Here in this country, Americans of Finnish descent are mostly employed in skilled building trades, as miners, in heavy industry, and as farmers. These are the fields which are hit especially hard by the growing and threatening recession, and the Finnish-Americans, as all of us, are alarmed about rising unemployment in these fields.

Finnish people in Wisconsin have earned their reputation as a hard-working, hardy, self-reliant group. This is notable in their participation and leadership in the cooperative movement. Finnish people were primarily responsible for founding Central Cooperatives, Inc., of Superior, Wis., and many local cooperative groceries, service stations, bulk-oil distributors, creameries, insurance companies, and even burial associations. Sons and daughters of these cooperative pioneers have gone into almost every State in the Union, serving as experts in cooperative enterprises organized by other Americans.

Finnish-Americans are among the most independent, liberty-loving, and stubbornly free of all the people of our great country, yet they know and practice the virtues of mutual aid and cooperation to its finest degree. Their contributions to our Nation have been great, and it is most fitting that the Congress should give recognition to them on this day of cultural importance to them.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1958

Rev. Richard E. Nowers, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we know the task of these Senators at times is almost impossible. The many demands of time, energy, and interests lay claim upon their busy lives. In this moment of prayer, we ask that they, too, may not forget Thy claim upon their lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 28, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1568. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; and

S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. 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. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that later in the day, after the unfinished business, Calendar No. 1253, House bill 5809, to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor, is disposed of, we expect to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1294, Senate bill 3149, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank.

We expect the Senate to hold a session tomorrow. Perhaps there will be a calendar call later in the week, either on Wednesday or on Thursday.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY AND THE SIEGE OF THE ALAMO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday was Texas Independence Day.

On March 2, 1836, delegates of the people of Texas, meeting in general convention at the town of Washington on the Brazos, adopted the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Texas.

The declaration was in large part a bill of particulars against a tyrannical and oppressive government. It was a firmly stated declaration that the people of Texas "are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations."

Even though Texas long ago joined the Union of States, every Texan is proudly conscious that Texas was once an independent nation. This knowledge is a vital part of our heritage as Texans.

Even as the delegates were meeting at Washington on the Brazos, another small band of brave and determined men was undergoing siege in a battle that was to become a rallying cry of victory in the war for independence. That was the battle of the Alamo.

Mr. President, the story of that battle has been told many times. And now it has been told again, perceptively and suspensefully, in a book called 13 Days to Glory, written by Lon Tinkle, the distinguished book editor of the Dallas Morning News.

In a review published yesterday in the New York Herald Tribune, Dr. Henry Nash Smith, himself a native Texan, explains, at least by implication, why this book needed to be written, even though the story of the Alamo has been told many times.

That story has never been told more effectively or more revealingly than Mr. Tinkle tells it.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Smith's review of 13 Days to Glory: The Siege of the Alamo, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

UNTIL THE LAST FIGHTER FELL

(Reviewed by Henry Nash Smith)

Because the early history of Texas has been studied with as much intensity as has that of Massachusetts or Virginia, the fall of the Alamo on March 6, 1836, has accumulated an imposing bibliography: Lon Tinkle's list of sources and the notes on his text occupy 14 pages. Yet despite this apparatus, 13 Days to Glory is the work of a novelist rather than of a historian. One does not question the author's assurance that, with one minor exception, "all movement of participants is based on documentary evidence." It is rather that the questions he asks of his materials have to do with the texture of experience—the inner life of individual characters—rather than with the play of political or economic or social forces.

Mr. Tinkle wants to understand why 150 men, most of them recent arrivals from the United States or Europe, remained in a fortress improvised from the ruins of an abandoned mission, allowed themselves to be surrounded by 3,000 troops of an invading army whose commander had proclaimed "No quarter," and as a result were killed to the last man. If the divided councils of commanders and the standard American underestimate of the Mexican enemy provide a partial answer, these factors are of no help in analyzing the motives of 32 volunteers from Gonzales who marched 140 miles and slipped through the Mexican lines in order to join the handful of doomed men inside the Alamo.

The force that made these men choose to die was not patriotism, at least in any usual sense: Travis was flying a flag representing the Mexican constitution of 1824, with the implication that he was engaged in a Mexican civil war against the dictator, Santa Ana. Nor was holding out to the end a military necessity: Travis was only 1 of 3 officers sent on 3 successive occasions with orders to destroy the Alamo and retreat. The stark vividness of the defense of the Alamo lies in the very fact that it was not rational. It was

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

an acte gratuit. Even the words "courage" and "heroism" do not do justice to the case. The more detailed the narrative becomes, the more it reveals something undefined and perhaps indefinable in Travis and his men.

Mr. Tinkle causes the reader to glimpse a dark, mysterious aspect of American frontier experience, not to be subsumed under the categories of land hunger and expansionist fervor usually invoked to account for the westward movement. He has arrived at an imaginative insight which can be expressed only by indirection. We come away from the book convinced that these men did indeed choose to die in just this fashion, perhaps without themselves knowing why, and that by their choice they realized to the full one potential aspect of man's nature.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON TUNGSTEN ORES AND CONCENTRATES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tungsten ores and concentrates, dated February 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS SUPERVISED BY FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Home Loan Banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PHASEOUT OPERATIONS OF SOUTHERN AIR MATERIEL, EUROPE, AIR MATERIEL FORCE, EUROPEAN AREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Phaseout Operations of the Southern Air Materiel, Europe, Air Materiel Force, European Area, Department of the Air Force, Nouaseur, Morocco, dated February 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS DETERMINATIONS AND RELATED PROCUREMENT FOR CERTAIN JET ENGINES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of requirements determinations and related procurement for J-57 aircraft jet engines in the Department of the Air Force, dated February 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Civil War Centennial Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated February 28, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Francesco Ianni from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 85-162 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PROGRESS REPORT ON HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report on the highway cost allocation study dated February 28, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

RATIFICATION OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES BY MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter from the Governor of the State of Maryland, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., February 28, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 19th amendment to the United States Constitution, otherwise known as the women's suffrage amendment, was approved by the 1941 session of the General Assembly of Maryland. However, there is no record in the Hall of Records of Maryland or in the Archives of the United States that certified copies of the ratification resolution, as adopted by the general assembly, were forwarded by the State of Maryland to the Secretary of State of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States as directed in section 2 of resolution 12 of the laws of 1941.

I have, therefore, had certified copies made from the original resolution and I take pleasure in notifying you that Maryland has ratified Resolution 12 of the Acts of 1941, and enclose a certified copy as directed by the act.

Respectfully,
THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 112

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide that the dairy support price for the marketing year starting April 1, 1958, shall be not less than the current $3.25 per hundredweight for 3.95 percent butterfat milk and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall use a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period from July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive

"Whereas on December 18, 1957, Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced that dairy price support for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958, will be at 75 percent of parity; and

"Whereas the 75 percent of parity will result in a decrease to approximately $3.02 per hundredweight for 3.95 percent butterfat milk from the current support price of $3.25; and

"Whereas, this decrease will reduce dairy income in the State of Mississippi approximately $2,300,000; and

"Whereas, on January 16, 1958, the President of the United States in his message to the Congress of the United States for a revised farm, food, and fiber program recommended that the dairy price support should be determined administratively between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity; and

"Whereas the recommended minimum of 60 percent of parity will result in a decrease to approximately $2.37 per hundredweight for 3.95 percent butterfat milk from the current support price of $3.25; and

"Whereas this decrease will reduce dairy income in the State of Mississippi approximately $8,800,000: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Legislature of Mississippi does hereby memorialize and petition, and does respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the dairy support price for the marketing year starting April 1, 1958, shall be not less than the current $3.25 per hundredweight for 3.95 percent butterfat milk and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall use a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by house of representatives February 5, 1958.

"WALTER SIEMS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the senate February 19, 1958.

"_____ _____,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collection of taxes on income by the States

"Whereas citizens of New Hampshire residing within this State but employed in the States of Vermont and Massachusetts are now imposed upon by being forced to pay income taxes to those States; and

"Whereas United States Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire have joined with United States Senators from other States in proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution to end the imposition of income taxes by one State upon the residents of other States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Hampshire (the House of Representatives concurring)*—

"(1) The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution by adding a new article to the amendments by which the several States would have no power to impose and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived except in respect to residents of the State imposing the tax; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to forward a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President of the

United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the United States Senate.

"W. DOUGLAS SCAMMAN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ERALSEY C. FERGUSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed February 12, 1958.

"Attest:

"HARRY E. JACKSON,
"Secretary of State."

A declaration adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Estonian descent, assembled in New York, N. Y., relating to the liberation of Estonia and other captive countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co., Inc., of Seattle, Wash., signed by Daniel J. Doswell, manager, endorsing an enclosed resolution favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Federal-aid airport program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of G. C. Weldin, of Rancho Santa Fe, California, relating to an investigation of the Federal Communications Commission regarding the Bell Telephone System; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of West Covina, Calif., favoring the improvement of the Walnut Creek system of the comprehensive plan for the control and conservation of floodwaters for Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Oil Men's Association at its 43d annual convention in Wichita, Kans., on January 13, 1958, adopted resolutions opposing any increase in State or Federal gasoline taxes, and recommended that the Interstate Highway System be so constructed with access roads that all classes of businessmen, major or independent, large or small shall have an opportunity to compete for such business that is carried on on the highway itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

The Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention assembled at the Lassen Hotel, Wichita, Kans., January 13, 1958, for their 43d annual convention, adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas it has been made apparent that the State highway commission have now and will for the foreseeable future have adequate income from present revenue sources to adequately match all available Federal funds for new highway construction, and to properly maintain the present system, without curtailing projects; and

"Whereas the motoring public are now paying excessive motor fuel taxes and as well extremely high taxes on motor vehicles, tires, repairs, etc.; and

"Whereas the cost of buying and operating motor vehicles is a cost-of-living item to all families: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Kansas Oil Men's Association at their 43d annual convention in Wichita, Kans., January 13, 1958, hereby go on record as opposing any increase on State or Federal gasoline taxes."

"Whereas the Interstate Highway System is so designed that there will be no direct access to the trafficways; and

"Whereas motorists traveling the Interstate System will be required to purchase gasoline and food on access roads or on roads leading into the interchanges: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Kansas Oil Men's Association assembled in their 43d annual convention at the Lassen Hotel in Wichita, Kans., January 13, 1958, hereby resolve that the location and design of such access roads, and shopping areas adjacent to interchanges be such that all classes of businessmen, major or independent, large or small, shall have an opportunity to compete for such business."

STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE OF KANSAS FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations at a meeting in Topeka, Kans., on February 18, 1958, went on record favoring a 5-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the reenactment of Public Law 480 as aids in exporting our surplus farm production.

The members of this organization are the Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas State Grange, Kansas Farmers Union, the Kansas Farmers Service Association, Farmers Union Jobbing Association, Consumers Co-Operative Association, Equity Union Grain Co., Kansas Co-Operative Managers and Directors Association, Farmers Co-Operative Commission Co., Kansas Co-Op Dairy Products Association, Kansas Livestock Association, Kansas Electric Co-Operative, Inc., and the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers.

Last year, under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the mutual-aid program and Public Law 480, our Nation exported crops which were grown on 50 million acres of cropland owned by American farmers.

The production of 1 out of every 2 acres of cotton and 1 out of every 2 acres of wheat grown in this country last year was sold abroad.

During fiscal year 1957—July 1956–June 1957—a record $4.7 billion worth of United States farm commodities moved into export markets. Eighty percent of these sales were made to nations with which the United States has trade agreements.

If United States export markets were lost, it would be necessary to take out of production the 50 million acres of cropland now devoted to the production of commodities for export.

If we are going to continue to export, we are faced with two alternatives:

First. We can continue policies designed to increase trade on a reciprocal basis.

Second. We can continue to resort to high expenditures for foreign aid, and if we do, agriculture will have to continue to rely on interim programs such as sales for local currencies.

As exporters and taxpayers, therefore, farmers have a major stake in the extension of the trade-agreements program, but as American citizens interested in world peace, they also have an even greater stake in its extension.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement approved by the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE OF KANSAS FARM ORGANIZATIONS MEETING IN TOPEKA, KANS., FEBRUARY 18, 1958

The high protective tariff law was enacted for the purpose of assisting in the development of "infant industry." As the years have passed these industries have grown up and in many cases assumed giant proportions. They have become a powerful force in the economy of the country, and in too many cases wield a most powerful political influence.

In addition to the benefit they have derived from the tariff they have enjoyed direct and indirect subsidies from the United States Treasury. Subsidies such as direct financial support of transportation companies, buildings for use in manufacturing materials that might be used in case of war, indirect subsidies in the form of semi-free mailing service and others.

These "favors" to certain industries have enabled them, through trusts, combines, and mergers to develop monopoly control of prices of most products that are sold at retail.

Service organizations, telephone companies, professions, labor unions, and many others fix the price of their service without regard to supply and demand.

Agriculture, because of the uncertainty of production and the fact that it is composed of millions of small units, has been, and probably always will be, unable to compete successfully in the mad scramble for power in control of the markets for its products and the power to fix its own prices on the purchase of necessary equipment to operate the farm and support his family on the basis of American standards.

We appeal to Congress and the national administration to give serious consideration to the lowering of the tariff wall, so far as is possible, without bankrupting essential industries and will enable this country to exchange goods and services with our friendly foreign countries to a better advantage.

We urge a 5-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements and a more aggressive use thereof. The reenactment of Public Law 480 as an aid in exporting our surplus farm production.

We feel the present price-support law should not be eliminated until such time as conditions change or some better method of handling the situation is devised.

Farmers are constantly being called upon to solve their own problems without Government help or interference.

While it seems impossible to do this effectively, yet much is being done and it behooves organized agriculture to exert every effort to affect this purpose.

The Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations representing as it does fully 90 percent of the farmers of Kansas, pledges its united support to the building of stronger and better marketing, purchasing and service cooperative organizations.

We feel justified in expecting encouragement and help from the Congress, and the United States Department of Agriculture. Therefore, the encouragement and development of a stronger system of farmer cooperatives should be the publicly declared policy of our National Government.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE WILLISTON, N. DAK., COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Williston, N. Dak., Cooperative Credit Union relating to Hells Canyon Dam and Federal regulation of gas companies.

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

WILLISTON, N. DAK.,
February 20, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM R. LANGER.
Senator MILTON YOUNG.
Representative USHER L. BURDICK.
Representative OTTO KRUEGER.

GENTLEMEN: Following are two resolutions which were unanimously adopted by the membership present at our annual meeting on January 25, 1958:

RESOLUTION 1

"We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 25th day of January 1958, go on record favoring Hells Canyon Dam.

"Moved by Jennie Solberg, seconded by Lloyd Esterby, that this resolution be adopted. Carried unanimously."

RESOLUTION 2

"We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union, in annual meeting assembled this 25th day of January 1958, go on record as being opposed to taking the regulation of gas companies away from the Federal Power Commission.

"Moved by Lloyd Esterby, seconded by Henry Williams, that this resolution be adopted. Carried unanimously."

We are requesting that you give these resolutions your consideration.

Very truly yours,

WILLISTON COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION,
CARL R. LARSON,
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1875. A bill for the relief of Christos Athanase Bellairs (Rept. No. 1333);

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Irene B. Moss (Rept. No. 1334);

S. 2499. A bill for the relief of Ilona Agnes Ronay (Rept. No. 1335);

S. 3124. A bill for the relief of Tommy Ilton Chatterton (Tommy Kim) (Rept. No. 1336); and

H. R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Pochon Dike (Rept. No. 1337).

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

S. 1380. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1338); and

S. 2919. 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 (Rept. No. 1339).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1749. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1340).

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, RELATING TO INDEMNITY PROTECTION IN RESPECT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP—REREFERENCE OF BILL (S. REPT. NO. 1341)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3106) to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship, with the recommendation that the bill be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The bill (S. 3106) to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, a letter from the Comptroller General, and other information pertaining thereto, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AUTHORIZING INDEMNITY PROTECTION IN RESPECT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT VESSEL

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to whom was referred the bill (S. 3106) to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for its consideration.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 3106 would amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which authorizes the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for operation in the foreign commerce of the United States, by providing that the United States indemnify any contractors or agents of the United States against liability on account of claims by third persons, employees or others, for death, bodily injury, sickness or disease, or loss of or damage to property, arising as a result of nuclear incidents in connection with the construction or operation of the vessel.

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION

Under Public Law 848, 84th Congress, there was authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, funds for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation of a nuclear-powered merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration was empowered to take all necessary steps, with the approval, where appropriate, of the Atomic Energy Commission, looking toward the construction of this prototype vessel, to train qualified personnel for its operation, and to arrange for its operation.

Because of the possibilities of widespread damage and destruction that might result from possible nuclear incidents, contractors and agents otherwise interested in construction or operation of the vessel were reluctant to enter into contracts without assurance that they would be indemnified by the Government against claims arising from any such incidents to the extent that commercial insurance was not available at reasonable prices. Also, such indemnifying authority was necessary in negotiations with foreign governments whose ports would be visited by the nuclear-propelled vessel.

At the open hearing conducted by your committee representatives of the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and Atomic Energy Commission were in agreement that the indemnifying authority sought in the bill would be required to assure prompt construction of the vessel in accordance with the planned time schedule.

It was brought out too, that the Atomic Energy Commission presently has authority, under Public Law 256, 85th Congress, to indemnify contractors against claims arising in connection with incidents involving reactors in power installations within the United States. Suggestions were advanced that amendment of the atomic-energy statute, rather than of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, would be preferable, and make possible more prompt provision of the vessel indemnity authority.

Recommendation from a shipping industry group that S. 3106 be amended to cover any future nuclear-powered ships was not approved, the committee taking the view that interim legislation would be desirable until enough experience had been afforded in the field to justify legislating on a permanent basis.

In summation, your committee is convinced that, despite the remarkable advances that have been made in atomic research and technology, and with due appreciation of the excellent safety record achieved to date in the operation of land-based nuclear reactors in the public-utilities field, the indemnity authority sought with respect to the nuclear-prototype vessel must be provided, as promptly as possible.

How this can best be done, whether by separate legislation as proposed in S. 3106, or by extending the indemnifying authority now vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by virtue of Public Law 256, 85th Congress, involves some new insurance problems and procedures to which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has devoted much time and attention over the past two sessions of Congress. For this reason, the committee recommends that the bill, S. 3106, be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The statement submitted by the Secretary of Commerce in requesting introduction of the bill is printed herewith, together with a letter, dated February 14, 1958, giving the Department's answer to questions raised by the commitee concerning the bill. Also appended is the report from the Comptroller General of the United States, which makes no recommendation.

