical look. We are asking ourselves whether the kind of educational system we have developed in this country is going to be good enough for the future.

We are asking whether at the very base of our educational system we are using the right methods. Are we teaching our children as effectively as possible to read, to communicate, to reason?

This is a good thing and perhaps every generation or so we ought to give our whole educational system a good, critical study from bottom to top.

Because they can change fastest, our universities are already changing their courses in scientific and engineering education. Some of them are dropping some of their shop-work type programs and substituting more training in advanced theory. That is all to the good. It will take more time and trouble and thought to change the far bigger educational system of which our universities are the apex. Both as engineers and citizens you should have a part in bringing about those changes.

We have done a lot of talking about Federal assistance to education in the past but we have not done much about it. The need for scientific and technical training is now so clear that at least in that field the Federal Government is certain to provide financial help.

President Eisenhower has sent to the Congress a program which includes a system of granting scholarships in the fields of engineering, science, and the like. The aim is in the right direction, but the plan has been opposed by many people as being too small to fit the magnitude of the problem.

Senator LESTER HILL, the distinguished and able Senator from our sister State of Alabama, is chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. He and his committee have studied this matter for a long time. As a result Senator HILL has introduced a bill which would provide a program about five times as large as that of the President. I have confidence in the judgment of that committee and I am sure that after thorough hearings they will recommend a bill that is both practical and capable of enactment into law.

It is too early to forecast the exact nature and extent of the program which will be enacted, but there will be a bill passed at this session. By the opening of the school session next fall I hope it will be fully operative.

Although I believe Federal aid is essential in this area of education, Federal aid is not going to solve the problem. I said earlier

that there was something which I believe you can do as citizens and as professional engineers to see to it that this new program works.

I think more counseling would be helpful early in the educational process. It is not very helpful or stimulating to a student who inquires why he takes mathematics and to be informed that the purpose is to find the answers.

There is no question but that we are lagging in the field of mathematics. Perhaps our teaching methods are sometimes not adequate. Yet I would like to know how often an effort is made to explain the worth and importance of mathematics to our students. If it served no other purpose, the study of mathematics improves the mind in exactly the same way that physical exercise makes muscles grow strong. But who tells the students.

If we wish to encourage able and apt students to prepare for the study of engineering, I believe it would be very helpful if arrangements could be made for members of your organizations to go to junior and senior high schools and talk to interested students about engineering. I think you who are practicing engineers can tell these students more effectively than anyone else what it is that a student must do to become a successful engineer.

I feel sure that the schools of this area would wholeheartedly welcome such visits from you and the counseling that, out of your own experience you can give best.

It will might be that arrangements could be made for field trips for interested students to see at first hand the contribution which engineering makes to the progress of mankind.

I would like to see the engineers of this area pioneer in such a program. I would like to think that scientists and organizations of professional groups would soon go along with you in similar programs.

The dynamo of Dixie has plenty of engineers in all categories to get such a program started. It has plenty of engineering works of all kinds which would interest students.

I would be hopeful that if such a program went well it could be a pattern for engineering groups all over the United States.

I think that any high-school teacher will tell you that most students are willing to learn everything about subjects which interest them deeply. I expect that some of the members of the Society of Automotive Engineers might be astonished by what some of our youngsters know about souping up an old car. If some of the mental energy went into the classes of skills and knowledge which the Nation needs now and will need so much more in the future, we would be well on the way to the solution of our problems.

I would like to say also that I would hope that if such a program could be organized, that the rural schools will not be neglected.

These fields ought to attract our best minds. As a matter of fact many fields are becoming so technical and complicated that only the best minds, highly trained, will be able to cope with them.

Engineers are already coping with rockets to the moon and problems of reaching beyond the moon. Others are working with scientists in the effort to control the forces of hydrogen fusion for the good of mankind. Yesterday's science fiction has become today's actuality.

On the basis of recent accomplishments, we can certainly expect more breakthroughs in the limits of man's knowledge and in his ability to control the conditions of life.

I think when we talk to the younger generation about the need for scientists, and particularly the need for more study of mathematics that we ought to tell them that all of these stupendous advances began with

a few solitary men whose only tools were a pencil and a piece of paper.

It was the knowledge of mathematics and physics applied to that paper—or maybe it was a blackboard—which told us that nuclear fission and fusion were possible. We learned that it could be done. Once we know that fact, the engineers can take over.

Our future is to a large extent in the hands of our scientists, our engineers, and our technical people. Our reliance on them will grow in the future. These fields must attract many of the best young minds of today and tomorrow. In order to do so we must see that all these fields obtain their proper due in public esteem and in professional rewards.

The world of tomorrow is the world of science. Brainpower can not be overestimated. A man, with an idea, can change the balance of power among nations. The scientists and the engineers have had vast effects on foreign policy. Thus far, their efforts are largely regarded as balancing striking power among nations, but through achievements such as the possible conversion of sea water into potable water they might instead make the world bloom for peace.

Mankind has reached out so fast and so far that we can only dimly perceive the shape of the future. The more we learn, the further mankind's horizons stretch. Today the future, if we can only control the destructive forces loose in the world, seems limitless.

As the world's science and technology move forward and upward and outward, engineering must and will keep pace. There will be calls made on the engineers in the future which today we can only dream about. But wherever mankind progresses, the engineer will be keeping pace. For wherever man goes in the future, it is going to take an engineer to get him there.

## The Wilderness Bill

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bipartisan opportunities in this 85th Congress is represented in the wilderness bill, a conservation measure that when enacted into law will make sure that some of our country is preserved in its unspoiled natural condition.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, sponsor with 11 cosponsors of the bill in the Senate, discusses this measure in an article in the current winter issue of *Naturalist* entitled "What the Wilderness Bill Means to You." In this magazine, published by the Natural History Society of Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY emphasizes the interest that is similar to that of any State where wilderness still exists. But he also points out that to all citizens of the Nation "The wilderness bill means much because it provides for the preservation of the areas wherever they are and wherever they can be preserved by the Federal Government as part of our overall outdoor recreation and resources-conservation program."

Mr. Speaker, I myself as a sponsor of this measure have repeatedly emphasized that this wilderness bill is one

that should receive the cooperative support of all Americans—including our lumbermen, our mining interests, our cattlemen. In this I heartily agree with Senator HUMPHREY that our distinctive opportunity in connection with this particular bill is to preserve the wilderness in a way that will not disrupt other interests.

I agree also that this wilderness bill is as reasonable and understanding of all our industrial and commercial uses of the outdoors as I can possibly imagine.

As Senator HUMPHREY has stated, the wilderness bill means "something like a last chance to protect the wilderness that we all love, and to do this as part of the great industrial, agricultural civilization that we have developed in America."

#### WHAT THE WILDERNESS BILL MEANS TO YOU

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

If the Wilderness Bill, now pending in the Congress of the United States, is enacted, we who prize our wonderful canoe country in northern Minnesota will have won a great victory. We will be assured that the irreplaceable primeval area with which we are blessed will be protected for the enjoyment of ourselves, our children, and for the generations to come. It will be protected in accordance with a policy that does not endanger the economic and other interests of the area.

Of course, I do not have to tell the readers of the *Naturalist* that we in Minnesota are just as much citizens of the United States as are the people in all the other 47 States to whom our national wilderness assets are of value, wherever they may be. So to us as citizens of the Nation the Wilderness Bill means much because it provides for the preservation of areas wherever they are and wherever they can be preserved by the Federal Government as part of the overall outdoor recreation and resources-conservation program.

Let me emphasize that our distinctive opportunity in connection with this particular bill is to preserve the wilderness in a way that will not disrupt other interests.

There is a strong and growing interest among the American people in the preservation of the relatively few remnants that still remain out of the vast unspoiled continent that they first discovered. Sooner or later—surely before it is too late—this strong public interest for conservation can express itself in measures that will be strong enough to keep this wonderful resource for the people from disappearing forever.

Right now this public interest is expressing itself in a Wilderness Bill that is as reasonable and understanding of all our industrial and commercial uses of the outdoors as I can possibly imagine. The supporters of the legislation, and by that I mean particularly the representatives of the conservation organizations who have worked so closely with us in Congress in developing the bill and supporting it before the public have not been extremists. Rather, they have been interested, as I myself have expressed it before, in the opportunity that we all now see "to provide for the preservation of the wilderness without having to interfere with other programs."

This opportunity will not be with us long, and so the Wilderness Bill means for us in Minnesota and throughout the United States, something like a last chance to protect the wilderness that we all love, and to do this as part of the great industrial, agricultural civilization that we have developed in America.

This legislation, nevertheless has been subjected to a fantastic amount of unwar-

ranted criticism. Much of it has been generated by special interests who feel that their cause is not served by the protection of our roadless areas. Some of it has been the product of misinformation as to the provisions and objectives of this bill. Let us then take a moment to state the intent of the bill and then cover points that I hope will assist in clarifying a number of provisions that have been misinterpreted or misrepresented.

The wilderness bill is a measure designed to make sure that some parts of America may always remain unspoiled and beautiful in their own natural way. This bill declares it to be a policy of Congress to secure the dedication of an adequate system of wilderness areas to serve the recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, and conservation needs of the people. In so doing, the bill makes no changes in the administration of the present areas of wilderness areas found in our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. It creates no new agencies to carry on the protection of these areas.

1. The wilderness bill gives Congressional sanction to the continued preservation as wilderness of those areas federally owned or controlled that are within national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other public lands, and that have so far remained under their Federal administration their primeval character. Under this bill, these areas shall serve the multiple public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people.

2. The bill creates no new agencies to do the land management job.

3. The bill makes no changes in the administration of wilderness areas. Wilderness in national parks will continue to be administered by the National Park Service. Roadless, wild, wilderness, and primitive areas of our national forests shall continue to be administered by the National Forest Service under its present regulations. Wilderness areas within wildlife refuges will continue to be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

4. Nothing in the act will interfere with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park, forest, or wildlife refuge, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering an area within the system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area.

5. The bill provides for addition to, modification of, or elimination from the system where necessary.

6. Any such addition, modification, or elimination, except by an act of Congress, shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days of continuous session of Congress provided no resolution has been passed opposing such change.

7. Any addition, modification, or elimination of any national forest area or part thereof shall be made only after not less than 90 days' public notice and the holding of a public hearing, if requested.

8. No wilderness area on Indian reservations shall be included in the system until the tribe or band through its tribal council shall have given its consent.

9. Within the national forest areas of the system, grazing of domestic livestock, use of aircraft or motorboats, where these practices have already become well established, may be permitted to continue subject to restrictions of the Forest Service.

10. Subject to existing private rights, no portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to any commercial enterprise except as contemplated by the purposes of this act; that means, except as there are some commercial enterprises in connection with such things as guiding and outfitting that are involved in our uses of wilderness for their wilderness purposes.

11. The National Wilderness Preservation Council set up by this bill serves as a repository for maps and official papers regarding the system, and as a nonexclusive clearinghouse for exchange of information among the agencies administering areas within the system. It makes annual reports to Congress on the status of the system. It is not administrative, but rather is advisory. It has no jurisdiction over lands or agencies. A majority of its members are the heads of the land agencies themselves, Forest Service, Park Service, and others, and a prime function of the council is to provide a common meeting ground for them in their interest in wilderness.