The Congress has enacted authority to build an atomic-powered merchant ship (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.; 70 Stat. 731). The law, by an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation (including training of personnel) of a nuclear-powered merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign

commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, may employ persons, firms, and corporations, on a contract or fee basis, for the performance of special services deemed necessary in carrying on activities and functions under the law.

The Secretary of Commerce has specific authority under Public Law 701, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 531), for the purpose of developing, trial, and testing, to operate vessels owned by the United States which have been constructed for experimental or testing purposes.

In making preliminary studies of the problems in connection with the building, testing, and operation of the first nuclear-powered ship, which will be a merchant-type oceangoing vessel, the Department has met with problems in the important and critical matter of third-party liability of designers, builders, and operators of the new vessel. Being a facility which will be used in worldwide oceangoing commerce, the matter of third-party liability takes on a special significance in a field of liability which apparently must remain indeterminate until experience and judicial determinations can provide guides for private insurance and indemnity organizations in this field.

The Department is concerned with prompt progress in the construction of the new nuclear-powered merchant ship. The Department has encountered difficulty in securing contracts in respect of the proposed vessel. These difficulties rise out of the practically immeasurable monetary liability in a particular case of possible nuclear disaster in connection with the ship, even though the possibility of such an occurrence with consequent legal liability may be only remote. It appears to be the generally accepted legal viewpoint that only experience and judicial determinations will fix the extent of the legal liability of designers, builders, owners, and operators of an atomic-powered vessel. The fact that the vessel will operate in oceangoing commerce and will necessarily operate in proximity to shoreside establishments and properties, both domestic and foreign, expands the geographical field of risk very broadly. Insurance and indemnity protection from private organizations may be available but only in limited amounts, deemed insufficient by prospective designers, contractors, and operators.

The Department in the legislative proposals recommends meeting these problems by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, in connection with the design, construction, maintenance, repair, use, and operation of the ship, to provide that the United States will indemnify any contractors or agents of the United States against liability on account of claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement of such claims) by third persons (including employees of the contractor) for death, bodily injury, sickness, or disease, or loss of or damage to property, arising as a result of such activities in connection with the ship. The indemnification would be effective to the extent that the liability arises out of the contract or agency and to the extent not compensated by insurance or otherwise. The bill would authorize the Secretary to require indemnified contractors or agents to procure private insurance against the covered hazards to the extent available at reasonable terms.

Payment under the liability provision would be made only with the approval of the Secretary, or his designee for that purpose, and would be made out of funds obligated for performance of the contract or agency agreement or out of any funds appropriated by Congress for making such payments.

Early and favorable consideration of this proposal is recommended in order that there may be no delay in the construction of this nuclear-powered merchant vessel.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed measure to the Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 14, 1958.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of February 6, 1958, asking that the Department of Commerce advise you on several points with respect to S. 3106, introduced at our request to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship nuclearship *Savannah*.

Upon the first point, the indemnifying authority introduced in the bill could possibly be satisfactorily achieved by an amendment to Public Law 85–256, known generally as the Price-Anderson law. However, the latter is legislation developed to assist the Atomic Energy Commission in promoting the industrial use of atomic energy and is primarily for land-based nuclear-powered stations. In application of Public Law 85–256, the Atomic Energy Commission has developed their administrative procedures in consideration of the public utilities praticipating in the atomic energy demonstration programs. Thus, we believe that the Atomic Energy Commission would be in far better position to indicate the problems that agency would have if the question of indemnification protection were under their administration.

As you know, Public Law 85–256 limits indemnification by the Atomic Energy Commission to nuclear incidents occurring within the United States, and consequently it would require modification to provide indemnification for incidents on the high seas or abroad. This may be a long-range necessity, but the time involved in the preliminary studies of how it can best be done appears to be in favor of S. 3106 which meets our most immediate needs of planning for the operation of the nuclearship *Savannah*.

In reply to your second point, it was not contemplated that the contractor or agent would be charged a fee for the indemnification. Our rationale in favor of free indemnification is that the contractors or agents would be Government contractors or subcontractors and to charge a fee would result in the cost being passed back to the Government as a charge against the project.

Regarding the third point, the source of funds to settle claims, the proposed S. 3106 provides that the Secretary of Commerce pay claims found just and reasonable out of funds provided for the design, construction, maintenance, or operation of the ship, or out of other funds appropriated by Congress for the making of such payments. In regard to the appropriation of funds for payment of claims, the proposed S. 3106 amounts to a moral obligation that Congress would appropriate sufficient funds to indemnify third parties for injury occasioned by design, construction, maintenance, or operation of the nuclear ship. With respect to the authorization of funds for indemnification in S. 3106, it is my understanding that Public Law 85–256 did not appropriate funds specifically for indemnification but did set a maximum of $500 million per nuclear incident which would be requested of Congress in the event such indemnification became necessary.

We trust that this brief reply will answer the questions you have asked.

Sincerely yours,

L. S. ROTHSCHILD,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 11, 1958.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of January 24, 1958, acknowledged on January 27, requesting the comments of the General Accounting Office concerning S. 3106, 85th Congress, 2d session, entitled "A bill to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect to the nuclear-powered merchant ship."

We have no special information or knowledge as to the need for or desirability of the proposed legislation and, therefore, we make no recommendation with respect to its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing laws made by the bill are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italic; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

"SEC. 716 (*a*) * * *

(*b*) *Subject to the provisions of this subsection, but without regard to any other provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the Secretary of Commerce may, under such terms and conditions as he deems necessary or appropriate, in or in conjunction with any contract with the United States for the design, construction, maintenance, repair, use, or operation of the nuclear-powered ship authorized by subsection (a) to be constructed, provide that the United States will indemnify and hold harmless the contractor or agent and any subcontractor thereof, to the extent arising out of the performance of such contract, agency or subcontract and not compensated by insurance or otherwise, against liability on account of claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement of such claim) by third persons, including employees of the contractor, for death, bodily injury, sickness or disease, or loss of or damage to property, arising out of or resulting from radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material, as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. In such provisions for indemnification, the Secretary of Commerce may require the contractor, agent, or subcontractor thereof, to provide and maintain insurance for liability arising from performance of the contract, agency, or subcontract to the extent such insurance is available from the private insurance market at reasonable terms and rates. Provisions for such indemnification under this section shall also contain such provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate, for notice to the United States of suits or actions filed or claims made against the contractor or agent with respect to any alleged liability for such death, bodily injury, sickness or disease, or loss or damage to third persons, and for control of or assistance in the defense of any such suit, action, or claims by the United States at the election of the United States. No payment shall be made on behalf of the United States under authority of this subsection unless the amount thereof shall first have been certified to be just and reasonable by the Secretary or by an official of the Department designated*

for such purpose by the Secretary. Any such payment may be made with the approval of the Secretary (or his designee for that purpose) out of any funds obligated for the performance of such contract or out of funds available for the design, construction, maintenance, repair, use, or operation of the ship and not otherwise obligated, or out of any funds appropriated by the Congress for the making of such payments. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Allen Cox, retired;

John S. Battle, of Virginia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

Robert G. Storey, of Texas, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

Paul Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma; and

Harold Sexton, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marion C. Matthes, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth circuit, vice Charles E. Whittaker; and

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

Don A. Tabbert, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice Jack Chapler Brown, resigned; and

Roy McKinney Amos, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3386. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in certain cases involving the right of persons to practice law before State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3387. A bill to authorize construction of a highway from Tuba City, Ariz., to the Four Corners area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 3388. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3389. A bill for the relief of Jesus A. Villamor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 3390. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3391. A bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS, RELATING TO PREVENTION OF MONOPOLISTIC ACTS OR PRACTICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1356) to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO CORRECTION OF UNINTENDED BENEFITS AND HARDSHIPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES submitted amendments, 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 were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CODE, RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN INTERFERENCE WITH FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on February 6, 1958, I introduced the bill (S. 3253) to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit certain interference with Federal construction projects, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] may be included among the cosponsors of the bill.

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

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1958,

The names of Senators NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, HENNINGS, CLARK, HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, and JACKSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3311) 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, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), on February 19, 1958.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS—REHABILITATION OF INDIANS OF STANDING ROCK SIOUX RESERVATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of the Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for the rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes. These Indians are being dispossessed by the gigantic reservoir being created at Oahe, and it is only right that we take the necessary steps for giving them prompt and honest compensation.

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

The bill (S. 3388) to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator MCCLELLAN at the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York City on February 20, 1958.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey at luncheon session of Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, Washington, D. C., February 26, 1958.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by Senator GORE at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1958.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "Oregon Lays Groundwork for Its Cetnennial," written by Senator NEUBERGER, and published in the New York Times of March 2, 1958.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON BILL TO EXTEND THE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE EXPORTS FOR 2 YEARS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on

Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on March 13, 1958, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, on S. 3093, a bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4–3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

MISSOULA AND MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the March issue of Harper's magazine contains an article glorifying and describing Missoula, Mont., and the State of Montana as places of near perfection in which to live. That is a position with which I heartily agree.

I was especially pleased that the author, Herbert Howarth, was so impressed during his stay in Missoula. It is an exceedingly wonderful community, located in the valley in the heart of the mountains of western Montana. Undoubtedly I am prejudiced, because I went to the university in Missoula, and for a time was a member of the faculty at Montana State University.

Herbert Howarth is an Englishman who recently completed a year as a visiting lecturer at the University of Montana. While most of Mr. Howarth's article, entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," is largely concerned with Missoula, I feel that what is "good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly" in Missoula can also be found in the entire State of Montana.

Mr. Howarth had an opportunity to become acquainted with one of Montana's greatest assets, its young people. He concurs in the excellence of Montana's State University system and its topnotch faculty, but he also points out that many of the Treasure State's talented young people and its brightest minds go to other parts of the Nation. Montana cannot afford to lose them.

This Harper's magazine article is very readable, and gives a tremendous insight into Montana. I urge all my colleagues in the Senate to read it. I know that each and every one would arrive at the same conclusion that Mr. Howarth does, if given an opportunity to live in Missoula, Mont.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," and editorials published in the Lewistown Daily News and the Ekalaka (Mont.) Eagle be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

MONTANA: THE FRONTIER WENT THATAWAY

(By Herbert Howarth)

We stopped one evening to buy cream at a farm where Missoula edges the mountains, beyond which Montana becomes Idaho. It was a small farm, started a generation and a half ago by homesteaders from middle Europe. The strong-featured grandmother who poured cream for us in the kitchen still talked with a Hungarian chime in her voice. The family was just sitting down to supper—to cottage cheese and chives, a bowl of steaming buttered corn, another of giant potatoes, a baked meat loaf in 2 inches of tomato sauce, coffee. The cutlery was sterling, heavy, and good. Revere saucepans shone on the range. A small farm, but its prosperity made us, with European scenes still fairly fresh in our memory, reflect, "Who in Europe today has a farm like this?"

We were, as that comparative way of putting it shows, still fairly recent arrivals. My wife was born in Switzerland, I in Britain, and we were in Montana for the academic year—I was lecturing at Montana State University's Missoula campus. This was not our first sight of the United States; we had enjoyed previous stays at other American universities; but it was our first spell in the Rocky Mountains.

As we came out I looked across the plantation of raspberry canes. The hills were pleasant in the sunset. A vacant lot beyond the farm was marked "Five acres for sale."

"Why are we just visitors?" I asked my wife. At that moment it seemed near perfection to have the genial productive life of Missoula, to settle into the rhythm of its hard, clean winters and fruitful summers.

If we could have acted on that thought, would we really have liked it? Arrivals stream steadily into Missoula, but it doesn't keep a hold on all of them. It is growing, but it has a quick turnover of transients. Newcomers separate into two distinct groups—those who find the promise of a satisfying life in it, and will stay; those who come hopefully, but now are restless and will move on.

For Missoula confronts you with this test: Can you be content with what is good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly, but short of the stimuli of larger cities? Or must you have, to buoy you, that typical modern urban life where a complex, saturated law and culture flow above a lower level of complex, saturated antilaw and vice? There are no double levels in Missoula. A minimum of urbanity, maybe, but with it a minimum of trouble. Missoula, like all Montana, has its contradictions, some of which I will try to pin down, but they are innocent, transparent.

MONEY AND PASSION

The first thing about Missoula is its affluence. It insists on the newest in living styles. It puts more up-to-date cars on the street, per capita, than I have seen in a prosperous Michigan town of the same size near the automobile plants. It is building impressive and expensive houses up all the creeks and canyons and equipping them lavishly. Even in the older houses the interiors have comfort and charm.

Beyond the perimeter and into the hills obvious up-to-dateness diminishes, but spending power is abundant. The day before Christmas Missoula filled with families from outlying ranches. Leathery men, girls in rough cowbody trousers with yellow hair trailing to the base of their spines, piled out of cars and practically stripped the stores. The packed toy basement of Montgomery Ward had, at dusk on Christmas Eve, been emptied of all but 3 or 4 bicycles.

What is extraordinary is that collecting this spending power does not produce tensions or pressure. No one in Montana is in a hurry. If there were barometers of public anxiety, installed like the temperature clocks over the city banks, they would register low all the way from Glacier Park to Glendive. Men take their jobs, including the heavy and dangerous jobs in forest or mine, at a leisurely pace. The natural resources teeming on the flanks of the Divide seem to turn to money easily enough to obviate competition. Where there's enough for everybody, there's no need for acrimonious rivalries. In fact, the norm of Montana is mutual helpfulness. This sense of security in abundance actually seems to make for more efficiency rather than less, and it has one definite result: a margin of free time for everybody.

The usual problem of leisure is what to do with it. The old puritans hated leisure because their experience was that very few people knew how to use it except badly. Missoula and its neighbors have, I think, only a modicum of the depleting kind of leisure routines. There is a modicum of drinking: cases of bourbon are wheeled in high pyramids out of the State liquor store into waiting cars. There is a modicum of gambling. But these international phenomena never go far in Missoula, never culminate in violence or public unpleasantness. The reason is that male energy is happily mated to a pleasure always available a mile or two from the dooryard. Western Montana is the country of sport: of the primitive, basic sports, hunting and fishing, and, after that, mountain climbing and skiing.

Missoula men invest their passions in these sports. A young student wrote to me: "In the month of September I feel the urge to go hunting. I just can't wait to get sighted in on a deer. I am hunting continually in my subconscious mind." On Sunday evenings in the fall the cars roll back townward with an elk or moose, clotted with blood, over roof or bonnet, and turn it in at their freezer locker. Occasionally a hunter doesn't come home, for they're a trigger-happy and not too prudent crowd, and have been known to pick each other off, or drill a station wagon, by mistake for a deer. In the skiing weeks—a lovely subzero season, when the morning sun comes up orange on the snow—there are new casualties daily swinging on crutches into office or classroom. But in nonchalant Montana nobody minds.

In fact, this sport on the hills and in the rivers is probably the source of the easy tempo and mental cleanness of Missoula. The folk who close their offices or clinics as early as they can on Friday afternoon disappear up the creeks, and come back brown and smiling to the job on Monday, renew their energy while they use it. They remake themselves with age-old sports that play mind and muscle at the pace of nature.

HUGGING TOGETHER

The women, though they do ski and shoot (and once or twice a year fell the bear that intrudes in the backyard), are not focused on sport to the same extent. To handle their leisure—and no European woman would credit how much leisure they have—they follow the regular American trend and invent a round of group activities. They have created enough clubs in Missoula to program the week 2 or 3 times over: religious, charitable, astrotheosophical, literary, factfinding, fact-dispensing clubs; Friday clubs that meet on Wednesday, As You Like It clubs.

Every male is tempted to caricature club work, in Missoula or anywhere else. But it has a value. It involves at least a minimal sense of social responsibility, produces heightened social consciousness; and some of the clubs require a program of reading, especially the network of book clubs that members of the university have set up (giving their own time) through the country districts over a hundred miles' radius. It is obvious that in isolated areas the book clubs may be the only—and certainly can be a significant—point of exchange of ideas. Still, within the area of Missoula itself there are too many clubs. What people are likely nowadays to need more in a town of 22,000 is a pause in the gregarious life. One or 2 nights a week might, as an experiment, be

publicly declared private nights. Instead, the ladies contrive pretexts to get together 3 times every 24 hours.

This hugging together in the mountain communities is surely a folkway formed in pioneer days and out of pioneer conditions, where neighborliness was a necessity against loneliness, accident, and illness. The frontier customs are still alive in Missoula. New arrivals are hailed with a party and presents, and local businesses send round their version of the Welcome Wagon with vouchers and invitations. When there is sickness, every neighbor comes with help and food from her kitchen. When you are in difficulties on the road, every passer-by stops and helps.

Is it also a pioneer tradition that makes Rocky Mountain men prefer plain wives? I noticed that of 20 girls in a group I met, 2 had engagement rings—they were the pleasantly plain girls of the group. Most wives in the city look similar. Sometimes, thinking over this sociological phenomenon, I imagined that it conformed with the male experience in frontier conditions: the old experience that beauty causes trouble and that a fellow can be almost damned in a fair wife. Montana has left many of its pretty girls single, although there is reportedly a girl shortage in the State. The desirable girl is the straightforward girl, who will be master of the house, hold the bankbook, drive firmly to the chairmanship of a telephone committee (and so bolster her husband's standing), produce a litter of young, and insist annually on throwing out the old appliances and buying new models.

Incidentally, although they have the latest appliances and superb kitchens, and demonstrate recipes to each other in their clubs, only a few wives can cook (and even these seldom do). Rich Montana—which spends generously on appliances, fishing tackle, and guns—is frugal on food. The monthly food budget is modest and is the first to be cut in any domestic economizing, and there is a tendency to save by taking margarine instead of butter or extending fresh milk with powdered milk. To a Britisher this is an unexpected feature; my wife contrasted the way in which food is the first priority on a British family budget while the economies are on appliances and equipment. This is partly because Britain undervalues a wife's time and labor, my wife commented; but she also asked whether the steady eating that goes on in otherwise austere Britain is, by a paradox, actually a symptom of the austerity and the paucity of goods. The fact that a place of abundance like Montana rates eating low on the list of activities suggests that eating, in any quantities beyond a very low minimum, is only a psychological necessity, and that the people who are prosperous, both actually and psychologically, can grow and thrive without much eating. Certainly Montanans grow and thrive.

IS IT PROPER OR LEGAL?