It may be well to reiterate at this point that all of the areas included in the system will not be managed in the same way. Rather, each will be managed as usual—as a park, a forest, or a refuge—except that no part of such management will interfere with its perpetuation as wilderness. Thus, hunting will be prohibited in park wilderness—as in the case of all national park land; but it will be permitted on forest wilderness—as it is on all forest land subjected to the usual regulations. Wherever there is hunting it will be wilderness hunting. Surprisingly, even within our national parks—thought by many to be the last and most secure stronghold of wilderness—developments may gradually take over unless we set guards against this possibility. Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has pointed out that, "Within the national parks and monuments in general there is at present no act of Congress that would prevent a future Secretary of the Interior or park administrator, with his approval, from deciding to construct a road, a building, or any other installation that he would deem appropriate for a national park or monument anywhere within the park or monument.

"In my opinion," Mr. SAYLOR continued, "if we are to make sure that we still have in the distant future our national park primeval back country still preserved as wilderness, we should declare here in Congress our purpose to do so."

Areas in Minnesota which would fall under the protection of the provisions of this bill are the Caribou, Little Indian Sioux, and Superior Roadless Areas of the Superior National Forest. As with all wilderness areas included in this system, the bill provides for the protection and administration of these areas by the existing Federal agency—in this case the Forest Service—as wilderness. In the event of administrative decisions affecting these or any other areas, it gives Congress the opportunity to review such decisions should it so desire. (Thus, any addition to, modification of, or elimination from these areas would have the chance of Congressional review.)

Although the bill would safeguard the wilderness character of these areas, it also protects and honors existing rights. It specifically provides that:

"Nothing in this act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, 71st Congress, 2d session, July 10, 1930, and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 22, 1956, as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture."

In proposed revisions for the bill, proponents are now incorporating a suggestion of the Forest Service which will direct that this wilderness canoe country—

"Shall be managed in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in conformity with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages."

Although the Superior National Forest wilderness is included in the system, it is one of many. The primary purpose of the bill is to protect and preserve all wilderness areas in the United States—now about 2.2 percent of our billion and one-half acres. The basic issue at stake is simply wilderness or no wilderness—commercialization and ruin of the Middle West's last tiny bit of frontier, or safeguarding these precious acres and their counterparts over the country as we would a great work of art or history for our children's children. Minnesota's living museum of a frontier era—rich in history of the voyageurs and pioneers—is a work of God and once destroyed can never be recreated.

The communities of northern Minnesota bordering the wilderness have a great asset for a permanent future prosperity which exceeds anything that a short-lived, exploitative boom might bring. As Americans increase in number, their need for outdoor recreation will expand manifold, and a bit of wilderness will prove to be a unique attraction to millions. We need the wilderness, and it may be well to consider the words of the prophet Isaiah:

"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!"

Speech of Hon. E. L. (Tic) Forrester, of Georgia, Before the Joint Session of the General Assembly of Georgia, February 6, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following address by the distinguished and able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is characteristic of his courage, forthrightness and love of country:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the great State of Georgia's House and Senate, all of whom I am humbly but profoundly grateful that I can address as my friends and proudly mean it, your gracious invitation to me, to leave my duties in Washington and speak to you at this joint session, will always be to me one of the most inspiring events of my life.

This is a privilege that has exceeded my most cherished ambitions. No man could possibly be so vain as to expect to merit such an honor. That you should have honored me with the invitation to address you is a compliment far beyond my deserts or capacity, and I can only conclude that invitation came because of your tremendous generosity and your personal friendship. The resolution extending this invitation to me, signed by your president, your speaker, your secretary, and your clerk, bearing the seal of our magnificent and enduring State of Georgia, is now being suitably framed, and it will hang in my office as a constant reminder to me that I am daily entrusted with the high responsibility and privilege of representing the heart beats and the heart throbs of the people of our State.

Believe me, my friends, I will read again and again the statements in that resolution, that I have aggressively fought those who

would destroy our country, that I had become a respected leader of the forces combating communism, and that I have been a champion of democracy and a courageous defender of the viewpoint of the South and the State I represent. I will particularly note that language: "he has been," with the determination that, God being my helper, I will try to be with all my heart and soul the kind of servant that you and the good people of Georgia so richly deserve.

It will be a daily reminder to me of the rich heritage which is mine in that I am born where you were born, blood of your blood, flesh of your flesh, and that I must stand as you have so gloriously stood for the things that have made this Nation great. It will renew my determination to fight zealously for the principles you have so grandly declared to all of this world in your official pronouncements, and in every act and action. The entire Georgia delegation in Congress deeply appreciates your patriotism and your endeavors, and I bring to you today the felicitations and the best wishes of every member of that group.

Your invitation is a challenging one. Knowing you as I do, I am certain that you invited me here for the purpose that I discuss with you the staggering problems confronting the human race today, and that I do it boldly and without equivocation. I would have it no other way.

Upon that premise, I declare to you that in these dark days, when everything is strife and confusion and the whole world is topsyturvy, this generation must face now without flinching these all-important questions:

1. Will the human race be wiped out?
2. Will the lights of civilization go out?
3. Will Christianity fade from human hearts?
4. Will constitutional government be completely destroyed?
5. Will the genius of this Government, the rights of the sovereign States under a republican form of government be destroyed?
6. Will there be an amalgamation of the races?

I digress here to say that in the past maybe many well-thinking Christian people have doubted that this question confronts us. I concede that it was hard to believe. None of us have any quarrel whatsoever with any honest person diligently seeking to discover the truth, insisting that evidence be submitted to support that statement. I have been patient with those people, and you have been patient. I cannot refrain from saying now that my patience has been exhausted. More than ample evidence has been made available to demonstrate this truth than the hardened skeptic, but honest skeptic, should require.

Today the singing of Old Black Joe as written is taboo. Uncle Remus and the Tar Baby, which came from the brain and heart of that immortal Georgian, Joel Chandler Harris, has been removed from the bookshelves. Stephen Foster's Swanee River and Old Black Joe must be altered in content before going out on God's ether waves. The moving pictures, *Island in the Sun* and *The Edge of the City*, are so utterly convincing that any person should read, as he runs, the signs of these unfortunate times.

The United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights should, and will, convince any honest person that the forces of amalgamation are on the march. The money-spending spree the United Nations is now engaged in, with money mostly gathered from the taxpayers of the United States, to prove that all races are equal and that there are no biological differences whatever, and its declarations legalizing mixed marriages, conclusively proves that this question confronts us. The experiences in the Nation's Capital, the guinea pig for social experiments, should cause the blind to see.

Today, any white woman walking the streets of Washington at night is exposed to the real danger of losing her life, or suffering sexual assault, or both. This day, in the Nation's Capital, white women sit and cringe in their apartments or homes, with windows barred, doors locked and chained, fearing they will be murdered, sexually assaulted, robbed, and beaten by gangs of other races.

The Chief of Police, who is a good one, finds it impossible to cope with them because it has now come to the point where it takes a genius to remain in jail, for only a genius can conceal his imprisonment from the United States Supreme Court, the Court that has in recent pronouncements stripped the meek and law-abiding citizen of every vestige of protection against those fiendish wolves who well know and understand that a complete cloak of security has been thrown around them. Yes, our patience has been exhausted. Surely, any of our skeptics now know about the breakdown of law and order in New York, the civil-rights capital of the United States, and in Brooklyn, and understand that the favorite indoor sport in the Brooklyn schools is the rape of 13- and 14-year-old white girls by members of the Negro race, occasioned by the wild-eyed leftwingers mixing the schools, when it would seem that any person would have more sense than to do such a thing. This unfortunate situation is a monument to Mayor Wagner, Governor Harriman, and others you know. Certainly, those skeptics have read the lament of Police Chief Parker, Los Angeles, which I quote: "We have lost control of the crime problem in Los Angeles."

That efficient police officer well knows and understands that this question is real; otherwise, he would not be asking for legislation that would permit him to save Los Angeles from this unholy problem.

I say to the skeptics in Georgia now, in the identical language that northern newspapers attribute to Gov. Marvin Griffin, "We ain't going to have it here." Shakespeare may not have approved that quotation, but it is eloquent to me. That statement was framed in Georgia-style, and reflects the spirit of Georgia, and I do not think anyone could fail to understand its meaning. No one has to tell me for I know in my heart that every one of you has that same resolve and expects to maintain it as long as you live.

I must confess to you that I have gotten a little tired of some of the "do-gooders" saying that segregation is un-Christian. Our unchanging God has never condoned the series of offenses and outrages that integration brings, and He never will. I am a little tired of some of those who are saying that God has told them that segregation is wrong. I know, and you know, God does not tell one person one thing and another person another thing.

Some ministers say that segregation is wrong; others say that segregation was ordained by our Creator. I accuse no one of insincerity, but I vigorously assert and maintain that God has not given to a few a monopoly upon His views, and withheld His views to other tried and true consecrated servants.

Such contentions remind me of a story, and whether or not it is true, it is a good story told about an episode in the life of that distinguished divine, Bishop Candler. The story is that on one occasion, a minister went to the bishop and said: "Bishop, I talked to the Lord last night and he told me to tell you that you had not treated me right, that I deserve a better charge next year than the one I had this year." The bishop said: "That is interesting. What time did you talk to the Lord last night?" The minister replied: "About 9 o'clock." The bishop then said: "Well, the only explanation I have for you is that the Lord must have changed His mind, for I talked

to the Lord about 10 o'clock last night, and He told me you were lucky to have any kind of charge at all."

Seriously, I say to these "do-gooders" to remember Little Rock. Little Rock will remain through the ages as an imperishable monument to the law of brute force; also, a monument to the will of a people who could not be broken by paratroopers or bayonets. Yet, Little Rock also stands out as a monument to the appalling realization of what division can do to a proud city. The editorials of one Harry Ashmore, the rantings of an integrationist mayor, the attitudes of public officials to the effect that a little integration would not do any harm, are the ones that the blame is upon, because they are the ones that caused the radical left-wing organizations and the NAACP to believe that they could move in with impunity. They are the ones whose conduct inspired the decision of the North Dakota judge, and they must share the blame, along with the President, for the presence of troops in Little Rock and the turmoil that ensued.

I wonder if anyone can doubt the fairness of these statements? Now, the chips are down, and those causing this division can only do so knowingly and with complete understanding of what division will mean in our State. I say to them, and you say to them, we do not intend to violate a single law, nor a single edict of the United States Supreme Court, no matter how wrong it be, but nevertheless, they may as well stop their ranting because "We ain't going to have it here."

They can deliberately make it hard for us, but they cannot alter our resolve and determination. We will do whatever it takes to prevent this and we will do it within the law. We will close every school in Georgia before it shall come to pass. There is no necessity for another Little Rock and there will not be if our ranks are undivided. Little Rock is not a circumstance to what can occur in Georgia if these wild-eyed left-wing groups demand that it shall be.

We are not confronted only with that problem which I digressed to discuss, but with the other problems I have stated. We have a stupendous work to do and it must be done right. This is the time for undiluted statesmanship, completely divorced from politics. The personal equation must be forgotten.