It seems curious that Missoula has not attracted more women doctors. As far as I could check in conversation and from the telephone book, no woman physician was practicing there last year. A woman gynecologist could make a fortune, for the town is observant of the proprieties, reticent in personal relations.

Propriety, too, may be a carryover from frontier traditions, when anyone with sense would avoid provocativeness. I should say, however, that to a transatlantic visitor America as a whole seems formal, ceremonious, discreet, attentive to the proprieties. Lurid stories are sometimes told us regarding the big cities of the East or the Pacific, but in brief passage through these it has not been my luck to confirm them. J. D. Salinger's Catcher saw marvels through uncurtained hotel windows in New York, but I did not.

But while Missoula completely respects an unwritten code of behavior between persons, it is superbly nonchalant in its relations with the officially written and impersonal law. The town treats its police with an indifference so unconscious and genuine that there isn't even humor in it. Half the drivers have no licenses. No one thinks of going in to pay a parking fine, or of answering a summons to court. Cars are to be registered by January 31, but no one hastens, and the law acquiesces by gently moving its deadline onward month by month.

This is a typical Main Street incident: A rancher is sitting at the wheel of his car, double-parked, staring at a store. A highway patrolman passes in the opposite direction, stops level with him, hoots to call his notice. He stares at the store, doesn't move his head. Another hoot. When I next look round, the patrolman has moved on and the rancher is still double-parked.

The attitude runs all through Montana and is significant—but not alarmingly significant. It means a simple dislike of regimentation. It is possible just because there is little lawlessness of the criminal degree: it is securely anchored in every man's certainty that he can rely on himself and his neighbors for sound behavior and honesty. A newcomer from the East will characterize Missoula as an extraordinarily honest town, and the absolute honesty and reliability contribute to the overall absence of tension. You can feel confident in every transaction.

Little crime in Montana, and little vice. A girl whose father owns a nightclub in another Montana city has assured me that the nocturnal offerings of the State are clean. She never saw vice in any tangled sense of the word till she saw California. I don't know whether she is right about California, but I find it easy to think her report on Montana is accurate.

Her remark about California arises, I fancy, from a widely prevalent Montanan conception of that State, which is just near enough to be the natural objective for the ambitious, just far enough to be the screen for strange and colorful projections. California is the Montanan's heaven and hell. It is a heaven in its opportunities: once there, they tell each other, you never leave. It is hell in its supported complications: you must keep an impassive face as you walk those west coast streets, or your glance will be taken as an invitation. Having met in Oakland and Los Angeles the same quiet corrections as elsewhere, I suppose that my friends who say this are only doing what is currently popular: localizing the mythical perversions of our time elsewhere.

A LEAP IN THE DARK

Quite independently of these fantasies, Montana feels a strong pull from the coast. Those transients who do not think they can adapt to Missoula's life will move on into Washington State, then perhaps work southward. For transients, that is all very well. It is not so obviously well if young men and women growing up in Montana homes come under the same magnetism, or, for that matter, if the somewhat fainter pull of the East draws them. There may be—and I believe that there already is—an outflow of the brightest minds, which the State cannot afford to lose.

The excellence of Montana's State University system actually sharpens this problem, though it also promises the best hope of a solution. The university has units in a number of centers. I saw only the Missoula unit, but if the others are as good, they are very good. A tiptop faculty teaches there. Many of the men have come from other States, deliberately choosing the mountains because, they say, the students bring unspoiled minds to their work, free from the sophisticated resistances that are sometimes a product of urban growing up.

It is remarkable to watch the interaction of faculty and students. When they arrive as freshmen, the boys and girls sometimes bring barely the first rudiments of academic habits of mind. They may have come from small, lonely, rural schools. Or, if they have had the fortune to grow up in a town (say, in Missoula itself with its splendid new million-dollar county school), they may have, offsetting their better academic preparation, a fear of privacy like their elders'—in the dorms they shy away from the few single rooms and choose shared rooms, where they prevent each other from studying.

On the other hand, almost all young Montanans have an important asset: they have a knowledge of life that comes from spending vacations in responsible and tricky jobs: logging, trucking, tractor-handling. Unlike the young in other places, where maturing still has to follow learning, they have begun to mature before they have begun to learn in the academic sense. They are all the readier to take in that kind of learning. They are gawky in their freshman year, but in the next two the interaction with the faculty begins to show, and in the fourth year they talk and write as men and women of high caliber.

Then comes the dilemma. The good student, in proportion to the extent he has been stimulated, wants urban pleasures that he has encountered in print in the process of learning. His town cannot supply enough of them, and his appetite is urgent. The pull from out of State becomes irresistible.

It is true that this exodus may be good for the rest of the Nation. But Montana needs its best products. Startling technical developments are imminent. New resources are being tapped, new industries settled. Over the next 10 years the face of the towns, even the skyline itself, may be transformed. These coming changes are necessary, and it would be as mad to resist them as it has always been mad and impossible to halt technical progress; and no one wants to. Almost no one is even thinking about the matter. Only a few thoughtful men are pointing out that the changes should be regulated, so that they shall not extinguish the graces and inner strength of present Montana: the ease, the sense of ample time and space, and the concomitant friendly honesty.

Montana is going to make its leap forward in any case, but at this moment it is shaping for a leap in the dark.

Just because Missoulans think individually, not in civic terms, they cannot easily plan for a problem like this. They feel that Missoula grew naturally across the lane that led from the mountains through the canyons to the eastern plains, the lane the Indians always used and the railway surveyors inevitably adopted, and that this process could not be bettered. Ever since the 1880's Missoula has been an active subcenter of the regional railway network; it has absorbed flour-milling and sugar-refining plants. So today when it is being offered its share in the new industries springing up all over the State, it is tempting for Missoulans to say: "Let them come. We have space for them all." But if they look about them, they may see even now, as a byproduct of the last 10 years' growth, warning signs that expansion can throw a spray of physical ugliness, like the straggling tin-can jungle along the main approaches.

As I said earlier, new arrivals face the problem of whether to stay in Missoula or push on to the coast. At present both alternatives are pleasant. The man lucky enough to have an equable Horatian temperament stays in Montana and enjoys his Sabine life at its kindest; the other man pushes to the Pacific and has his motley and culture. But in 10 years Missoula itself may be a motley, a scar on the hills.

What insurance can be taken up against this prospect? That depends on the extension and intensification of the university's

work. Its teachers can communicate to students and parents their sense of the urgency of local needs. They can also work out and communicate a philosophy of public planning which will not damage the easy spirit that is part of the character of present Montana. What is needed among the students is a seeping awareness that, though it is good to go out of State for a taste of the world, it is even better to come back and play an influential role at home. The university already contains some striking instances of this process in action; its president, Carl McFarland, a brilliant man, formerly active in national affairs, came home to give his energies and considerable vision to strengthening the university that produced him; the faculty includes talented local men who went to Yale or Berkeley and came back to live and to help.

POSTSCRIPT

I add a line to these notes on the way east from Montana. The more miles fall behind, the more I realize the beauty of Missoula. To the newcomer the beauty is not promptly evident: the mountains may seem less erect and impressive, the life a fraction less robust, than he had supposed. But it will steal into him imperceptibly every day, lent by the changing lights on the hills, the resinous air, the pulsing rivers.

Anyone in his senses would rather live there than anywhere else in the world. Anyone who has been there would want to keep the beauty in Montana. It seems to me, at this moment of writing, that there is a broad national reason why America has a stake in keeping that beauty alive. As the westerns on TV make clear, America loves her frontier tradition. The frontier has become an image of purity—of a moment when the mind was adventurous, courage high, and when the continent opened up at the thrust of these virtues. There is sentiment around the image, but it has a real center. Clear of sentiment, true and natural, a nuclear something of the frontier spirit is retained in Montana.

[From the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of February 25, 1958]

A BRITISH VISITOR TELLS WORLD ABOUT MONTANA

A British scholar, one Herbert Howarth, writing in the March issue of Harper's magazine, has high praise for Montana in general and for Missoula (where he visited) in particular.

"Anyone in his senses would rather live there than anywhere else in the world," he says.

In his article entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," Mr. Howarth pays lavish tribute to our State's higher than national prosperity; our spectacular natural setting with all of its sports possibilities and most of all to our friendly people.

Examples:

"This hugging together in the mountain communities is surely a folkway formed in pioneer days and out of pioneer conditions, where neighborliness was a necessity against loneliness, accident, and illness. The frontier customs are still alive in Missoula. * * * When there is sickness, every neighbor comes with help and food from her kitchen. When you are in difficulties on the road, every passer-by stops and helps.

"But while Missoula completely respects an unwritten code of behavior between persons, it is superbly nonchalant in its relations with the officially written and impersonal law. The town treats its police with an indifference so unconscious and genuine that there isn't even humor in it. No one thinks of going in to pay a parking fine * * *. Cars are to be registered by January 31, but no one hastens and the law acquiesces by gently moving its deadline onward month by month.

"(There is) little crime in Montana and little vice."

And our intuitive British visitor looks into the future:

"Startling technical developments are imminent. New resources are being tapped, new industries settled. Over the next 10 years the face of the towns, even the skyline itself, may be transformed.

"Montana is going to make its leap forward * * * but at this moment it is shaping for a leap in the dark. * * * Only a few thoughtful men are pointing out that the changes should be regulated so that they shall not extinguish the graces and inner strength of present Montana."

Mr. Howarth concludes:

"Clear of sentiment, true and natural, a nuclear something of the frontier spirit is retained in Montana."

Here, it seems to us, is something which all Montanans, as rugged and individualistic as we all are, can agree on.

[From the Ekalaka (Mont.) Eagle of February 28, 1958]

ANYONE IN HIS SENSES WOULD RATHER LIVE THERE

That is what Herbert Howarth, a Briton, who spent a year as a visiting lecturer at the University of Montana at Missoula, had to say about living in Missoula. Howarth hadn't gotten to some of the better parts of Montana, but then Missoula is a fair sample and some of the things he had to say about life in Montana are pertinent right here.

Howarth discussed his impressions yesterday in an article in Harper's magazine entitled: "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway" and illustrated by Willard Goodman.

Howarth obviously, like so many "furriners," enjoyed his stay in Montana, but seems to have been more gifted than some in his facility for expression. However, while his remarks pertained to Missoula, we know of a dozen Montana communities whose names could be substituted and the sense remain practically identical. Not too farfetched is the assumption that the remarks are universally applicable to the Treasure State.

"Missoula and the State of Montana are near perfection because of their honest people, natural beauty, pioneer tradition, and abundance. It presents the resident with what is good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly in contrast to life in large cities where a complex saturated law and culture flow above a lower level of complex, saturated antilaw and vice."

Howarth remarks on the Montanan's preoccupation with outdoor sports, hunting, shooting, skiing, but try on this observation for size right here:

"The women, though they do ski and shoot (and once or twice a year fell bear that intrudes in the backyard), are not focused on sport to the same extent. To handle their leisure—and no European woman would credit how much leisure they have—they follow the regular American trend and invent a round of group activities. They have created enough clubs in Missoula to program the week 2 or 3 times over: religious, charitable, astrotheosophical, literary fact-finding, fact-dispensing clubs; Friday clubs that meet on Wednesday. As You Like It clubs. What people are likely nowadays to need more in town * * * is a pause in the gregarious life. One or two nights a week might, as an experiment be publicly declared, Private Nights. Instead, the ladies contrive pretexts to get together 3 times every 24 hours.

"Incidentally, although they have the latest appliances and superb kitchens, and demonstrate recipes to each other in their clubs, only a few wives can cook (and even these seldom do). Rich Montana—which spends generously on appliances, fishing tackle, and guns—is frugal on food. The fact that a place of abundance like Montana rates eating low suggests that eating in any quantities beyond a very low minimum is only a psychological necessity, and that where the people are prospering * * * can grow and thrive without much eating. Certainly, Montanans grow and thrive."

MARINE CORPS DRILL INSTRUCTORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there appeared in the March 1958 issue of the Leatherneck an article entitled "I'm a DI." A DI is a drill instructor in the Marine Corps. The article tells of the experience of one DI in training approximately 75 civilians; he was told to give back to the Marine Corps, within a certain period of time, 75 marines. I believe the article is an outstanding one. It indicates the fine points of the DI system.

Mr. President, as one who had, not the pleasure, but the privilege, of serving under a DI in getting my boot training on the west coast, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

I'M A DI

(By S. Sgt. Arthur J. McGowan)

I had been handed 75 civilians and told "give me back 75 marines." Just like that, with 12 weeks in which to make the transformation.

Ninety days, not 1 minute more, for me to change the whole character of 75 human beings. And I love my job, I'm a drill instructor—a DI.

To assist me I have three junior drill instructors. We are the 4 cooks who will take 75 ingredients and produce 1 perfect stew. The Marine Corps is not interested in half-baked or overdone products. Only the finest is acceptable.

The "cooking oven" is located at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.—in the tidal swamps about 70 miles south of Charleston, S. C., and some 30 miles north of Savannah, Ga.

Offering further assistance are some of the greatest officers and noncommissioned officers that the corps has. Only the very finest are ever considered for drill instructor's school. And if any of us thought we were sharp or on the ball, all such ideas vanished after just 1 week at drill instructor's school. Talk about sharp. Why, those instructors must have changed uniforms after every time they sat down.

I don't know every drill instructor at Parris Island, but I know enough of them from each of the different recruit battalions to know that our commanding general's goal—to make sure that only the very capable are given the task of changing civilians into marines—has not been set in vain.

One of the first things I remember about drill instructor's school was waiting outside the psychiatrist's office (we call them head shrinkers) to find out if I was mentally and emotionally stable enough to be a drill instructor. I found out much later how all important this interview was.

Do you know what pressure is? Mental pressure, I mean. The kind that makes you want to give up a career of 13 years, when you realize that leadership under pressure is the most important part of being a drill instructor. Leadership, plus commonsense, will give me the answers to more than 75 daily little problems, human problems, for the next 3 months. That's the kind of pressure all drill instructors are under. Yes, I

said all. Every man working on the drill field is under the same pressure every day he is working with recruits. Sometimes the pressure gets too great, and something gives.

It is nothing premeditated, but just like the lid blowing off the teapot. You get the same feeling you had when your son broke one of the good dishes. Your first impulse might be to grab the young one, and even a slight paddling might be in order, but that won't put the pieces back together.

No matter what your recruits do or what they have broken, you cannot lay a hand on them. We know it and so do the recruits. The men I feel honored to work with know in their hearts that they are capable of answering any problem connected with recruits, without using a form of maltreatment, any form.

After convincing the head shrinker that I had the minimum required amount and type of gray matter, I was allowed to start my 5 weeks at drill instructor's school, the "chit pit," where you get a demerit, or "chit" for major crimes like having a piece of thread hanging from inside your collar, or a discoloration under one fingernail, or getting caught reaching in your pocket. Nothing is carried in pockets anymore, that's what the tops of our socks are for.

The instructors who preside over the students demand perfection—absolute perfection. Until the day I picked up my first platoon I could never understand this incessant demand.

I remember the day my platoon had its 15th-training-day rifle and personnel inspection. This inspection is to allow our company commander to review the instruction that has been given and to find out how well the new boots are progressing in their training. You see, nothing is taken for granted. Even though a drill instructor is known as an outstanding professor of basic military subjects, he and his platoon will be examined periodically to make sure everything is up to the Corps' standards. No matter how hard you try, you never pass one of these inspections without a mistake.

That day it was request mast. Each recruit at Parris Island has the privilege of requesting to see the "skipper" (company commander or the "Old Man"—the battalion commander) whenever he feels he has a problem that warrants that much attention. The procedure is called requesting mast. This is to make sure that anytime a recruit feels he is mistreated, he can go over the drill instructor's head, right to the top—the commanding general if need be.

The rights of request mast are explained to each new recruit within 72 hours after he joins his platoon. But in the schedule that runs from 5 a. m. until 9:30 p. m. the request mast lecture was overlooked. No excuse, just overlooked.

Well, I've said previously that these battalion officers were sharp; it took the captain just 4 minutes to find out the platoon hadn't been told their rights of request mast. I received a phone call the next morning inviting me to drop in and see our battalion S–3 (training) officer. And I would rather lose my wallet than have to stand in front of our S–3 for another one of his lectures.

Needless to say each man was fully indoctrinated with request mast procedures before the inspection party had left the drill field. Thank God I've got a tough hide.

My schedule for the first 8 days began at 5 a. m. and ended anywhere from 9 to 11 p. m. that same night. Physicals, clothing issue, dental appointments, issuing rifles, how to make a military bunk and endless hours of drill are crowded into the first 8 days, or forming stage as it is called. You get so tired you don't dare sit down.

I do not smile during the daylight hours for the whole 3 months, for to smile would show sentiment or kindliness, and while working with a platoon you must appear to be devoid of all such feelings. Maybe this incident will show you why.

The first night with the platoon I ordered all the troops to write post cards home to their mothers, fathers, wives, girl friends, guardians or anyone they thought should know their address.

I received a card from every man except one private. He jumped to his feet as I yelled his name. "How about it, boy. Where's the card I said I wanted from everyone?"

"I'm sorry sir, I have no one to write to."

"What do you mean you have no one, how about your mother or father?"

"Both dead, sir."

"And I suppose you don't have a sister or brother, an aunt, uncle, grandparent, or even a girl friend who might like to know how you are making out?"

"No, sir; I have no relatives and I don't know any girls, sir."

"Where did you come from before you joined the Marine Corps then, wise guy?"

"I spent my whole life in an orphanage, sir."

For just a second, I could not find words. Here was a kid with as much guts as I'd ever want to see.

Yea, I would have liked to pat him on the back and tell him he had 74 friends or buddies now. But one pat on the back or a kind word can be taken a lot of different ways by 75 different men. It would have made my treatment of him a little bit different from the others, and that's wrong. Each man has to get the same impartial objective treatment.

At the moment, I personally hoped this kid would make it, and he'd get no special treatment—he'd have to make it on his own.

There are many times when you have to order your best buddy or even your own brother to do some pretty messy jobs. You don't like them, but they have to be done. And unless I treat everyone exactly the same I don't think I'm doing the Marine Corps or myself justice. And maybe the other men wouldn't think they were getting justice either.

I have no Negroes, no Wops, no Jews, no Micks nor individuals in my platoon. Just 75 recruits practicing to be a team. And I want to be sure that if this team ever gets into the "big game" they have all the equipment, especially the mental stuff, they need to keep us undefeated. This next one may be our last game, and the enemy isn't interested in what we accomplished in the past, only what we can do now and in the future.

I want to be certain that O'Reilly isn't worried about Ginsburg on his left or DeAngelo on his right or Robinson behind him. To him they are Marines, so he hasn't got a worry in the world.

I am convinced that if they face that supreme moment of "kill or be killed" my recruits will have the will to win, the courage to fight on, even with only rocks, and the humility to remember that God is the maker and taker of all things.

All this in 90 days. And that's more time for "boot training" than Medal of Honor winners S. Sgt. John Basilone (6 weeks) or John Daly (1 month), Lou Diamond, or Major Kukela were given.

Have you ever seen a 17-year-old Yankee from New York trying to sell the merits of pizza pie to an 18-year-old Rebel from Atlanta, Ga., who in turn was trying to sell the dish of cornpone, ham hocks, and a little blackeyes in return? It is a wonderful country that breeds such young men. Our land will always be safe as long as such men continue to believe that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are more important than self-gratification.

There is in all men I believe, a spark, that if cultivated, produces a flame of the spirit recognized the world over.

Pride. That is one of the important qualities we hope to find in our recruits. Honest, heartfelt pride in his hometown, his high school; yes, even the way they make pizza pie in his particular city; this pride that can be used to make the sharpest uniform, cleanest rifle, and the best damn platoon on Parris Island. It's no cinch, but the challenge is exhilirating. Most of the time we make it. Sometimes it takes a couple of months in the Fleet Marine Force to bring it out; but we never stop trying to find the spark which ignites that burning desire to be a man.

Why do we demand so much from people who just yesterday were young average citizens of Uncle Sugar Able? Well, the veterans of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, and Iwo were mostly the same average, normal 18-year-olds of the early 1940's. They got their advanced training the hard way. Or is there any easy way? At Parris Island we are not trying to duplicate the wartime conditions of a steaming jungle or a frozen ravine, but if somewhere in the Valhalla of great heroes, past or future, a voice cries out "If only I had been better trained," I'll know in my heart it is not the voice of one of my boys.

Today I reprimanded a recruit for a full minute. The cause? He brushed a fly from his chin. That doesn't sound like a crime, but to a Marine, the position of attention does not allow for the slightest movement. When the command "Attention" is given I demand a platoon of statues. Drill instructors will settle for nothing else. We believe this to be a very small example of discipline.

My company commander and I just finished a little talk; I did the listening. It seems that three recruits in the platoon were not up to par in the care of their weapons. My junior drill instructors and I thought we were really "squared away" on our M–1's. But the captain has inspected more rifles than there are sand fleas, and little areas that we had completely overlooked were caught by the skipper's critical eye. The drill instructors are very lucky to have such a company commander. Unless each man in the platoon is completely up to standard, in all phases of training, we will surely be given the word. And because there are so many people who are sincerely interested in helping a drill instructor to do a good job, the job is becoming easier and easier. I know my weapons will never again be below par.

Every single day of "boot camp" has been carefully planned, right to the minute. Every move have been tested again and again to rule out the chance for error. We make mistakes—we're human beings—but seldom, if ever, is the same mistake duplicated.

The pay we get as drill instructors is the same we got as mechanics, office personnel, armorers, or just plain old foot soldiers. Our conduct and proficiency markings and our fitness reports, upon which promotions are decided, do not get any better simply because we are drill instructors; as a matter of fact, my last fitness report was a little below my average markings. So you might wonder why we volunteer for this duty. Personally, I think I know the kind of man the Marine Corps needs when it gets a Marine from recruit training at Parris Island. And that is why I volunteered. They do not expect us to send forth someone who is so inspired but untrained that he would want to fight the enemy single-handed, for then we would have failed to prove to him the value of living to fight again, or the superiority of team fighting over every man for himself.

Nor do we train men to fight only when every one else around them is participating, for then we would be discouraging individual initiative. Instead, our goal is to send forth Marines who believe in their hearts that they have been completely trained to handle any situation, in peacetime or in war.

We have just finished practicing for our platoon graduation. I stand back and wonder as each recruit marches past: Have I given him everything he needs? Are they

the finest product the Marine Corps can produce? Is there any part of their training, however small, that is not outstanding? Seventy-five times a day, from now until I put them on the bus, I will ask myself these questions. Yes, I believe I've done my job thoroughly. There are no professional drill instructors in the Marine Corps. If another war or "police action" breaks out I will stake my reputation and my own life on the combat performance of these same Marines I am turning out now.

And this is why I love my job. To see 75 long-haired, slouch-shouldered civilians step down from a train, and 12 weeks later have a platoon of spit-shined, hard-muscled young Marines leave the Island for active duty, will always keep me working at this job.

And one day I hope, my own boy will be in an honor platoon.

HOW TO GET OUT OF THE RECESSION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there is now a great deal of discussion as to how we may get out of the present recession. We talk of tax cuts and increased expenditures for public works as steps in the direction of economic recovery.

In reality, in order to get out of the recession we should put more reliance in ourselves and less in government. This subject is so well discussed in an editorial in U. S. News & World Report for February 28 by its editor, David Lawrence, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

HOW TO GET OUT OF THE RECESSION

(By David Lawrence)

The main reasons why there is an economic recession in America today are clear enough, but we are reluctant to take the steps to cure what's wrong.

We place reliance, unfortunately, on the erroneous concept that, if the economic situation gets very bad, the Government somehow, by one magic device or another, can prime the pump or by reducing taxes, can create purchasing power, and then supposedly recovery will promptly ensue.

The people themselves, however, must bear much of the blame for the present recession. For it is largely the indifference of the electorate to the growth of group power, group monopoly, and organized greed which is responsible for our present plight.

Self-restraint is the most difficult form of discipline to administer in a free economy. But the need for it was never greater than it is today.

Thus we now are faced with the effects of an inflation spree. Labor unions have utilized their stranglehold on business in recent years to extort higher and higher wages under penalty of strikes that would be so costly as to make it impractical for employers to resist the unions' demands. The only alternative for the companies was to raise prices.

Gradually the purchasing power of the dollar has been depreciated. The laborer gets higher wages numerically, but his dollar buys half of what it did before. As for the vast number of persons with fixed incomes—those living on pensions or retirement pay—they are suffering hardships. They have been cheated. They worked many years to save money to care for themselves and their families in later life, only to find now that someone has robbed them of their earnings.

Time was when labor unions recognized that every dollar given in wages must represent a given schedule of work performed. This has been called the productivity of labor. Hours may be shortened and wages may be increased but sound economics requires that there be a corresponding increase in the productivity of labor. This can come from the use of improved machinery or from more efficient methods. Technological progress is essential if wages are to be raised. More pay for less work spells bankruptcy.

But today the theory is advanced that union labor has a right to a share in the profits of industry even before adequate sums are set aside to modernize plant and equipment or to accumulate the surpluses needed to finance deficits when depression comes.

Naturally the volume of business grows as the Nation expands, and profits are larger numerically. But the rate of return on the investment has not grown perceptibly in many industries. Due to the monopoly exercised by national unions, the bigger businesses, with their large surpluses available to buy better machinery, can produce at a lower cost and can actually afford to pay the higher wages which many of their competitors cannot pay. Labor-union strategy nevertheless forces the marginal competitors to pay the same high wage scale or go out of business altogether. This kind of squeeze is largely responsible for the recent wave of mergers. It's the principal reason why big business gets bigger and small business suffers.

Prices as well as wages must be stabilized if we are to get out of the recession. They cannot be stabilized unless labor unions are willing to sign 2- or 3-year contracts without wage increases so that their workers may be given a chance to increase productivity.

Government cannot help us out of the recession by artificial measures, such as the reduction of taxes in the low-income groups. Two or three more dollars a week in the pay envelope for everyone does not create the general prosperity that makes possible purchases of more automobiles. Nor can this bring the resumption of employment in the hard-hit industries which manufacture durable goods.

Government does have a very important part to play. It can fearlessly reveal the truth about our economy—the factors that have brought on the recession. The people must not be frightened by the political claptrap of those who want to exploit adversity. The people must let all organized groups, such as business and labor, know that this is a time for partnership and for intelligent cooperation. It is not a time for strikes or threats of strikes. It is not a time for raising prices. It is not a time for huge deficits in the Treasury.

The way out of the current recession is to persuade the organized groups in our economic system to give us an assurance of stability in wages and prices. Only an enlightened public opinion can achieve that result.

We can come out of the recession before another year has passed, but we cannot do so if everybody demands all he can get. We must proclaim again and again the maxim of that eminent exponent of Christian philosophy, the Reverend Samuel M. Shoemaker: "There is enough in the world for everybody's need, but not enough for everybody's greed."

THE SECONDARY ROAD SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] before the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., on January 24, 1958.

Senator CASE discussed the secondary road system, and his statement is a most lucid explanation. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

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

SECONDARY ROADS

(Address by Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota)

Thank you, Mr. Seitz. The chairman has indicated that I was to speak on the secondary system. In talking with Bob Koch here, I've gotten the impression that possibly in the minds of the average person, the secondary system is commencing to mean the roads other than the so-called interstate system.

The first road work I ever did was on a secondary road—a very secondary road. It was when we were living on a homestead out in western South Dakota. We used to have a poll tax and you could work out your poll tax by working on the roads, and I remember that the township supervisor talked with dad about it and they decided that we could work out the poll tax for the family for a couple of years if we would take a team and a scraper, go down to Spring Creek, and fill in the holes by the bridge and put the new planks in the bridge where they'd worn out.

A, B, C ROADS

Now that kind of a road, the road that we worked on, wouldn't even rate recognition in a so-called secondary system today. But, in order that what I say about the secondary system may be clear, I'm going to explain that we do have the so-called A, B, C roads and they are only called A, B, C roads because there are three paragraphs which relate to them, and those in paragraph A relate to what is called the primary system roads; those in B, the secondary system or farm-to-market roads; those in C, the urban roads. For a great many years we had only those systems for Federal aid for matching by States or local communities.

We did have in addition to that, the roads built on Indian reservations, the roads built in the national parks and in forests, and to a certain extent, they might be called a part of your secondary systems. That is, the roads in the national park or in the national forest, or on or approaching an Indian reservation, contribute to the secondary system, so-called. But the primary system was the principal system. That is the one which received the most money. Forty-five percent of the amount of money that the Federal Government has been appropriating historically for Federal aid to highways went to the so-called primary system; 30 percent historically has gone to the so-called secondary system, the farm-to-market road; and then 25 percent went for a cooperative aid program on the so-called urban system which was concerned with the city.

THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

In 1944 Congress authorized a new system called the Interstate System, now it is called the Interstate Defense System. That was quite dormant for a while. In 1947 designations were made and in 1956 the Interstate System spurted so much so that in most talks about the highway program today, people are talking about the interstate system.

The primary system of highways in the country today is approximately 225 to 230 thousand miles of road. The cream of that so-called primary system is the Interstate System. I say, "cream," just to mean that it's part of what was originally designated by the States as a part of their primary system but picked up and put into the Interstate System category. It's the superhigh-

way, the turnpike type of highway which will connect the principal cities in the country, the State capitals, centers of industry, and serve defense needs.

The secondary system of roads, meaning the roads which are in the secondary systems of the States, amounts to something over 500,000 miles of roads. You could say roughly half a million miles of roads. The primary and secondary systems together count for over 700,000 miles of road and I think that for the popular term of secondary system as opposed to the primary system you can think in terms of a little over 700,000 miles of road.

Now, historically, the Federal Government has said to the States that they should spend on their highway systems as much money as they collect in taxes from the highway users; and if they didn't do that, they would be penalized in their apportionment or allocation of Federal funds. The Federal Government itself, however, not until 1954, or the 1954 act, not until then has it pretended to make available for highway purposes as much money as it was collecting from the gasoline tax and the tax on motor oils.

In 1954 we said that the time had come for Uncle Sam to apply the same principle to himself, and that was to provide for Federal aid as much money as he was collecting taxes from highway users directly through the gasoline tax or the tax on motor oils.

INCREASED ROAD AID

We have been running at a level of from $450 million to $500 million worth of Federal aid for highways prior to 1954. In the 1954 act we increased from that $500-million level to $700 million. In the Senate we had made it somewhat more than that, but in the conference with the House we settled on the figure of $700 million, and that was divided in its apportionment—45 percent to the primary system, 30 percent to the secondary, and 25 percent to the urban. We had been authorizing about $25 million for the Interstate System. That stepped up in 1954 with a great deal of interest being taken on the Interstate System—that stepped up to $175 million.

After the President signed the 1954 act, he said, "That gets us started," and followed with his recommendation to the Conference of Governors that we launch a program to build the Interstate System in a period of 10 years, possibly. In the 1954 act we had carried a section known as section 13, which called upon the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the States, to make a study and determine how much money it would take to get our highways and roads up to date.

The former Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald, told us that we weren't even making as much progress as we thought we were, because the dollar wouldn't buy as much in construction as it had before World War II. I think in 1952 that the Commissioner told us we were dealing with about a 53-cent dollar in terms of 1939 construction. I see "Red" over here nodding. That was about it, was it? In terms of 1939 values, our dollar in 1952 for road construction was worth about 53 cents that year. I believe it went down eventually to about 47 cents; so that even if we were appropriating the same amount of dollars, we couldn't get as much road built, despite the increased efficiency of dirt-moving machines and things that go along with it.

So we directed in this section 13 that the Bureau come up with a report on what it would take to put our highways in first-class shape to meet the traffic needs. If we took the figures that were submitted by the Clay Committee (the Clay Committee was appointed by the President, with General Clay as Chairman), it was estimated that with $27 billion we could bring the Interstate Highway System up to a standard required for the traffic 30 years from that time (required for 20 years, but good for 30 years) and build it in 10 years.

ACCELERATING SECONDARY

The same figures and the same report, as I recall them, would have required 25 years to get the secondary systems up to the same standard, if we appropriated for them at the rate that we appropriated in the 1956 act. Now, it may be that the public doesn't quite expect the secondary system to be finished as quickly as the Interstate System, but those of us who are concerned with secondary roads felt that 25 years was a pretty long time to get our roads up to date—to catch up.

I see that there are several ladies in the audience here today which reminds me that after all I think that one of the most important roadbuilder assets we have in the United States are the ladies.

One of the sharpest lessons I ever got about roadbuilding was when I was traveling out in western South Dakota one time, and I was a little bit off the road I think, or off the most direct route I might have taken, and I wanted to inquire about the road ahead. It wasn't too good a road, it was pretty rough. It was in spring and there were a few boggy places, so I stopped with the introduction that I needed a drink of water. I didn't say to the lady of the house that I thought the roads were bad because I thought she might say, "Why don't you do something about them?" She did, however, without any prompting from me.

I asked for a drink of water and asked her simply the way to Bonita Springs, and she told me to take this turn and that turn, but then she said, "Why don't you folks do something about the roads? You talk about the roads, and we have the same road out here in front we had 25 years ago."

Now she lived on what was called a county road. It was part of the authorized secondary system in my State. So I say that the ladies are important in roadbuilding because they help to build the demand or start the fires under legislators and Congressmen who are responsible for the legislation which authorizes road programs.

With the emphasis that we put upon doing something on the secondary system and the primary system in the 1954 act, we went even further in the 1956 act. We went back and authorized an additional $125 million for fiscal year 1957 which was the second year which was taken care of by the 1954 act, or normally would have been taken care of. And then we indicated a rate of addition of $25 million a year additional for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. We are now in fiscal year 1958. The Government's money year ends June 30, 1958, so that this year for the A, B, C roads (the primary, secondary, urban roads) there are authorizations of $850 million approximately. I think there is a little variation of that, perhaps, because of some tag ends, but approximately $850 million, and for fiscal 1959 it will be $875 million.

CURRENT ROAD REVIEW

We are presently engaged in the Congress in reviewing the status of the highway program preparatory to enacting the Highway Act of 1958.

Congress passes the Highway Act every 2 years as a means of defining the amount of Federal aid that will be available for apportionment to the States, recognizing that most States elect their legislatures in even-numbered years, and then those legislatures meet in the succeeding winter and spring, and need to know how much money will be available from the Federal Government for matching purposes. They, in turn, can make their planning and adopt whatever revenue measures they need to match the Federal aid that will be available in the subsequent biennial. So, we are presently engaged in reviewing the status of the highway program.

Now there has been some suggestion in the press that there has been a great lag in the highway program.

Actually, on the combination of all the highway funds available, the interstate, the primary, the secondary, and the urban systems we're talking about—the Bureau of Public Roads says it is about 3 percent ahead of schedule in the commitment of money for roadbuilding. In actual road construction I think probably there would be some lag because such a large portion of the money goes into the Interstate System. Initially in launching a great expansion in the Interstate System, some of the money had to be used for buying rights-of-way, setting up engineering staffs, and things of that sort which are necessary before road commitments can be translated into road contracts and jobs. You have to know where you are going to run the roads; you have to get some rights-of-way; you have to get some plans, of course, before you can build.

I asked the Bureau this morning about the status of the primary and secondary moneys, that is the money for the primary systems and the secondary systems. They said to me that on the total of the primary system they are somewhat ahead of schedule in commitments and a little behind on the secondary, but on the whole, pretty well up to schedule if you add the primary and secondary systems together (that is leaving out the Interstate System).

FARM TO MARKET ROADS

Now I am going to talk for a few minutes about the secondary system as such, the technical secondary system which is the farm-to-market type of road which the State highway commission builds in some instances, or which it turns over to the counties to build. In addition to stepping up the funds for the secondary system, Congress in the last two Highway Acts of 1954 and 1956 has taken specific steps intended to expedite work on the secondary system.

The first step in 1954 was to authorize a 10 percent transfer and, in the 1956 act, to increase that to 20 percent so that there might be a transfer between the primary and the secondary system within a State on the request, of its highway authority. Thus, the State itself might tailor its funds somewhat according to the demands within the State for improvement on roads, whether on the State's primary system or the State's secondary system.

The next step was to place a provision in the law to give the State highway commissions greater authority and responsibility in checking the progress on the secondary system.

That, as amended and rephrased in the 1956 act, follows:

"Provided, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility, relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects, by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him."

What that says in effect is that whereas before the Bureau of Public Roads had to have an engineering staff adequate to examine in some detail and check on the progress of the construction of a secondary road, that after certain standards have been established, the Bureau of Public Roads can say to the State's highway department, "We'll accept your certification that these standards have been met."

That grew out of the fact that we were getting reports from too many county commissioners and too many people who were interested primarily in the secondary system, that it just took too long, or that there was too much redtape in having a Federal engineer on top of the State engineer inspect the county secondary system or the roads they were building in the name of the secondary system by the State.