It is evident to me and God knows I hope and somehow believe that it is becoming clearer to the majority of the people of the United States that had it not been for the social revolution carried on so feverishly for the past 3 years by our President, Vice President, and entirely too many Democrats and Republicans, all urged and spurred on by left-wing minority groups, many of whom cannot be trusted when the chips are down, we would not have found ourselves in our present position where a Godless nation has outstripped us in the development of weapons which could mean the end of civilization; indeed, the destruction of the human race. Had those people used those 3 years for the lofty purpose of preserving the human race and worked as feverishly toward that laudable end as they have fought for minorities, we would not find ourselves in this unfortunate situation.

I do not mean to tell you that we are defenseless. I do not think that we are. I do mean to tell you that we are behind, and that anyone should know that we must be ahead and remain ahead if we are to preserve civilization and Christianity on the face of this earth. I mean to tell you that we must build, and build speedily, satellites, missiles, planes, submarines, and other death-dealing instruments far more capable of destruction than anything Russia can produce. Further, we must continue to do these things for a long time and until the people behind the Iron Curtain realize the futility of war, and sue for peace.

Anyone advocating an all-out war now is a menace to this world. The only hope for avoiding war, and the destruction of humanity, is that we be stronger and more capable at all times. Ludicrous as it may seem to some, it is now a fact that the one nation which controls the moon and the planets will rule this world. We are behind in this race, but we must win this race. A second-best military is like a second-best poker hand. The second-best just cannot win. This is a fight, my friends, to the finish. It is going to cost a lot of money, but it is one that money alone cannot win. We need to forget the idea that we can go to the battlefield in Cadillacs, or under the slogan "Business as usual." This fight is going to be won by those who are willing to give the noblest part of their natures, and who are not only willing to die for our principles, but to do the harder thing—live for our principles. Liberty simply will not consort with a coward, a weakling, or the fainthearted.

Maybe it was too much to expect, but when the President talked to us a short time ago on security, immediately after the launching of sputnik, I was hoping in my heart that our President would suggest that this social revolution, which is destroying the unity of our country, be called off. Yes, I had hoped that he would issue a challenge to that effect so that the people could have the opportunity of determining those who could be trusted when the chips are down. You and I would welcome that challenge, and we would accept that challenge. It would be wholesome for America to have the opportunity of finding out whether these minority groups, who ask for so much and give so little, are willing to prove their loyalty and devotion to constitutional government.

The President did not issue that challenge. Unfortunately, the same day he talked to the American people, he announced his appointment of the members of the Civil Rights Commission. It was a bad Commission which he set up. It could have been worse. I have the idea that sputnik caused it to be no worse. I concede that it could have been worse, because he could have appointed Eleanor, he could have appointed Averill Harriman, who is antiwhite; perhaps he would have appointed Vice President Nixon except for the fact that Nixon was busily engaged traveling over Africa and working with Martin Luther King, on Operation Dixie. The story is told in Washington that after Vice President Nixon returned from one of his African trips he appeared at a baseball game and was taken out to greet the umpires and players; that he was first met by a white umpire, the Vice President extended his hand, and forgetful of his surroundings, looked at the umpire with amazement and was heard to say: "You're Mr. Livingston, I presume."

This Civil Rights Commission will soon start stirring up the strife it was created for. I know this civil-rights legislation. I know it as well as any man in the United States. I know it as well as Herbert Brownell, and I know it better than President Eisenhower will ever know it. If I did not know it, I would have failed you and would have failed the people I represent, and I would have failed the white race.

I was the only member of the House Committee on the Judiciary from Georgia, and as such I had the sacred duty of knowing that legislation and fighting that legislation every step of the way. If I fell down on the job in any respect, recognition of that fact would be the deepest regret of my life. As a member of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the only southerner on that subcommittee of seven, I was able to hold that iniquitous legislation throughout the session of 1955 and until April 9, 1956. The full committee, on which there were seven other southerners, was able to keep it off the floor until July

18, 1956. It passed the House on July 24, 1956, after having been riddled with amendments, and was sent to the Senate 4 days before adjournment.

In 1957, commencing when Congress convened, a determined fight was made to bring that bill out of committee. Chairman CELLER and ranking minority member, KEATING, said the bill would go through like a dose of croton oil, and be passed on February 15. Congressman CELLER would not let me sit as a member of the subcommittee in 1957, but he could not prevent me from fighting it just the same. We demanded public hearings and we got public hearings.

I called the Governor of our State and asked him to send me Eugene Cook and Charlie Bloch to testify before that committee. He sent them, they came, they did a masterful job. Time will not permit me to enumerate what they did, but as a result of their work and as a result of Georgia responding to my call, the backbones of other southern governors and attorneys general were stiffened, and they came to Washington in numbers that the opposition did not dream would come.

As a result that bill was amended in at least 7 important particulars before it reached the floor only 4 days earlier in 1957 than it did in 1956. Our fight was organized every step of the way. I was the leader of that fight in the committee, Congressman HOWARD SMITH was the general on the floor, Congressman JAMES DAVIS, of Stone Mountain, Ga., was our parliamentarian. We were finally whipped, but that fight proved to me that Lee's army was as good as it ever was. We suffer simply because of lack of numbers. Our heads were bruised, but they remain unbowled.

Sometimes you cannot measure results in the heat of the day. I am inclined to believe now that our success exceeded our expectations. Veritably, I believe that on the national level this social revolution has reached its crest and can only go downhill. Many of the boys who so enthusiastically supported that legislation are now giving the appearance of having been thoroughly chastened. The truth seems to have sunk into them that they did not pick up any votes by doing this un-American thing. That is something that you and I could have told them, and I did tell them, but this is a problem that some people simply have to experience personally in order to understand.