An additional proviso guarantees quality. It says,

"Provided further, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1–B of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950, and provided further that nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligations now provided by law relative to maintenance nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligations with respect to the selection of a secondary system or the location of projects thereon and to make a final inspection after construction of each project and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual costs of construction of each project."

That is, we put on those provisos to be sure that we weren't just throwing the money away or saying to the States, "You just take this money and spend it any way you see fit." There had to be standards but we would accept the certification by the States that these standards were being met. That is, the Bureau of Public Roads could accept it. Now that was to eliminate some need for personnel and to eliminate the time and the redtape involved.

SECONDARY STANDARDS

In addition to that, a fourth step has been made which the Bureau of Public Roads is now putting into effect, and that is to create a group of counselors or assistants, a board of engineers—a board of county engineers you might say—in which each region will have a representative on a council to work on secondary standards and also help the State highway commissions and the local highway authorities in getting qualified engineers to do their road work.

I don't know how far that has progressed in the Bureau but I did understand that the different regions had named their representatives or most of them had named their representatives (I see some people here who are conversant with the details on it nodding their heads), so that they will soon be starting to function.

The purpose of that again is to expedite the construction of the secondary systems. Thus, there are 4 things which have been done in 3 legislative years—1954, 1955, and 1956—to improve the position of the secondary roads:

First, the increase of the dollars; second, the institution of the transfer clauses; third, the giving to the States the authority to approve the secondary contracts by certifying that they are meeting the required standards; and, fourth, the creation of this board of county engineers which is to assist in counseling.

So I do think we are going to make more progress on the secondary system than we have in the past.

PROPOSED REMODELING OF THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL BUILDING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, because of reports of deterioration of the sandstone wall of the east front of the Capitol building, which will require major repairs, I had been inclined to go along with plans to reconstruct that front of more permanent material, and at the same time to move it out to the position said to have been intended by the original architects, which would place the dome over the center, instead of nearer one side. The fact that the change would provide some additional space inside the building was more or less incidental, from my point of view.

After looking at pictures of the proposed reconstruction, however, I have become concerned about the change which apparently would be made in the character of the east front of the building and the historic plaza where so many Presidents have taken the oath of office. It now seems to me that we should at least make a more thorough investigation of the feasibility of repairing the present front, before tearing it down and rebuilding it.

I shall, therefore, support any effort to halt the work which has been authorized, until such a study has been made and until we have had more opportunity to confer with the distinguished architects and others who have expressed opposition to the remodeling plan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before making several statements, I wish to commend the Senator from Virginia on his remarks. I share with him the thought that the matter of the extension of the east front of the Capitol should be more fully studied before contracts are let.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the substantial and continuing public interest in the preservation of the historic east facade of the Capitol, the matter to which the distinguished Senator from Virginia has just referred. In a front-page article in today's Washington Post, Elsie Carper has compiled an impressive list of editorial comment from newspapers throughout the country in opposition to the present plans for altering the east front. In addition, this article, the first of a series, provides a succinct statement of the controversy which should be of great value in keeping my colleagues informed on the background and status of this problem.

An editorial entitled "Behind the Facade," appeared in the Washington Post yesterday, March 2, 1958, and should be of interest to all who are anxiously awaiting the action of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Buildings.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the article from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of March 2, 1958]

BEHIND THE FACADE

Why the rush? Why the indecent haste to let out bids and begin ripping out the east front of the Capitol at the very moment when doubts are greatest about the wisdom of the change? Only 4 days after hearings were held on a bill to rescind previous Congressional authorization, a special Congressional commission in a secret meeting voted to ram through plans for a 32-foot extension of the Capitol's east front at a cost of $10.1 million. The secrecy was typical, as was the high-handed manner of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who dominates the Commission, is a deservedly beloved figure, but Mr. RAYBURN seems to forget the Capitol belongs to all the people. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, whose committee is considering the voiding legislation, said he felt the Commission "should have delayed its action until our committee reported out the legislation." That seems minimal.

Distinguished architects have expressed grave doubts about the change, as have many private citizens who cherish their Capitol. It may be that the relation of the dome to the present facade is imperfect; doubtless the leaning tower of Pisa could also be improved by straightening. If the facade is in disrepair, surely there are simpler solutions than gouging out the venerable east front. Is the only answer to rip apart a landmark which has been the setting for every inaugural since 1825?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 3, 1958]

CHANGING THE CAPITOL: PUBLIC PROTEST SAVED EAST FRONT THREE TIMES

(By Elsie Carper)

Three times in its 165-year history the east front of the Capitol has faced destruction. Each time it was saved by public clamor. Once again the wrecking bars are poised to tear down the center facade of the building.

Plans advanced by a Joint Congressional Commission will obliterate the work of three of the Nation's earliest and most gifted architects—Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin H. Latrobe, and Charles Bulfinch.

Behind a new and shiny marble front will vanish that section of the building for which in 1793 Washington laid the cornerstone. Down will come the portico where every President since John Quincy Adams has taken the oath of office.

WALLS TO DISAPPEAR

The walls that the British were unable to destroy when they fired the Capitol in 1814 will disappear.

All of this is being done at a cost in excess of $10 million to provide additional office and restaurant space in the Capitol.

The plans, prepared without public hearings, are going ahead despite the fact that within a few months great sections of the Capitol Building will be left vacant when the new Senate Office Building is occupied. An even larger office building is under construction for the House of Representatives, and a new cafeteria is being built in one of the present House Office Buildings.

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart is ready to let contracts at any moment to begin rebuilding the Capitol. He will construct a marble replica of the east front 32½ feet from the present walls. The courtyard before the central portico, considered by architects one of the most satisfying aspects of the building, will be flattened out.

But, as in the previous three attempts to rebuild the Capitol, voices are being raised that the historically significant and mellowed east front be preserved.

PROTESTS CHANNELED

Protests are being channeled to a Senate Public Works Subcommittee headed by Senator PAT MCNAMARA (Democrat, Michigan). The subcommittee will meet Wednesday to consider bipartisan legislation that will revoke the Congressional Commission's authorization to proceed with the east front extension.

The American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Society of Architectural Historians have banded together with a new organization,

the Committee to Preserve the National Capitol, to save the building.

Supporting the groups are State and local historical societies, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the editorial opinion of dozens of newspapers.

At recent hearings before McNamara's Subcommittee only two witnesses appeared who favored rebuilding the east front. They were Stewart and John F. Harbeson, a fellow of the American Institute of Architects and one of Stewart's consulting architects in planning the alterations.

EARLIER WORK

Harbeson has worked for Congress before. He planned the remodeling in 1950 of the Senate and House Chambers.

The man behind the east front extension is Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Congressional Commission. He is pushing doggedly ahead and wants the project completed by the 1961 presidential inauguration.

Endorsing RAYBURN's view are Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Senate Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND (Republican, California). House Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. (Republican, Massachusetts) opposes the project. The four men with Stewart make up the Commission.

Spearheading the drive in the Senate to save the east front are Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH (Republican, New Jersey) JOSEPH S. CLARK (Democrat, Pennsylvania), HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota) and CLIFFORD P. CASE (Republican, New Jersey).

In a joint statement presented at the hearing they declared "It is shocking to realize the present plans to provide * * * facilities and conveniences would result in the drastic alteration of historic east facade."

ON HOUSE SIDE

On the House side, Representative HENRY S. REUSS (Democrat, Wisconsin) has described the east front extension as an attempt by Congress to feed itself "by the somewhat excessive process of tearing down its historic house."

Printed below are excerpts from editorials printed in recent weeks:

Eleanor Roosevelt in her syndicated column: "A major catastrophe. * * * I hope many people will write in protest of this proposed desecration of the National Capitol."

The New York Times: "Every age and every country has its architectural vandals, but the present period in the United States seems to have brought forward more than its share. The city of Washington is a natural magnet for them, itching as they always do to put the impress of their incompetence on the design of great historic monuments and national shrines. * * *

"It is planned to put a new facade on the central section (of the Capitol), thus pushing forward and hopelessly altering the one part of the historic building whose simple beauty has served as backdrop for the Presidential inaugurations for more than a century and a quarter."

Raleigh, N. C., News and Observer: "It would be a * * * barbarism to destroy the long-fixed image of our Naitonal Capitol. * * * The protests of Americans should put a stop to this plan right now—and forever after."

Boston Herald: "For some additional restaurant and office space it is apparently a matter of no importance that the remaining traces of the Capitol's original grace be obliterated. * * * To alter the facade is an act comparable to drawing a mustache on a public poster."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Countless citizens will be looking in to see what takes place (at the McNamara subcommittee meeting. * * * If they could vote * * * it would be: 'Find the extra space some other way. Do not damage the Capitol'."

San Francisco News: "Prominent Republicans must bear their majority share of the blame for this barbarous mutilation." The paper suggested that the names of members of the Commission be added to a building plaque: "Founded, 1791; burned by a British Army, 1814; restored by Congress, 1817; vandalized by Congress, 1958."

Philadelphia News: "There are lots cheaper ways to get more space. And if repairs are needed they can be made without mutilating one of our most treasured national shrines."

Baltimore News-Post: "We're for progress and we're for recognition of the automotive age. But there's a limit. And the limit is messing up the Nation's superb and unique Capitol."

Baltimore Sun: "Congress has appropriated money toward the huge cost of the rebuilding job, but has never discussed the wisdom of the entire plan. * * * A debate should be held to air the whole business before large sums are spent on this dubious bit of restoration."

Cleveland Press: "Both vandalism and extravagance are involved in plans to hack up and deface the historic United States Capitol."

Houston (Tex.) Post: "If the present plans * * * go forward, the millions of pictures of the building in millions of school textbooks will be wrong."

St. Petersburg Times: "Proposing to change the facade of the United States Capitol is a little like sitting down while the band plays The Star-Spangled Banner."

Richmond Times-Dispatch: "The plan is basically bad. It would mean virtual elimination of the Capitol Plaza."

Milwaukee Journal: "Let's keep the beautiful, distinguished and historic east front of the National Capitol the way it is."

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks at this time, a press release issued by the Architect of the Capitol on February 21, 1958, relative to the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

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

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1958

The Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, composed of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; Hon. William F. Knowland, minority leader of the Senate; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, minority leader of the House of Representatives, and Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, at a meeting, today, February 21, 1958, acting under authority of Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, directed the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with the extension of the east central front of the United States Capitol, including the letting of contracts and all other necessary items, in accordance with the provisions of those acts and in accordance with preliminary plans prepared by the Architect of the Capitol, his associates and consultants, for such purpose. The estimated cost of the construction work approved today is $10,100,000. The front line of the central steps, as extended, will be 40 feet behind the front line of the steps of the House and Senate wings.

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER ON ECONOMIC RECESSION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, we repeatedly have cause to be grateful for the magnificent service which our 31st President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, continues to render his country as a private citizen. His wise and constructive contributions to national understanding are typified by the speech he made to the New York City Chamber of Commerce last Thursday, February 27, in which he analyzed the current economic situation.

In his text Mr. Hoover made clear that the economic forces at work today are entirely different from those which arose from the aftermaths of World War I to produce the depression in 1929. He expressed his conviction that America has the means at hand to deal promptly and effectively with this recession and come out of it bigger and stronger than before, and he outlined a positive program to help speed the general recovery.

He advocated some housework in the industrial world to halt wage and price rises. He also called on Congress to eliminate waste and reduce nonessential spending, balance the budget, and reduce taxes. This, he said, requires a demonstration of great economic statesmanship in these Halls, but it can be achieved by applying the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, many of which still await our action.

Mr. Hoover's message was seconded at the dinner by another distinguished American, former Postmaster General James A. Farley, who served with him on the Commission. Mr. Farley emphasized that some of the Commission's most fundamental findings are still untouched, and he joined in urging Congress to adopt them.

Because of the helpful light which Mr. Hoover sheds on the economic situation, and because of the need for action to carry out the rest of the Hoover Commission recommendations, I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of his address, entitled "Some Observations on Business Slumps and Recessions," printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TEXT OF HOOVER'S ADDRESS ON THE ECONOMIC RECESSION

Aside from Communists, defense, sputniks, Explorers, and missiles, the major conversation in the country is on this minor slump in business and employment. The debate is largely on where, when, and how we will get out of this hole or whether our activities will dig it deeper. In joining this discussion I shall be hopeful and friendly and throw no dead cats.

Our country has invented a special nomenclature to describe the stages of this sort of misfortune. We use the terms "business dip," "slump," "readjustment," "recession," and "depression." If we use the terms "dip," "slump," readjustment," or "recession," it makes the business world and the unemployed feel better. The term "depression" carries reminiscent terror.

Just for your comfort I may mention that even as a partly free economic system proceeds down the highway of progress it occasionally bursts into a joyride of excessive speed. Then a tire leaks and we have a bump. The spectators engage in extreme pessimism. In terms of time the bumps come about every 7 or 10 years. Seldom in our history have the bumps developed into a depression.

RECALLS WORLD DEPRESSION

And on the subject of depressions I may mention that once upon a time my political opponents honored me as possessing the fabulous intellectual and economic power by which I created a worldwide depression all by myself. At least I might claim from these tributes that I must know something about depressions.

In that great depression we were on our way out of a normal dip, slump, readjustment, or recession, whichever term you prefer. But in the midst of our recovery we were struck by a cyclone from Europe. That was the result of the aftermaths of World War I, the Treaty of Versailles, and subsequent follies in armaments, unbalanced budgets, inflation, and other governmental foolishness.

They gave birth to a panic in most of Europe. In that panic practically every bank in Europe, including the Bank of England, ceased international payments. And those countries suspended buying our commodities.

With my acknowledged expert qualifications I have looked over the world, and I may say that there are no such economic cyclones being hatched today—provided of course we keep our great enemy intimidated from making a war.

There are some lessons that can be had from our own and the world's experiences and vicissitudes with booms and slumps.

The first lesson is that a people by their own actions can get themselves into considerable trouble. That can be done by the route of inflation.

We, by devaluation and the expenses of the Second World War, had reduced the purchasing power of the dollar by about 50 percent. Then inflation was stopped for a while. But it has struck again. That is the result of pressure groups creating excessive expenditures and irresponsible action in the operations of our productive facilities.

In the last 21 months inflation has cut the purchasing value of the dollar about $70 from every income and pension of $1,000. If we want to stop it and at the same time stop this recession in its tracks, we need some homework in the industrial world.

First, we must have no wave of wage and fringe rises. This is not a new idea. I might remind you that labor and employers made and loyally carried out such an agreement for 3 years beginning in 1929. It was a great contribution to the recovery we had started before the cyclone.

Second, there should be no lifting of prices by industry.

There are some old and proved wonder drugs useful both to prevent inflation and to speed recovery from recessions. The most useful of these economic wonder drugs is the elimination of waste and the reduction of nonessential Federal spending until we have a balanced budget.

President Eisenhower prescribed this remedy in his address in Oklahoma last November when he declared that the increased expenditures for defense would have to come out of nondefense programs, saying:

"Savings of the kind we need can come about only through cutting out or deferring entire categories of activities. This will be one of the hardest and most distasteful tasks that the coming session of Congress must face, and pressure groups will wail in anguish."

The President added to this prescription a further proposal in his state of the Union message where he included also:

"Reducing expenditures on less essential military programs and installations."

AUSTERITY IS EMPHASIZED

But let me stress at once that there is no expenditure, no tax burdens, no austerity that we cannot endure in order to protect the United States from the greatest enemy of mankind in all human history.

I can expand the President's point as to anguish. These pressure groups include every segment of the Government bureaucracy. Their very nature is to avoid anguish. And they are supported by more than 1,200 citizens' pressure groups quartered in Washington wishing to safeguard the Senators and Congressmen from anguish.

But to speed up recovery, we need go much further than this, and that is the job of the Congress where great economic statesmanship will be needed.

We should cut Government expenditures not only to provide for additional weapons and balance the budget, but also to the point where we can have a tax reduction. This would be the greatest possible stimulant to recovery.

However, there is an opiate drug being proposed that should be resisted with horror. That is to reduce taxes without corresponding reduction of Government expenditures or a balanced budget. That opiate will poison you with more inflation. No doubt the voices of the pressure groups will rise in even greater anguish over any such cut in Government expenditures.

And may I add that when we have the joyride of a boom, we must just stand up and work out our readjustments. In the meantime we must see that no one in the country goes hungry or cold. Readjustment from economic sins is a tough operation.

ANSWERS NOW AVAILABLE

Those who do not know how these cuts in expenditures can be done without injury to any essential service, can find the answer in plain language in the Reports of the Commission on Organization of the Government.

These reports can be had from the Public Printer for a few cents each. Most of you in this audience do not need to be bored by quotations by me from them. You helped to make them. And they still stand. And many of them with great savings await action by the Congress.

Tonight you have heard from two of our great national leaders, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and former Postmaster General James Farley, who were members of the Commission. There are here other members of the Commission and the leaders and members of the task forces whose experience and devotion made those reports possible.

You have in the last few days received a great compliment from Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, President Eisenhower's able assistant, whose purpose is to secure the adoption of the administrative part of these recommendations. He says:

"The benefits which will flow from the work of the Commission cannot be measured adequately in terms of dollar savings * * * important recommendations are addressed * * * to more effective performances of the process of government. This is an area where the Commission has made an enduring contribution."

In addition to our economic problems, the Nation is faced with another and parallel crisis. Man's curiosity to explore the unknown and his impulses under freedom to do it, have led him further and further into the discovery of the fundamental laws of nature.

Today, the scientists, with the aid of the engineers have introduced new and gigantic forces into our civilization. But as yet the ethical standards of mankind and its governmental methods have been unable to control these forces.

And in closing may I say that the American people have often in the past dealt with many recessions and with great crises from development of scientific discoveries and their new inventions. We have come out bigger and stronger than ever before. And we will again.

MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in its February 26 issue the Washington Post published a thoughtful editorial on the bipartisan conference for the mutual-security program which was held at the Statler Hotel on the previous day. It alluded to the fact that there are many different reasons, all of them compelling, to sustain this vital program.

It enumerates some of these reasons which stretch across the spectrum of American ideals and needs from brotherhood to security, reasons set forth by some of America's leading citizens. The mutual-security program, concerned with bread and freedom, is the greatest weapon in freedom's arsenal and deservedly merits this broad range of support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Search for a Reason" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

THE SEARCH FOR A REASON

If there is a single conclusion to be drawn from yesterday's impressive outpouring of bipartisan enthusiasm for the mutual-security program, it is, we think, simply this: There are very many different reasons, but all compelling, to sustain, enlarge, and improve this program; there is no good reason to end or to diminish it. The idea of applying some of America's great plenty to the stupendous tasks of defending the Free World and of making it a better one is a concept around which men of every disposition may rally in good conscience.