As a matter of fact, I am a little tired and disgusted over the prattling of so many of our leaders to the effect that the Negro has caused all of this trouble. I never will agree that a handful of Negroes has turned this world upside down. Further, I have never convinced myself that the rank and file of the Negro race has any desire to do so. To attribute to the Negroes all of the blame for this strife and confusion would be admitting that they possess political acumen and intelligence that the facts do not warrant. The NAACP is not a Negro organization and never has been. It has had three presidents—all of whom had white skin. It is an interracial movement, and the board of directors is about evenly divided. Eleanor is an honorary member. So is Dick Nixon.

You ask me, naturally, who did stir up this trouble in our land? That is a good question and I can tell you. It was not stirred up by the Yankees, and this is not a battle between the Yankee and the Rebel, or the North and the South. Many would have you think that it is. Thank God there are millions of unreconstructed Yankees who believe in constitutional government and want to have the privilege of preserving our republican form of government. The Yankees are on our side in numbers so large it is hard to envision. There are millions more we can win, when we discharge our duty to carry the facts to them and extend the welcome hand of friendship in recognition of our common

destiny. To that end we must unceasingly work.

Of amazing interest to me is the fact that in all of the hearings, not an agency of our Federal Government or the agencies of any of our State governments appeared and testified in behalf of civil-rights legislation. The FBI did not appear. No judge of any court appeared. No attorney general appeared other than Herbert Brownell, and he appeared only on April 9, 1956, when it was apparent that civil-rights legislation was going to be passed out of subcommittee No. 2.

It might interest you to know that when Brownell did appear, he had a bill hastily prepared, which was the worst legal garbage I have ever been permitted to see, and which was completely fashioned upon the bill recommended by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1949, which Tom Clark admitted was of doubtful constitutionality, but contended would be made legal by recitations that the legislation was drawn pursuant to the United Nations Charter. The legality of the civil-rights legislation is now dependent upon the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

With the exception of Congressmen who were authors of civil-rights legislation, Herbert Brownell, and the Director of the FHA, who bluntly testified that while he was color blind, interracial housing was a bad financial risk for the taxpayers of the United States, here is the list that did appear and testify:

Chairman of the National Civil Rights Committee, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, accompanied by director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C.; executive secretary of the NAACP, New York, accompanied by the director of the Washington bureau and counsel for the bureau; general counsel, American Jewish Congress; executive director, American Veterans' Committee; secretary-treasurer, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO; codirector of the fair practices and antidiscrimination department, UAW-CIO; accompanied by national representative, UAW-CIO; legislative representative, Americans for Democratic Action; director, American Council on Human Rights; W. Astor Kirk, who said he was appearing as a private witness, although a professor of government at Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Tex.; Washington representative, Japanese-American Citizens League; statement of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the statement reciting that it represented the combined and joint views of the constituent organizations as shown on pages 360-361 of the hearings; also, statement by the National Lawyers Guild, National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.; Womens' International League for Peace and Freedom; and the American Civil Liberties Union.

In other words, the only persons in the whole United States testifying in behalf of civil rights legislation were the above minority groups. Now, I hope no member of any race or religion bruises too easily. I attack no one on the basis of race, color, or creed per se, and I want that understood. But, I want it to be fully understood that I attack any organization, irrespective of race, color, or creed, where the national interest is involved. I am aware of the fact that these organizations do not represent the thinking of the great majority of the races and religions that they claim to represent. Actually, I think they are misrepresenting the races and religions they claim to represent. I think any good citizen of the United States should be glad to know, irrespective of any racial ties, or religious ties, the organizations stirring up our land. If anyone resents me telling the truth, then they are the ones who deserve criticism and condemnation.

The testimony of Judge Rose, chairman of the civil rights committee, Anti-Defamation

League of B'nai B'rith, was absolutely astounding. His testimony will be found on pages 403-415 of the Civil Rights Hearings published in 1957. On pages 409-415 will be found my cross-examination of Judge Rose. Judge Rose made it crystal clear that he approved legislation making it a criminal felony offense for anyone abolishing public schools and substituting private schools to avoid integrated schools.

The record shows that I called his attention to the fact that Georgia was discussing going on a private-school system, and asking him if he was advocating that if the State of Georgia should abolish its public-school system that the abolishment would come within this criminal statute that he advocated, and the judge made it crystal clear that he did. The American Jewish Committee sent each Member of Congress a pamphlet entitled "The People Take the Lead" and, on page 631 of the American Jewish Yearbook, 1956, volume 57, is found the statement, "We were very closely involved with the Supreme Court decision. Not only were we active, along with other organizations, in the filing of an amicus curiae brief, but we contributed materially to the social theory upon which the desegregation decision was based." Also, "Fact-finding studies from which this theory developed would not have been made were it not for the American Jewish Committee."

The National Lawyers Guild, an organization which Mr. Brownell has termed "subversive," testified on page 529 of said hearings, and stated that they had drafted the model civil-rights bill, evidently meaning the one that Attorney General Tom Clark submitted in 1949, and hastily copied by Attorney General Brownell in April 1956. Whether the National Lawyers Guild was the father of that illegitimate offspring, I do not know. I admit that the child looks exactly like it.

The UAW-CIO, through its codirector of the fair practices and antidiscrimination department, pages 479-510, recommended legislation founded on the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration on Human Rights. On page 498 of the 1957 hearings will be found the statement by that witness that segregation must be stopped because "white dominion is dead or dying everywhere in the world, not only in Africa, but also here in the United States of America."

I observe now, as I did then, that witness will not live long enough to preside at the funeral of the white race.

The secretary-treasurer, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, recommended legislation which would halt Federal funds to segregated schools, would pass an FEPC law, prohibit segregation in Government-assisted housing, demonstrating that they did not mind trampling underfoot the Constitution of the United States.

The Americans for Democratic Action, through John J. Gunther, advocated an anti-discrimination amendment to the military reserve bill and to eliminate segregation and other forms of discrimination in housing, education, employment, recreation, Government-supported financing, the National Guard, and other areas of life. Also, they urged that all Federal contributions to such programs be conditioned upon such principles.

By the way—I understand that the ADA has blacklisted TIC FORRESTER. I appreciate that compliment, and I can assure you that TIC FORRESTER had blacklisted them long before they blacklisted TIC FORRESTER.

I have barely touched the testimony of these various minority groups, but they sang the same songs and played the same music.

The truth is, this agitation over civil rights and the destruction of the 10th amendment reserving all powers to the States not delegated to the Federal Government is the work of the Communist Party.

Two or three weeks ago on Mike Wallace's program, John Gates, a Communist and former editor of the Daily Worker, took credit for the civil-rights legislation in behalf of the Communist Party.

In 1928 the Communist Party platform laid down 9 planks dealing with minority races, and 8 of those planks have already been complied with through executive decrees and decisions of the United States Supreme Court. The plank remaining unsatisfied is the one demanding the abolishment of all laws prohibiting mixed marriages. There is a case now pending before the United States Supreme Court attacking the constitutionality of those laws, and as sure as the sun shines the United States Supreme Court will accommodate that demand.

The most unfortunate decision ever rendered by the United States Supreme Court was the case of *Missouri v. Holland* in 1920. That decision wrongfully held that treaties are superior to our Constitution. The Communists and left-wingers danced with glee when that decision was announced. President Truman's Civil Rights Commission in 1947 reported that the United Nations Charter being a treaty, that new vistas had opened to them in the field of civil rights which they had not theretofore dreamed were possible. While you and I, and the rank and file of the American people, were told that the United Nations Charter represented our longing for peace and was a panacea against war, those boys were operating on the idea that the United Nations was a super government, and as Secretary Stettinius termed it, the Charter was an international constitution.

We did not dream that it would be used to run roughshod over our Constitution, or that it would meddle with our internal affairs. We had no idea that it would be used as a basis for the enactment of civil-rights legislation, which even the United States Supreme Court had held conflicted with our Constitution. We of course know that in *Oyama v. California* (334 U. S.), the Supreme Court held that a former constitutional law of California was illegal because it conflicted with the United Nations Charter.

Briefly, though I must hurry on, I stake any reputation which I might have as a lawyer of 30 years' experience that there is not one decision of the United States Supreme Court that has offended our philosophies, ran counter to our Constitution and completely against our way of life, which cannot be defended, provided you first admit, which I do not, that treaties override and are superior to our Constitution. I hope that shocks you. Many lawyers have asked me why it was that the United States Supreme Court ignored the rule of stare decisis in the school case decisions. I can give you this explanation: cases holding that separate but equal facilities satisfied all constitutional concepts were decisions rendered in the Constitution itself. Since those decisions were rendered, the United Nations Charter has been adopted and ratified by the Government of the United States, and if treaties override our Constitution, then the Supreme Court Judges perhaps could defend an impeachment proceeding upon the contention that there was no rule of stare decisis, because a treaty had been approved since the rendition of the former decisions.

It is my recommendation that each and every lawmaker in the United States and everyone interested in constitutional government secure a copy of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. For your information, a few months ago I sent my check to the United Nations, after discovering that this spendthrift Government of ours had neither of those documents, although it distributes free pamphlets on everything that the human

mind can conceive of, including the sex life of flowers, asking that they send me an equal number of the Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. They sent me 200 copies of the Charter, but advised me they were indefinitely out of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. In other words—I must assume they do not expect to print any more copies.

I have one copy, however, and I am saving it for seed, and if they do not print more we will just have the one that I possess reprinted, because there is the instrument which explains everything and shows the direction this Government is traveling in. Those two instruments furnished the inspiration for the decision in the Watkins case which virtually destroyed the powers of Congress to investigate subversive activities; they also will explain the decision against California, telling that sovereign State that it must withdraw its denial of the right to practice law to the one that had been a former Communist; they explain the Steve Nelson case which told the sovereign State of Pennsylvania in effect that States rights were no more, and that a State could not legislate against the overthrow of a State government. When you read those instruments, you can understand where the reasoning was obtained in the decision telling New York that it could not fire a Communist teacher in the public schools, for under those instruments communism is a political philosophy and protected as such. Under those instruments you can begin to see the unreasonable utterances enunciated in the Girard will case in Pennsylvania.

Now, we might as well shell the corn and we might as well understand what lies ahead for us. It is my considered opinion that the Girard will-case decision was rendered for the express purpose of being made applicable to the State of Georgia and other Southern States. The NAACP and other organizations understand that, and I am not telling them anything which they do not already know. To the Governors of Georgia, the present and the future, to the present leaders of the House and the Senate, and the future leaders, and to the present members of this body and those who come hereafter, I warn you that you might as well roll up your sleeves and bare your breasts and be at all times ready, willing, and able to fight. There are entirely too many lawyers in this joint session for me to presume that I must analyze and digest the consequences of that decision to you. Let them threaten the denial of funds. Let them threaten the denial to us of the use of public buildings or property. They may put those threats into execution, but by the grace of God they will be the losers. In punishing us, they will arouse the righteous wrath of the good people from the four corners of this Nation as nothing else could do.

You have been most kind to me. You have honored me far more than I deserve. I am simply a country lawyer from the little town of Leesburg, who is entrusted with the privilege of fighting for principles which our people love more than life itself. I have done, and will continue to do, and the Georgia delegation has done and will continue to do everything possible to try to recover those principles for you and bring them safely home.