For many the clarion call will be the moving words of Bishop Sheen, who, speaking of the underdeveloped nations, reminds us that "theirs is the burden of being underprivileged; ours is the burden of being overprivileged. It is their stomachs that are empty; it could be our hearts that are empty." Recipients of this country's aid might somehow do without it, as he says, "but we cannot continue to be without justice and mercy."

Others, not uncharitable, may yet find their motivation to support mutual-security spending in former President Truman's "brass tacks" reasoning: "The only thing we can do with armaments is to buy time." But time for what? "Foreign economic assistance is the cutting edge on the tool that gives some meaning and purpose to all our efforts for defense," the former President observes. For Adlai Stevenson, as for Secretary Dulles, foreign aid is "an essential weapon in the armory of American diplomacy." Allen Dulles, pointing to the Soviet Union's recent but imaginative and broadgage programs in the foreign-economic-assistance field, sees this as the new and perhaps decisive battlefield of the cold war. President Eisenhower, in one of the strongest statements he has made on the subject, calls foreign economic and military assistance, together with the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, the "iron imperative of security and the building of true peace."

This newspaper long has contended that a mutual-security program cast mainly in a military, materialistic, anti-Communist mold is a far less useful program than one more broadly motivated and conceived. But it is better than no program at all. And, like Mr. Truman, we would not advocate scuttling the ship to stop the leaks, for all the admitted failures and extravagances of some foreign-aid efforts. Mankind is in quest of freedom and dignity and material advance, and the search for one opens roads to the

others. Mutual security, concerned with bread and freedom, raises a standard to which men of vision large and vision small may all repair.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the growing debate on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act will soon be shifted to the Chambers of the House and the Senate. Points of view about the act are, of course, numerous and diverse. One significant body of opinion will be that from our great coastal cities and ports through which flows the huge bulk of foreign trade.

The Honorable Donald V. Lowe, chairman of the New York Port Authority, a resident of New Jersey, has written an eloquent and persuasive letter to Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, urging the extension of the act. He describes the amount and flow of trade, the employment which it supports, and the investments by the authority for the better promotion and service of this trade. I believe that this excellent letter should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter dated February 25, 1958, from the Honorable Donald V. Lowe, chairman of the New York Port Authority, to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and an enclosing letter addressed to me dated February 26, in regard to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N. Y., February 26, 1958.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: I am enclosing for your information a copy of my letter of February 25 to Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, presenting the port authority's strong conviction that the fundamental interests of the Metropolitan District of Northern New Jersey and New York require a foreign-trade policy which encourages the freer movement of goods to and from the United States. The commissioners of the port authority respectfully urge the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We hope that such legislation will have your support.

Sincerely,

DONALD V. LOWE,
Chairman.

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N. Y., February 25, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Board of Commissioners of the Port of New York Authority endorses and respectfully urges that Congress renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. On behalf of my fellow commissioners, I therefore would like to present the port authority's position respecting foreign-trade legislation now before the Congress. May I ask that this letter be made a part of the records of the hearings and deliberations of your committee.

Since 1934, the reciprocal trade agreements program has served as a cornerstone for the foreign economic policy of the United States. This program, by means of the reduction of tariffs and trade barriers on a mutually advantageous basis, has resulted in expanded international trade. This ever-increasing volume of trade, travel, and investment flow has unquestionably strengthened the economy of the United States and the rest of the Free World.

The expansion of trade and the strengthening of the economy have of course benefited the States of New York and New Jersey and their bistate harbor, the port of New York. Eight billion dollars' worth of export-import cargo arrived and departed from this port by ship or airplane in 1957, and these benefits ultimately accrue to the entire national economy.

The importance of export-import trade to the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area is emphasized by the fact that port jobs provide a livelihood for at least 430,000 people in this great bistate region. These 430,000 jobs, in turn, furnish the economic basis of existence for one out of every four persons who live in the port district. Moreover, the port's handling of many millions of tons of waterborne commerce a year produces more than one-fourth of the total wages earned in the port district.

The port of New York has therefore a vital interest in the continuance and expansion of the flow of international trade and commerce. This concern and interest was demonstrated by the States of New York and New Jersey in their port compact of 1921 which created the Port of New York Authority as their bistate public agency. One of the basic responsibilities of the port authority is the development and promotion of commerce and trade through the port of New York.

The conviction of the commissioners of the port authority that international trade is vital to the port's welfare and their faith in the future of this trade is proved by their continued approval of new and expanded programs and activities designed to promote the welfare of the port district and its 13 million residents.

Thus, during the past 15 years, the port authority has invested $90 million in 5 great marine terminals in New York and New Jersey and has authorized the expenditure of an additional $60 million during the next 5 years in further improvement of its waterfront terminals. These new and modernized piers, cargo terminal buildings, ship berths, channels, and supporting facilities accommodate a substantial portion of the 12,000 ships which enter New York Harbor every year.

In its investment and authorized additional expenditures of $370 million in four great metropolitan airports, a large part of which has been spent for facilities to handle overseas air passengers and cargo, the port authority has also demonstrated its confidence that the welfare of the port, the two States, and the United States as a whole is founded on an ever-increasing interchange of people and goods between the nations of the world.

So too is that confidence expressed in our trade development and port promotion program, on which the port authority spends $1 million a year. This activity includes a number of publications and other mediums designed to inform and assist overseas and domestic shippers in their handling of export-import trade to and from the United States. Similarly, the port authority's three overseas trade development offices in London, Zurich, and Rio de Janeiro as well as its four domestic offices in Washington, D. C., Chicago, Cleveland, and in downtown Manhattan have, as their basic function and purpose, assistance and service to the shippers in the respective areas of Europe, Latin America, and this country for which they are responsible.

It is the firm belief of the commissioners of the port authority that the objective of American tariff policy should be an orderly and progressive increase of international trade. Such a tariff benefits each of the participating countries by providing the stimulus for the international exchange of goods. Equally vital is the increase of commerce among nations as a positive step toward world peace.

Foreign trade is important to a much greater area of our national economy than just the export-import business directly concerned. It is important to everyone in the country who has labor, products, or services for sale. This truism has been amply demonstrated. The original purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—the increase of foreign trade through bilateral tariff reduction agreements between the United States and individual countries—has succeeded beyond expectation. Exports have increased from about $2 billion in 1934 to more than $20 billion in 1957, while imports have increased from about $1½ billion in 1934 to almost $13 billion in 1957.

For these reasons, the Port of New York Authority endorses a foreign trade policy which encourages the freer movement of goods to and from the United States as best serving the economic welfare and security of the Nation. We respectfully urge the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Sincerely,

DONALD V. LOWE,
Chairman.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday, the 24th of February, I had the honor and privilege of addressing the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. Through the courtesy of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], my address was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, and which appears on page 2569.

On February 25 the Trenton Times, of Trenton, N. J., carried an editorial on the subject of collective security, referring to my address and contributing further in an effective way to the current discussions of our so-called mutual-security program. Because this important subject will soon be before this body for debate, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the editorial from the Trenton Times.

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

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

As the world's capacity for material destruction and human annihilation has been increased through scientific achievements, an awareness of the folly of nuclear war has become more pronounced.

It is hardly conceivable that the masters of the Kremlin are keen for a competition involving the certainty of mutual destruction. Neither is it likely that they have abandoned their designs for the extension of their power and dominance throughout the world. Their tactics, it is apparent, are in process of change.

Soviet Russia is now cultivating the role of the benefactor and friend of the underprivileged peoples. In view of its record of slaughter and enslavement, notably in Hungary, a more brazenly hypocritical role is hardly conceivable. Nevertheless, it may

prove to be an effective means to Soviet ends.

It poses a challenge to the western allies, a challenge which, as Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH insisted in his address last night to graduate students in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, must be met effectively.

The underdeveloped areas of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa, present fertile fields for Communist subversion—fields in which, unless strong forces intervene, resistance may be feeble. This intervention, as Senator SMITH logically declares, can come only from the United States and this country's allies.

It is not, however, an exclusively American responsibility. Our allies, as Senator SMITH insists, "have as big a stake in the matter as we do." While the United States, by reason of its superior resources, may be expected to assume the leadership, "it is a great mistake to think of the battle as a peculiarly American one."

Senator SMITH has given a timely and an urgent emphasis to an obligation which cannot be ignored. Subtle Soviet intrusion into vulnerable territory holds peril for the Free World. Aid from the Free World accordingly presents "the middle course between doing nothing, which would be fatal, and trying to do everything, which would be futile."

POSTAL RATES—EDITORIAL COMMENDATION OF SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, all of us have respected the personal courage and political independence of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] in his recent advocacy of increased postage rates to cut down the alarming deficit of the Post Office Department.

This stand has been all the more to the credit of the junior Senator from Oregon because he was sufficiently openminded to change his original position as he studied the evidence and facts brought before his subcommittee by the Postmaster General.

A most heartening editorial, commending the Senator's independence and openmindedness, was published in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of February 25, 1958, entitled "On Not Closing One's Mind." Because of the forthright position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon during the recent postal debate, I believe many of us would like to see the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for that privilege.

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

ON NOT CLOSING ONE'S MIND

Some time back, Senator NEUBERGER told the Journal of his conviction that neither Oregon nor the country can afford to have issues decided on the basis of closed minds. He said that the problems which face us both statewide and nationally require some budging from positions traditionally held by both Democrats and Republicans.

The Senator has shown some signs lately that he is willing to retreat from prejudice when he is convinced such change is justified.

In a discussion of Oregon's economic problems recently, he conceded that the State must look to a broadening of its tax base if it is to compete with other Sttaes for its share of industry. At least until recently, such a stand, for a Democrat, would have approached heresy, and by taking it NEUBERGER risked losing some political mileage.

He has risked it again now by endorsing the administration's proposal for a 5-cent postal rate on out-of-town letters, along with other related rate increases, which has now passed the Senate Post Office Committee. His endorsement is for him a complete reversal, for his first reaction to the proposal was to blast it.

However, his change of mind, he says, is partly the result of detailed testimony by Postmaster General Summerfield before the Postal Rate Subcommittee, of which he is a member. He has become convinced that the added revenue is urgently needed to build new post offices and raise the salaries of underpaid postal workers.

The Senator recognizes that he is among the foremost of those urging Federal expenditures in which Oregon has shared generously. He defends this position, but he concedes now that "we cannot always advocate only the spending of public funds. * * * We cannot always evade the responsibility of facing up to the need to collect revenue."

The Journal does not always agree with Senator NEUBERGER and has from time to time been critical of statements he has made and positions he has taken. But it must agree with his view on the need for openmindedness, and it finds admirable his willingness to change from a position which he believes is no longer tenable.

FAMOUS JUDGE REBUKES SUPREME COURT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, when the voice of one of the Nation's most eminent and erudite jurists is raised in protest against the calculated efforts of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to set themselves up as a superlegislature, its significance cannot be ignored even by those who, for political considerations, choose to wink at the Court's flagrant usurpations.

Such a voice is that of the Honorable Learned Hand, for many years presiding judge of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York, whose opinions over the years have come to be regarded as being among the most scholarly and persuasive expositions ever written on constitutional fundamentals.

Judge Hand raised his voice in a series of three lectures delivered recently at Harvard Law School—lectures which have just been published by Harvard University Press.

A reading of these lectures reveals them to constitute one of the most stern and devastating rebukes of the Supreme Court and its arrogant arrogation of legislative power yet delivered.

David Lawrence, the able and distinguished editor of U. S. News & World Report, deals with Judge Hand's charges and conclusions in a forceful editorial entitled, "Famous Judge Rebukes Supreme Court," which appears in the current March 7, 1958, issue of that worthy publication.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Lawrence's editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

FAMOUS JUDGE REBUKES SUPREME COURT

(By David Lawrence)

Judge Learned Hand, now retired, is one of the most eminent men ever to sit on the Federal bench. For many years he presided over the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York, and his opinions were usually accepted by the Supreme Court of the United States. Indeed his opinions came to be regarded by the legal profession as among the most persuasive expositions of the law of the land.

Recently Judge Hand delivered a series of three lectures before the students at Harvard Law School. He dealt with the widely debated concept that the Supreme Court may "legislate" at will.

These lectures have just been published by the Harvard University Press. While they are written in dispassionate and restrained phrases, the lesson contained therein is unmistakable. It is one of sharp rebuke of the Supreme Court for a tendency to set itself up as a "third legislative chamber."

Judge Hand issues a warning as to what the American citizen faces whenever the Supreme Court not only restricts the right of legislative bodies to legislate but itself assumes a legislative function.

Judge Hand does not confine his criticism merely to the present-day Supreme Court. He points out that an 1894 opinion of the Court foreshadowed current trends. He quotes the Court's declaration at that time that a State legislature's "determination as to what is a proper exercise of its police powers is not final or conclusive, but is subject to the supervision of the courts."

Judge Hand observes that such a definition leaves no alternative to regarding the court as a third legislative chamber. He then notes the subsequent disavowals of such a doctrine by this Supreme Court and cites a 1952 opinion which says:

"Our recent decisions make plain that we do not sit as a superlegislature to weigh the wisdom of legislation, nor to decide whether the policy which it expresses offends the public welfare."

Judge Hand remarks: "One would suppose that these decisions and the opinions that accompanied them would have put an end—at least when economic interests only were at stake—to any judicial review of a statute because the choice made [by Congress or the State legislatures] between the values and sacrifices in conflict did not commend itself to the Court's notions of justice."

Judge Hand finds, however, that the Supreme Court recently has not only proceeded to impose its own view of what is wise or unwise legislation, irrespective of constitutional powers, but seems to have applied hostile rules where property was involved and softer rules where liberty was at issue. He says:

"I cannot help thinking that it would have seemed a strange anomaly to those who penned the words in the fifth [amendment] to learn that they constituted severer restrictions as to liberty than property, especially now that liberty not only includes freedom from personal restraint, but enough economic security to allow its possessor the enjoyment of a satisfactory life.

"I can see no more persuasive reason for supposing that a legislature is a priori less qualified to choose between 'personal' than between economic values; and there have been strong protests, to me unanswerable, that there is no constitutional basis for asserting a larger measure of judicial supervision over the first than over the second."

Judge Hand puts his finger on the cases that today transcend all others as examples of usurpation of power by the Supreme Court. He says:

"The question arose in acute form in the Segregation cases. In these decisions did the Court mean to 'overrule' the 'legislative judgment' of States by its own reappraisal of the relative values at stake? Or did it hold that it was alone enough to invalidate

the stautes that they had denied racial equality because of [14th] amendment inexorably exempts that interest from legislative appraisal?

"It seems to me that we must assume that it did mean to reverse the legislative judgment by its own appraisal. It acknowledged that there was no reliable inference to be drawn from the Congressional debates in 1868 and it put its decision upon the feeling of inferiority that segregation was likely to instill in the minds of those who were educated as a group separated by their race alone.

"There is indeed nothing in the discussion [by the Supreme Court] that positively forbids the conclusion that the Court meant that racial equality was a value that must prevail against any conflicting interest, but it was not necessary to go to such an extreme. *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* [the 1896 case approving separate but equal facilities] was not overruled in form anyway; it was distinguished [differentiated] because of the increased importance of education in the 56 years that had elapsed since it was decided.

"I do not see how this distinction can be reconciled with the notion that racial equality is a paramount value that State legislatures are not to appraise and whose invasion is fatal to the validity of any statute.

"Whether the result would have been the same if the interests involved had been economic, of course, I cannot say, but there can be no doubt that at least as to personal rights the old doctrine seems to have been reasserted.

"It is curious that no mention was made of section 3 [of the 14th amendment], which offered an escape from intervening, for it empowers Congress to enforce all the preceding sections by appropriate legislation.

"The Court must have regarded this as only a cumulative corrective, not being disposed to divest itself of that power of review that it has so often exercised and as often disclaimed.

"I must therefore conclude this part of what I have to say by acknowledging that I do not know what the doctrine is as to the scope of these clauses; I cannot frame any definition that will explain when the Court will assume the role of a third legislative chamber and when it will limit its authority to keeping Congress and the States within their accredited authority."

Judge Hand says he "has never been able to understand" on what basis other than as a coup de main the Supreme Court adopted the view that it may actually legislate. By coup de main, he means, of course, arbitrary usurpation of power.

Should we establish a "third legislative chamber"? This is the penetrating question asked by Judge Hand, but he adds quickly: "If we do need a third chamber it should appear for what it is, and not as the interpreter of inscrutable principles."

But Judge Hand doubts the wisdom of letting a judge serve as a communal mentor and deems inexpedient any such wider form of review based on the moral radiation of court decisions. He gives these reasons for his view:

"In the first place it is apparent, I submit, that insofar as it is made part of the duties of judges to take sides in political controversies, their known or expected convictions or predilections will, and indeed should, be at least one determinant in their appointment and an important one.

"There has been plenty of past experience that confirms this; indeed, we have become so used to it that we accept it as a matter of course.

"No doubt it is inevitable, however circumscribed his duty may be, that the personal proclivities of an interpreter will to some extent interject themselves into the meaning he imputes to a text but in very much the greater part of a judge's duties he is charged with freeing himself as far as he can from all personal preferences, and that becomes difficult in proportion as these are strong.

"The degree to which he will secure compliance with his commands depends in large measure upon how far the community believes him to be the mouthpiece of a public will, conceived as a resultant of many conflicting strains that have come, at least provisionally, to a consensus.

"This sanction disappears insofar as it is supposed permissible for him covertly to smuggle into his decisions his personal notions of what is desirable, however disinterested personally those may be.

"Compliance will then much more depend upon a resort to force, not a desirable expedient when it can be avoided."

Those last words could apply to the use of troops at Little Rock, which certainly was not a desirable expedient and could have been avoided.

There seems no doubt that Judge Hand would like to see the Supreme Court adhere to its basic function of interpreting legislation without adding laws not written by the people's legislatures. He evidently deplores the tendency to vest political power in the Supreme Court of the United States whose Justices are appointed for life. He concludes:

"For myself it would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians, even if I knew how to choose them, while I assuredly do not. If they were in charge, I should miss the stimulus of living in a society where I have, at least theoretically, some part in the direction of public affairs.

"Of course, I know how illusory would be the belief that my vote determined anything; but nevertheless when I go to the polls I have a satisfaction in the sense that we are all engaged in a common venture."

Judge Hand has rendered a great service to contemporary understanding of the true limits of the Supreme Court's powers. For there are limits, and the Congress, acting for the people, can and should impose such limits lest we fall victim to absolutism in our own institutions.