I thank the people of Georgia for that privilege; and, if you will permit me, please let me tell you of one little act which I was able to perform for you that will perhaps remain the high-water mark of my life. In the 83d Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 44, proposing an amendment to our Constitution, was introduced by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, and was passed in the Senate by a vote of 44 to 29. That resolution was advocated by the bar of the city of New York, a bar which I have found by experience to be one that favors centralized gov-

ernment and liberal theories always, and approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

Under article III, section 2, paragraph 2, of our Constitution, it is provided that in all constitutional questions the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, subject to such exceptions and regulations as Congress might make. Under Senate Joint Resolution 44, as conceived by the bar of the city of New York, and approved by the American Bar Association as aforesaid, that provision was changed to read that the Supreme Court would have appellate jurisdiction of all constitutional questions both law and fact, deleting the right of Congress to make exceptions and regulations.

Strange indeed, Justice Burton and former Justice Owen Roberts had recommended that provision. Indeed, those gentlemen referred to the right of Congress to make exceptions and regulations to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as the Achilles heel. They recommended that the Supreme Court be given complete and exclusive authority on saying what the Constitution did and did not mean, free of any interference from any branch of Government whatsoever. That resolution was passed favorably out of a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary; but, when it was brought before the full committee, I read that iniquitous provision and I led the fight to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 44; and, strangely, not a one of the members of the subcommittee had realized the danger of such provisions. We defeated that bill, thank God.

Here is why I am proud and thankful. Had that bill passed and been adopted, the people of this country would have been bereft

of any remedy whatsoever in seeking to undo the horrible decisions that the United States Supreme Court has rendered in recent years, and the United States Supreme Court would have been, as they assume themselves to be, complete dictators of the United States of America. I had the joyous privilege of retaining for the people the right to deal with that Court and its membership and that right remains, and all on earth we need to deal with that Court is the will on the part of the Congress so to do. That was worth going to Congress for.

As surely as we stand in this hallowed place, if the Supreme Court of the United States has the power to write the law of the land, and if the President has the right to enforce those decisions with troops, then we are a dictatorship as terrifying as any existing in foreign lands. Yet, that is the order of these evil days.

Maybe some of you were surprised when I was bold enough to give a statement to the newspapers that President Eisenhower would send troops to Little Rock. I was not unmindful of the fact that the Civil War statute providing that the President could send troops to enforce civil rights had been stricken from the law in the Senate. I was thoroughly familiar with that provision and pointed it out in the minority report of which I was the author in 1956, and again in the minority report of 1957, and I pointed it out on the floor of the House in 1956. I also knew that when that provision was stricken in the Senate by a vote of 94 to nothing, that the left wing boys did not think that they had given up anything.

I remind you again, remember the law of brute force. I do not think that Herbert Brownell sent those troops. I do not think

that Sherman Adams did. Sitting in the White House is a man by the name of Max Rabb, who is one of the President's secretaries, and who was head of one of the minority groups before he became adviser to the President on minority affairs. The minority groups are the boys who demanded that troops be sent to Little Rock. They are the ones who got the President's ear, and I am confident that they are the ones who persuaded the President to do a thing that he had told Senator RUSSELL about 2 weeks before he could not conceive of ever doing.

Believe me, my friends, these so-called tolerant boys are the most intolerant boys this country has ever spawned. No; it is not the Negro. Down in Leesburg, Ga., there is an old Negro who has worked for me off and on for 25 or 30 years and he has as faithful a heart as ever beat in a human breast. He writes to me often. In one of his letters he said this to me: "Everything is all right down home, and the yard's all right. You take care of the Yankees, and I'll take care of the home folks." While he is wrong in saying the Yankees, he knew that there were sinister influences somewhere and in his heart he wanted them corrected.

I know of no greater privilege ever accorded to the lawmakers of this Nation and to the leaders of this Nation than the privilege of preserving these things which I have discussed. There is no place on the globe more appropriate to discuss these principles than the spot where you and I stand, and no legislative body, State or Federal, can be more dedicated or more firm in its adherence to the principles upon which our Government is based than here. No wonder, my friends, it's great to be a Georgian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ted Richardson, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Harlingen, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, whose name is above every name, bless us today as we endeavor to do Thy will. Give us spiritual insight equal to the challenge of our material discoveries. Make us aware of our need for Thee and our need for each other, the servant and the served. Save us from folly and deepen our sense of responsibility for each other. Raise up within our midst leaders equal to the times so that the kingdoms of this world may more nearly resemble the kingdom of our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 15, 1958:

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. 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; and

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.

### A SHIFT IN LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. PORTER. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have deplored the administration's courtship of Latin American dictators. The other day I received a letter from the State Department in answer to a letter I wrote to the President recommending that he publicly commend the new Venezuelan Government for its moves toward democracy and freedom.

The texts of those letters are included in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

No one, except those who are in control, favors a police state. No one advocates intervention by force by the United States in any country. But we can say clearly and officially that we strongly prefer democracy and freedom to dictatorships.

It is most encouraging to discover at long last that the administration is willing to reflect the deepest beliefs of our citizens and make a public statement in favor of nations who choose democracy and freedom over dictatorships.

### PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services may sit during general debate in the House this week.

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

There was no objection.

### FELICITATIONS TO DR. BRASKAMP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas for 1 minute for a special purpose.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I think I am giving away no secrets when I say that today is the birthday of our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp, who has done so much and is doing so much for us.

I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of this House as I wish for him a very, very happy birthday and that all his years will be happy ones.

### MARGIE C. STEWART

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 8038, an act for the relief of Margie C. Stewart.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1958.