ALASKAN AND HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, says that the public willingness to accept Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and the present impasse on the question in Congress, point up a classic example of a lag between public opinion and legislative action.

Institute surveys since World War II have consistently recorded overwhelming sentiment for admitting both Territories to the Union. In the latest survey, the vote is 12 to 1 in favor of admitting Alaska and more than 5 to 1 in favor of granting statehood to Hawaii.

"Political observers claim," says Dr. Gallup, "that the recent administration decision on calling up Alaska for action only if Hawaii is also considered has, in effect, killed the chances once more of either being granted statehood for the time being."

Mr. President, I suggest to the leaders of both parties that it is dangerous to continue to manipulate this issue. There comes a time when the Congress must act without intrigue and equivocation if it is to retain the respect and confidence of the people. The statehood bills are on the Senate calendar. The statehood issue faces us. We cannot ignore it further without repudiating a clear mandate from the American people.

I ask that the report of the Institute's surveys, and Dr. Gallup's comments, as they appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PUBLIC STRONG FOR ALASKA, HAWAII

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J.—The public willingness to accept Alaska and Hawaii in the Union and the present impasse on the question in Congress point up what is a classic example of a lag between public opinion and legislative action.

The introduction of statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii has become a standard feature of each session of Congress for many years. Just as standard has been the shelving of the bill at some point during each session.

Yet institute surveys since the end of World War II have consistently recorded overwhelming sentiment for admitting both Territories to the Union.

In the latest survey, the vote is 12 to 1 in favor of admitting Alaska, and more than 5 to 1 in favor of granting statehood to Hawaii.

Many voters, perhaps aware of the Congressional inaction on the question, added the comment:

"And it should have happened a long time ago."

Since 1946, the institute has regularly asked these questions:

"Would you favor or oppose having Alaska admitted as a State in the Union?"

Here are the highlights of the trend in sentiment since World War II:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1946	64	12	24
1950	81	8	11
1953	78	10	12
1955	82	9	9
1956	74	10	16
1957	71	8	21
Today	73	6	21

"Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as a State in the Union?"

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1946	60	19	21
1950	76	10	14
1953	72	14	14
1955	78	12	10
1956	71	11	18
1957	64	14	22
Today	65	12	23

Political observers claim that the recent administration decision on calling up Alaska for action only if Hawaii is also considered has, in effect, killed the chances once more of either being granted statehood for the time being.

In the past, the statehood issue has foundered on the delicate question of a political balance in the Senate. Hawaii, traditionally Republican, has been blocked by Democrats. Alaska, normally Democratic, has been kept out by GOP efforts.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not so sure that I heard the complete remarks of the Senator from Idaho, but, of course, neither the administration nor the minority determines the calling up of proposed legislation in this Chamber. I inform the Senator from Idaho that, as the minority leader of the Senate, I have made clear my position and it is the position which I have taken for the 13 years I have served in the Senate of the United States. It is one which was developed in a colloquy several weeks ago with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

I am in favor of statehood for the Territory of Alaska. I am in favor of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. I hope that both Territories will be admitted into the Union as States. I think they both deserve it.

So far as I am concerned, I would not like to see the two items tied together. The only request I have made, which I think is a fair one, is that once the bill for statehood for the Territory of Alaska is called up for consideration, when the Senate will have a chance to vote on the merits of the bill—and I hope pass it, I might say, speaking personally—then there will be immediately called up for consideration the next bill on the calendar, which is the bill to provide statehood for the Territory of Hawaii. I hope the Senate will be allowed to debate and act upon that bill on its merits. It seems to me the Senate then at least would have discharged its obligation in the matter. We would have had a chance to vote independently on both bills, and Senators would have had a right to vote on the merits.

Speaking personally again, I express the hope that both bills to provide statehood will pass.

That is the procedure which I favored following when I was majority leader. Personally, I think it is a mistake to tie the two bills together. I think we will have a better opportunity of not having an effort made to tie the two bills together if assurance can be given that once the bill to provide statehood for Alaska has been acted upon the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii will be called up for the consideration of the Senate, when Senators will have a chance to act upon that bill.

In view of the Senator's statement, I felt that the record should be made clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak an additional 3 minutes, to reply to the distinguished minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I appreciate his participation in this colloquy. I, too, am very much concerned about the delay which has occurred these many years in acting upon statehood for both the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii.

I think it is significant, however, that at the recent Democratic National Committee meeting held in Washington it was the national committeeman from Hawaii who submitted a resolution calling upon Congress to act upon statehood for Alaska.

I am sure the people of Hawaii understand full well that if we can at last get action on statehood for Alaska and make that Territory the 49th State, then in the very nature of things statehood will come to Hawaii as inevitably as that the day follows the night.

For that reason, Mr. President, I feel that any effort which has heretofore been made to combine the two statehood bills, under any understanding or arrangement, whether that effort involves a simultaneous linking of the bills or a successive consideration of the bills, is an effort which is directed toward combining the opponents of both bills in opposition to each, and thus is not an effort which is in reality designed to serve the interests or the cause of statehood for either Territory.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to express myself as being in full accord with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. President, S. 49, a bill to enable the strategic and richly endowed Territory of Alaska, which has been American for some 91 years, to become a State is pending on the Senate Calendar. It is Calendar No. 1197. This measure was reported, after complete hearings and thorough executive consideration, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the first session of this Congress with only one dissenting vote.

Also pending is another bill, S. 50, which would enable the prosperous and progressive American Territory of Hawaii to become a State.

Mr. President, S. 49 and S. 50 are separate and distinct measures, just as Alaska and Hawaii are separate and distinct geographic and economic entities. Separate hearings were held on these two different measures by the Interior Committee; they were considered separately in executive session; they were reported separately; they are on the Senate Calendar separately.

I emphasize their separateness because there seems to be a feeling on the part of some Members of the Senate that the two are in some way linked or tied together, so that consideration of Alaska would necessarily involve us in consideration of Hawaii. This is not the case either in fact or in theory.

Nor does it exist even in the minds of the people of Hawii. I have here a letter from the very able and very public-spirited Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JACK BURNS, stating that fact unequivocally. Delegate BURNS is the holder of the highest and, in fact, the only territorywide elective office in Hawaii. If anyone can speak for the more than one-half million American citizens of that American Territory it is he.

Mr. President, because of its great pertinency to the pending issue of statehood, I ask that Delegate BURNS' letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1958.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your statement in the Senate on February 10, 1958, merits the careful consideration of every American. The importance of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii should not be minimized. No issue before the Congress transcends statehood in its effect upon the present and the future of the United States. Just as integrity of character in an individual is more important than health and wealth, so, too, must be our integrity as a Nation.

Your statement reveals your wisdom and understanding, as well as prescience, qualities which have earned for you the highest respect. In this issue, as in others that you have faced in your distinguished career, your forthrightness has removed the clouds of confusion. The appreciation of the people of Hawaii is heartfelt. All Americans should join them.

As the only one with the authority to speak for the people of Hawaii, I support your stand that all friends of statehood should unite in permitting Alaska to go forward alone. On October 15, 1957, I was quoted in a Honolulu newspaper as saying: "I will work hard for Alaskan statehood. If it becomes necessary to drop Hawaii statehood in order to get Alaska through, I will do just that."

My statement has been supported by the people of Hawaii. Other than a few partisan efforts to make political capital of the statement, no objections, public or private, have been voiced.

I now repeat that statement as the Representative duly elected to speak for the people of Hawaii—the only one. Alaska and Hawaii should be considered separately. Since, as you point out, Alaska is presently before both the House and Senate with favorable reports from the respective committees of each body, Alaska is ready for consideration.

Enlightened self-interest demands application of the Golden Rule in this instance to our just claim. Hawaii does not want to be a means of killing statehood for both. She would rather withdraw to "clear the track." The sincerity of her desire for statehood would be suspect if she followed any other course.

In a matter so vital to our national best interest, Hawaii will not be found wanting. She has never been found wanting in her response to the needs of the great Nation of which she is an integral part. Hawaii always will respond willingly and wholeheartedly.

Your great confidence and your support are deeply appreciated with heartfelt thanks.

Warmest personal regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always and in all ways.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BURNS.

Mr. MURRAY. Also, Mr. President, I have received a splendid statement on statehood from the very young but very able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Senator CHURCH took an active part in the hearings and consideration in committee of statehood, and his eloquent

statement is based on knowledge and fact.

I ask that Senator CHURCH's letter to me in the subject of statehood be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
January 28, 1958.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This session of Congress has a rare opportunity to demonstrate to the world that the right of self-government is still espoused by the United States. That opportunity comes at a time when free government contests mightily with communism for the allegiance of uncommitted people, in areas where colonialism still persists, or lingers as a bad memory from the recent past.

I recall the magnitude of the impact upon the people of the Far East, when the United States granted independence to the Philippine Islands. The enthusiasm engendered toward America was spontaneous, genuine, and widespread. Nothing we have done since the war contributed so much to American stature in the Orient.

In recent months, the dramatic Russian successes in making the first plunge into outer space, have doubtlessly enhanced the appeal of communism to the newly emancipated people who live around the rim of Asia and in restless Africa. Russian prestige, sullied by her brutal bludgeoning of Hungary, is suddenly rising again. We cannot erase it with tardy satellites of our own, nor are we likely to win new adherents to our cause by building missiles.

But this Congress, by granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, could strike a telling blow for freedom. Statehood would end that subordinate relationship to the United States which causes world opinion to regard both Territories as akin to colonies. Statehood would strengthen confidence everywhere that our country remains true to its anticolonial heritage. Its significance would reach through to millions around the world who have but recently struggled, or who still aspire, to be free. It would strengthen our cause, and win us new friends at a critical time.

Accordingly, I earnestly recommend to you, as a member of the Democratic steering committee, that highest priority be given to the pending statehood bills. Both measures have long been called for in our party platform; both have been reported favorably by the Senate Interior Committee, on which I serve.

I realize that the steering committee will assess the factors most likely to effect successful floor management of these bills. With due regard to the policy determinations that are the province of the committee, I urge my strong conviction that the best interests of our country will be served, and great credit reflected upon Democratic leadership, by prompt and favorable action on the statehood measures.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH.

AMBASSADOR LODGE'S VISIT TO INDIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we all know the fine job which our former colleague and my good friend and former fellow Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge has been doing as America's Chief Delegate to the United Nations. Ambassador Lodge has recently made a visit to India which has had a beneficial effect on Indian-American relations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks an article published in the Christian Science Monitor on February 26, 1958, telling something of Ambassador Lodge's visit to India.

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

LODGE SINCERITY STIRS INDIANS

(By Sharokh Sabavala)

BOMBAY.—A distinguished son of Massachusetts, who lives only a short distance from Walden Pond—best-known stretch of American water to Indians—has come 10,000 miles from home to tell people here that in the United Nations, the United States and India have been on the same side on 45 major roll-call votes.

This is not the only fact which has caused astonishment, here and in New Delhi, about the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Cabot Lodge. Preceded by a legend of seeming antagonism to India and heralded by that well-worn doggerel about the Lowells and the Cabots, the Lodges were suspect in the eyes of many Indians before they ever arrived. And equally in question was the tact of the Indian Cabinet, which deputed Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon to play host to Mr. Lodge. (Messrs. Lodge and Krishna Menon are both their countries' chief delegates to the United Nations.)

As often happens, however, yesterday's fears only provoke laughter today. Far from being the haughty Bostonian he was supposed to be, Mr. Lodge showed himself as a friendly, charming, sophisticated American, who has been to Bombay once before in the guise of a newspaperman, who during World War II lived side by side with Indian troops in Italy and who appeared in private and on public platforms on the friendliest terms with Mr. Krishna Menon—"my friend, philosopher, and guide in India."

RESTRAINT SHADES FLATTERY

Distinguished visitors to India, whose unending stream now flows throughout the year, sometimes stoop to conquer and they are noticed so doing. Others lay on flattery with a trowel because they are told Indians like being praised. There are those from the Communist world who go on repeating a catalog of this country's stupendous and colossal achievements. A small minority, however, uses restraint. It does not go out of its way to demonstrate wide-eyed wonder, which makes Indians feel they are on the wrong side of the bars at a zoo. It does not strive too hard for friendship and ends up by receiving it in abundant measure.

IMPRESSIVE VISITOR

Indian public opinion has put Mr. Lodge in this category. As a member of the Cabinet and as the President's personal Ambassador, he would have been received in any case with the respect and courtesy due his rank. But Mr. Lodge easily has dislodged the formidable barriers of protocol and in a few days dispelled many of the stories which, in Indian eyes, made him a hostile figure on the world stage. Above all, he appears to have made it possible for Indians to reach out for a more sympathetic understanding of his fabulous and much-misunderstood country.

Here in India, newspaper readers have been led to believe that with Mr. Lodge and Mr. Krishna Menon constantly engaged in verbal duels, the United States and India are near enemies, at least in the U. N. Yet in New Delhi and Bombay, both these men have shown a striking identity of opinion and action on a wide variety of international problems and disputes. For this reason, if for no other, the Lodge visit is one of those quiet successes, which only seize the imagination after it is all over.

DEATH OF FREDERICK M. DEARBORN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, all of us who knew him were stunned by the tragic death last week of Frederick M. Dearborn, Jr., of Wenham, Mass. The high regard in which he was held by his friends and associates was exemplified by the President's action in directing that all flags on Federal buildings in Washington and Massachusetts be flown at half mast in tribute to him the day following his death. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD following my remarks Mr. Dearborn's obituary published in the Boston Herald on February 27, 1958.

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

[From the Boston Herald of February 27, 1958]

FREDERICK DEARBORN, JR., DIES—WENHAM MAN AID TO IKE—FORMER COUNSEL TO GOVERNOR HERTER

The death yesterday of Attorney Frederick M. Dearborn, Jr., 46, of Wenham, special assistant to President Eisenhower and former special counsel to Governor Herter, came as a stunning shock to his many friends in the State and Government service, the legal profession, and in Harvard alumni ranks.

Mr. Dearborn was found dead yesterday morning in his Washington home. The coroner's report said death resulted from acute pancreatitis and that he apparently had died in his sleep sometime between 10 p. m. and midnight Tuesday. His friends had known him as a person of fine health.

IMPORTANT IKE AIDE

He had been an important figure in the Eisenhower administration since last May when he took over as vice chairman of the Operations Coordination Board. He was Eisenhower's representative on the Board, whose function is to assure proper execution of National Security Council decisions affecting various Government agencies.

President Eisenhower learned of Dearborn's death after his news conference yesterday. White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said the President was deeply shocked.

The President ordered flags flown at half-staff on all Federal buildings in Washington and Massachusetts in tribute to Dearborn.

Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, who as Chairman of the Operations Coordination Board was Dearborn's immediate superior, said he and Mrs. Herter planned to attend the funeral services in Hamilton at 10 a. m. Saturday.

A close personal friend of Herter, Dearborn was treasurer of Herter's campaign leading to his election as Governor in 1952. From 1955 to January 1957, he was legal counsel to Herter at the State house.

Friends said Dearborn's desire to continue practice as a lawyer in the field of public service led him to reject offers to be a judge in the superior and supreme courts of Massachusetts.

HARVARD GRADUATE

A graduate of Harvard and Harvard Law School, he joined the Boston firm of Bingham, Dana and Gould in 1936.

During World War II, he served in Europe with the 18th Field Artillery Battalion, rising from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel. After the war he returned to his Boston law

firm and in December 1946, was made a partner.

As executive secretary of the committee of civilian components of the Armed Forces in 1947 and 1948, he was praised by the then Defense Secretary James Forrestal.

He later served as town moderator in Wenham and president of the Shore Country Day School. He was a trustee of Boston Lying-in Hospital and a member of the American Law Institute and the Harvard Law School Alumni Association.

He leaves his wife, Pauline (Moore); three sons, David, 20, a student at Harvard; and Henry, 18, and Philip, 15, both students at Brooks School, North Andover; his father, Dr. Frederick M. Dearborn, of New York, and a brother, William, of Nashville, Tenn.

PRAISED BY HERTER

"Frederick Dearborn was one of the most devoted public servants in Massachusetts and in the country," former Governor Herter declared last night. "His passing is a tremendous loss both to his many friends, among whom I was proud to count myself, and to the Nation as a whole."

Dearborn's unexpected passing plunged his Harvard College classmates into deep personal mourning. He had always taken an active part in the affairs of the class of 1933 and had been looking forward to a gay 25th reunion with his college classmates at Cambridge in June.

Dr. Irad B. Hardy of Waltham, chief marshall of the class and chairman of the 1933 class committee, said the news of Dearborn's "sudden and untimely death will be sorrowfully received by all Harvard men."

"A highly-regarded and successful lawyer, he worked hard for Harvard, Massachusetts, and more recently in Washington," Hardy said. "The class of 1933 will remember him with pride."

SHOCKED BY NEWS

Donald M. Sullivan, of Wellesley, secretary of the class, was shocked at the news.

"If ever a man died for his country, which he had served so well in war and peace, it was Fred Dearborn," said Sullivan.

"For his classmates about to celebrate their 25th anniversary at Harvard in June it was a blow," Sullivan said. "He had been selected as 25th reunion chairman and resigned to answer the call of duty in Washington. He was to have been chief usher at memorial services for our deceased classmates. The whole of Harvard's alumni has honored him by election to the Harvard Fund Council.

"He was so busy in Washington," Sullivan related, "that his wife wrote for him the biography for the 25th anniversary report, which had in it these prophetic words from President Eisenhower when he administered the oath of office to Fred Dearborn—'You will never work harder in your life.'

"The Nation, Harvard, and his classmates are poorer, indeed, through the loss of this good and youthful man, devoted to his friends and to the high calling of his conscience," Sullivan said.

THOUGHTFUL MAN

Lawrence Dana, of Hingham, a law associate of Dearborn's in the firm of Bingham, Dana, and Gould, described him as "the kindest, most thoughtful man I've ever known, as well as a man of tremendous capability for public service since 1939."

Executive Councilor Christian A. Herter, Jr., a close friend, said that "the sudden and tragic death of Fred Dearborn was a blow not only to his friends but also to the people of Massachusetts and the entire United States.

"A person of extraordinary ability, humility, and understanding, he had, in his very quiet way, made an unforgettable contribution to the furtherance of the ideals in which he believed so strongly," Herter said. "I can think of no one that was a better friend or fought so hard to do things for people who were in trouble."

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, particularly in the East, we hear a great deal of talk about recession, but we do not hear such talk in Arizona. In the East we hear a great deal of talk about lack of faith in the future of the United States. However, that is not the situation in my State of Arizona. One of our leading editors in Arizona is Mr. Hanson Ray Sisk. He is not a very young man. However, the wonderful Arizona air and the youthfulness and spirit of our State evidently keep a man's thoughts buoyant; and so he has written an interesting editorial entitled "Glowing Future for Arizona," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

GLOWING FUTURE FOR ARIZONA

(By Hanson Ray Sisk)

Arizona is the youngest State in the Union and it has a young population. It has a higher percentage of its population under 18 and a smaller percentage over 65 than has the Nation as a whole.

Back in 1910 the State had about 250,000 inhabitants. Today it has more than a million and the second million is on the way. From 1940 to 1950 the population increased 50 percent, and during the present decade 40 percent more. Census authorities estimate the population by 1970 will be 1,800,000, an increase of 140 percent over the 1950 population of 750,000. By 1975 the population will be more than 2 million, and this is less than 20 years from now.

Vast numbers of people from other States are moving into Arizona. Industry wants a place in the sun and vast sums are being expended for development. Valleys, once remote, are now thriving areas.

A few years ago some of us, who are now showing the "frost" in our hair, rode by land which could be bought for $5 an acre. Today some of that same land is selling for $5,000 an acre. The same opportunity exists today in other areas of the State which are marked for development.

Big business in the Nation is planning for the future and Arizona is on their expansion maps. In Arizona everything is booming. Bank deposits, business, population, development—and taxes. It is a boom State and the chances are it will continue to boom for years to come. This is because Arizona has thousands of acres of available land for development and it is a land of sunshine and warmth.

Demands for educational facilities are concurrent with population growth. By 1970 school attendance will be double the present enrollment.

The labor force of Arizona is growing daily. The industrial scene is changing rapidly because money follows money and capital is coming to Arizona.

Agriculture is expanding rapidly. The Valley of the Sun and other valleys are blossoming. Now the great Willcox area is being developed.

Thousands upon thousands of our present citizens will be here 20 years from now. During this period they will see a marvelous change, far greater than was visualized by their elders.

Arizona's future is dynamic.

RESOLUTION BY ARIZONA NEWSPAPERS ASSOCIATION REGARDING PICTORIAL REPORTAGE OF COURTROOM PROCEEDINGS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently the Arizona Newspapers Association held its convention in Phoenix, Ariz., and adopted a number of resolutions. One of these resolutions affects canon 35 of the American Bar Association Canons of Judicial Ethics. It is the one in which the American Bar Association supports the idea that photographs should not be taken in courtrooms.

The Arizona Newspapers Association—rightfully, I believe—is against that stand. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY ARIZONA NEWSPAPERS ASSOCIATION AT PHOENIX, SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 1958

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas a special committee of the American Bar Foundation has recommended a restatement in which there would be no change in the prohibition against photography, broadcasting, and televising of court trials as now contained in canon 35 of the American Bar Association Canons of Judicial Ethics; and

Whereas the aforementioned canon 35, restricting, as it does, the people's full freedom of information as it concerns their courts, stands as a lamentable parallel to the State-controlled legal process of those totalitarian nations we all abhor; and

Whereas the international political importance of news photography has never been better described than when President Dwight D. Eisenhower, greeting a national photo conference, said, "Pictorial reportage is the most universal of all languages. It is an indispensable tool of freedom in these days when so many people are oppressed and personal freedom is restricted in many parts of the world": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Arizona Newspapers Association, in convention here assembled, do unanimously condemn the principles of prohibition contained in canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Arizona Newspapers Association urge the Arizona delegates to the American Bar Association meeting at Atlanta February 23–25 to oppose the recommended restatement of canon 35 and support either the elimination of the canon or its modification to make it consistent with the tenets of freedom upon which the laws of this Republic are based; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Arizona Supreme Court and the Arizona Bar Association.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas it has been our observation that a proportion of college graduates in journalism are not proficient in the fundamentals of the writing profession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association recommend to schools of journalism that degrees in journalism be issued only to candidates who have passed proficiency examinations in such fundamentals as spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, sentence structure, and grammar—in the same sense that engineering graduates be proficient in such fundamentals as mathematics

and that medical graduates must be proficient in such fundamentals as chemistry and biology; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all other State newspaper organizations, to the National Editorial Association, and to all schools of journalism.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas there are now on the statute books of the State of Arizona laws pertaining to libel which do not give adequate protection to the public; and

Whereas the newspapers, radio, and television are most important mediums through which the public may be protected against the results of honest mistakes in connection with published materials which may be alleged to be libelous; and

Whereas these mediums, individually and collectively, have traditionally held the viewpoint that the best interests of all concerned would best be served if they were permitted to atone for mistakes by means of adequate retraction of stories and statements published in good faith and later found to be erroneous: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association support legislation before the 23d Arizona State Legislature providing that news-distributing mediums may not be accused of compounding libel, by publishing retractions in as prominent a position and with the same or greater prominence as the originally published material.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas there continues to be an ever-mounting number of instances in government where officials restrict freedom of information; and

Whereas some public agencies continue to hold secret or closed meetings from which the public and the press are excluded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association go on record opposing limitations placed by public governmental agencies on freedom of information; and be it further

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association go on record supporting legislation now before the 23d Arizona Legislature which would prohibit the holding of secret meetings by public agencies.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas the success of the 18th annual convention of the Arizona Newspapers Association has been largely dependent on the cooperation and work of many individuals, groups, business firms, and organizations; and

Whereas it is the intent as well as the custom of this association to express appreciation to those who contribute to the success of our annual meeting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association express its thanks and appreciation to the following for their contributions to the enjoyment, smooth operation, and success of the 18th annual convention of the association:

Federated Metals division, American Smelting & Refining Co.; First National Bank of Arizona; A. E. Heinsohn Printing Machinery & Supplies; Jones Graphic Products; Arizona Public Service; Intertype Corp.; Valley National Bank; Blake, Moffitt & Towne; Butler Paper Co.; Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph; PBSW Supply & Equipment; Zellerbach Paper Co.; California Ink Co.; Graham Paper Co.; Mergenthaler Linotype; Standard Oil Company of California; Phoenix Gazette; Arizona Republic; California Newspaper Publishers Association, Inc.; Western Society of Business Publications; Los Angeles Club of Printing House Craftsmen; Santa Fe; Powell River Sales Corp.; Arizona Public Service; Westward Ho Hotel; Tempe Daily News; Orpheus Club; guest speakers, Howard N. King, James Russell Wiggins, Governor MacFarland, Senator Goldwater, Lawrence Wallace, Dick O'Malley, Everett M. Remsburg, Elmer Wolfer, Seymour C. Sterling, James Minotto, John Herbert, George Duncan; ANA committees, panel members, and association officers; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the association write a letter of appreciation to each of those named above, and that this resolution be spread on the permanent minutes of the association.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the Arizona Newspapers Association has had an interesting and important history of some 18 or more years; and

Whereas there is not now a consecutive or organized record of the operations, achievements, and activities of the association; and

Whereas it would be to the advantage of the association to have an organized history of the association, including the detailed minutes of its activities, both as an organization and through its board of directors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association instruct its board of directors to investigate the possibility of creating the office of historian for the association, and outlining the duties of such office.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas there is a growing tendency toward organizational and national restrictions and prohibitions on advertising of various kinds; and

Whereas professional associations and Federal agencies are the greatest offenders in this regard; and

Whereas this growing practice threatens the wellbeing of members of this association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association board of directors take appropriate action to inform such associations and agencies, and the general public, that it is opposed to such restrictions and prohibitions on all types of advertising.

RESOLUTION 8

Whereas many communities in Arizona served by weekly and smaller daily newspapers have been built, and do now continue to depend upon tourism for a substantial percentage of their overall economy; and

Whereas the future of this segment of income is seriously threatened and jeopardized in the construction program of the Interstate and Defense Highways System because of certain standards adopted by the United States Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce, application of which will cause many communities in Arizona to be bypassed by these highways, and numerous roadside business concerns face extinction because of the controlled access provisions of Public Law 627; and

Whereas the financial injury and damage threatened to these communities and roadside businesses pose a threat, not only to the future economic welfare of community newspapers, but to the overall economy of the entire State of Arizona: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Newspapers Association in its 18th annual convention assembled in Phoenix, Ariz., call upon Arizona's Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert influence possible to have Public Law 627 amended to permit amendment, modification, or change in the uniform standards of the United States Bureau of Public Roads to accommodate the different conditions throughout Western States that will permit the highest possible economic advantages to continue to accrue to these roadside businesses, communities, and, therefore, the overall economy of the entire State of Arizona as prevails at present, and may be expected to continue in the future.

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Arizona Newspapers Association that there is now pending in the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate S. 963;

Whereas S. 963 would ban outdoor advertising from the Interstate Highway System; and

Whereas we feel that this is an undue restriction on advertising and an invasion of States' rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arizona Newspapers Association, That they go on record as opposing the passage of S. 963, or that part of it dealing with advertising and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator CARL HAYDEN and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and that copies also be sent to the members of the Arizona delegation in the House.

VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 4, I introduced S. 3227, a bill to provide for voluntary unionism in the United States. My reason for introducing this measure is that I feel that individual union members are being subjected to economic and political pressure by certain unscrupulous labor leaders. I have often been criticized as a conservative by labor leaders for my stand on voluntary unionism. It is refreshing, therefore, to me to find that my position is receiving support from the so-called liberals in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a booklet which was recently published by the Fund for the Republic entitled "Unions and Union Leaders of Their Own Choosing." This booklet was written by Dr. Clark Kerr, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, Calif.

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

UNIONS AND UNION LEADERS OF THEIR OWN CHOOSING

(By Clark Kerr)

A quarter of a century ago in the United States the great issue in industrial relations was "unions of their own choosing." The country was in the depths of a profound depression, and a great ferment was in process. A new orientation of the American economy was in the making, an orientation toward full employment, Government-sponsored security for workers and farmers, Government regulation of business practices, and the creation of workers' organizations to balance the power of employers in the industrial labor markets of the Nation. The American economy, previously largely monistic in the management-labor area, in a few short years became pluralistic. Ranged alongside the power of the private employer was now the power of the State and the power of the union.

As it turned out, this new balance of power made less difference than once supposed, for the employers generally adapted quite well to the new situation and found they could prosper within it, but there was a new environment, largely set by Government, and within this new environment the employer faced the union as well as the individual employee. New unions came into being, and old ones found new life. Workers could vote unions and collective bargaining into their plants, and they did do so on a mass basis.

They chose to have unions, and they got them.

A quarter of a century later, today, unions are well established and secure in most major industries of the Nation. Their members number 18 million. They can close down even the giants of American industry—General Motors and United States Steel. They negotiate 100,000 contracts covering the working rules that guide and govern important aspects of the life of industrial men in nearly every trade and every industry and nearly every town. Income, leisure, job security, retirement, pace of work, job opportunities, discipline—all are affected by union participation in the rulemaking process. And union influence extends outside the industrial government of the Nation into its political processes, too. Unions affect the selection and the election of candidates. They are intimately woven into much of our economic and political life.

This quarter century has seen the great change in the power structure of our economy from monism to pluralism. It has seen new wealth, new security, new satisfaction for nearly all the people. It has seen the creation of a modern capitalism which can stand as a vital alternative in the great ideological, economic, scientific, and military contest that enthralls and engulfs the world—an alternative that has amply produced both goods and freedom. These developments in the United States have resulted in an acceptance of the surrounding society by its members which can hardly be matched in our earlier history or elsewhere in the world at any time in history. It is a society with consensus.

This consensus and the great achievements of the recent period should not obscure the fact that our society is still changing. Industrialization is new to the United States and to the world. The final form of the industrial society cannot yet be clearly seen. In particular, the ultimate adjustments between institutional power and individual choice within the State, the private economic organization, and the economic process (such as the labor market), are not yet settled and, of course, may never be in any final way. Many large and open, and even more small and silent, battles will be waged in the process of adjustment. Nor should this consensus and these achievements obscure the fact that all is not for the best even in the "bset of all possible worlds." There are no really dramatic internal crusades today either existing or needed; but there are reforms which are both needed and in the making. This discussion relates to one of them.

American government has been under critical scrutiny almost since the founding of the Nation. American industry was subjected to an intensive national review particularly in the 1930's. It had become big and powerful and sometimes corrupt. The great depression was laid at its doorstep since it was the most prominent doorstep around at the time. American unions are today undergoing similar scrutiny. They, in turn, have become big and powerful and sometimes corrupt.

It is said, by some, that only the unions can scrutinize themselves; that it is not the proper business of anybody else because they are private, voluntary associations. The corporations said this once, too, and they were scrutinized. And the unions will be, too. For, though they are private, their actions are clothed with the public interest; they affect the levels of wages and prices, the access of individuals to jobs, the volume and continuity of production, and many other important aspects of society. Also, they are seldom really voluntary. Even in the absence of the closed or union shop, social pressure often assures membership. Along with this external scrutiny, the unions should scrutinize themselves, and the more effectively they undertake this scrutiny (and they are doing suprisingly well) the less need there is for external examination and external reform. Our pluralistic system has three main organized elements, the State, the corporation, and the union. It is essential that each element function effectively, and consequently that each of them be subject to both internal and external criticism.

THE CENTRAL ISSUE—UNION IMPACT ON WORKER FREEDOM

Of the several issues involving labor today three are inherently simple issues. They are confined to specific segments of the labor movement but at the same time run to American life generally. These three issues are corruption, collusion, and violence.

Corruption exists and it is bad; but right and wrong are evident and hardly open to debate. Few unions are involved and other institutions in society have known and do know it also. Some remedies, including proper accounting procedures, are relatively easy to identify, although not always so easy to apply effectively.

Collusion also exists and it also is bad; but again the nature of virtue is not hard to define, although the line where it ends may be hard to draw in particular cases. (Virtue and the drawing of proper lines have met before on other stages.) Relatively few unions are affected and then nearly always jointly with their employers; and collusion, too, accompanies human nature almost throughout the span of social relationships.

Violence also is to be condemned. It has decreased greatly as a union tactic, however, and is subject to control by the many devices civilized man has created to insure law and order.

These are issues—they probably will be for a long time, and they deserve attention. But they are peripheral to the main controversy today.

The great current issue is the impact of the union on the freedom of the worker. This issue is not simple; it is most complex. It is one that runs through all or nearly all of the union movement and is central to its very existence. While not unknown as an issue in the spheres of government and the corporation, it is less intensely manifested there at the present time. Our Nation has had a long, successful experience in creating a democratic framework for our Government and protecting the liberties of individual citizens. Our corporations are not expected to be run on a democratic basis. They are founded on the model of the individual entrepreneur making his own decisions; and corporations seldom have either a captive labor force or captive consumers (when they do have captive consumers they are usually subject to State control).

The unions are different. They have not had, like our Government, a long and successful experience in developing a system of checks and balances, in limiting their sphere of endeavor, in defining and protecting the internal rights of their members. Unlike the corporation, they are founded on the assumption of internal democracy. They are associations of individuals, not collections of capital funds. Moreover, increasingly they have a captive membership. It is usually not possible for a union member just to withdraw in protest, without penalty, if he does not like the organization, its leaders, or its policy. We have here, most frequently, a more or less compulsory organization with substantial impact on the lives of its members.

American unions do make a major overall contribution to a democratic industrial society—this is the first and most important observation to be made about their impact on worker freedom. They usually create a two-party legislative system, governing the life of the workplace. In their absence, the rules would be set exclusively by the employer. Through the unions, the workers can have a direct influence on the nature of the rules under which they work. (Without a union they can also have an impact, by their choice of employers, but this is much less direct.) Also, unions usually insist on a grievance mechanism and this brings a judicial process into industrial life which is more impartial than when the employer sits as both prosecutor and judge. Beyond that, unions create a new power center which can, if it wishes, stand against the power centers of the State and the corporation, and these latter power centers have gained greatly in recent years in their absolute strength. A rough balance among private and public power centers is the essence of a pluralistic society, and a pluralistic society is the only firm foundation for democracy in an economy based on industrial production.

Thus the unions have generally brought a better legislative and judicial process into industrial life and a better balance among the power groups of society. They have done this without the consequences that were so feared in times just past. It was believed that industrial conflict would tear society apart; the fact is that industrial peace is now the commonplace, and, except for the few unions still under Communist domination, American unions most certainly contribute to the social stability and security of our whole system. It was feared that unions would hamper productive efficiency and stifle progress; undoubtedly many union rules do retard production but there is no evidence that the overall effect has been anything but relatively minor, and some new methods have been better received because of union consultation than they otherwise would have been in the light of the inherent conservatism of the workplace. It was feared that unions might distort interindustry wage structures and that their actions would assure wild inflation; in fact, it is one of the wonders of the economic world that unions have had so little effect on wage structures; and their impact on price levels, while open to dispute, has certainly been no more than moderate. The fears of costly social conflict, of strangled production, of rampant inflation because of unions have proved largely without substance.

But a fear does remain that unions may take too much freedom from the worker, and this fear may not prove so groundless. If they do, they will not be the only institutions in our mass society which have conduced toward conformity. Big unions, big corporations, big government, and small individuals seem to be the order of the day.

If freedom is defined as the absence of external restraint, then unions reduce freedom, for they restrain the worker in many ways. They help to establish formal wage structures, seniority rosters, work schedules, pace of output, and the pattern of occupational opportunities, all of which limit his freedom of choice. They decide when he shall strike and not strike. They are—and this is one of the essentials to an understanding of unionism—disciplinary agents within society. They add to the total network of discipline already surrounding the workers through the practices and rules of the employer. They, too, insist upon order and obedience. It is inherent in their very existence. Two bosses now grow where only one grew before.[1]

Some loss of freedom, however, is inevitable in an effective industrial system. It

[1] This is not to suggest that it is not often and perhaps almost always better to have two bosses rather than one, for the union boss may help liberate the worker from the unilateral rule of the employer boss; but the worker is still subject to a web of rules and this web tends to be more thickly woven as a result of the presence of the union.

will occur, more or less, whether the system is run by the employers alone, by the State alone, or even by the unions alone. Industrial society requires many rules and reasonable conformity to these rules. There must be a wage structure, a work schedule, and so forth, no matter who operates the system. This loss of freedom is one of the prices paid by man for the many benefits in income and leisure that can flow from industrial society. The challenge is that this price not be any higher than necessary. The issue lies in the "more or less." The loss of freedom of the industrial worker will be substantial, as compared with the self-employed farmer or craftsman, but it may be less rather than more; and unions can make it either less or more.

UNION DEMOCRACY—DIFFICULTIES, DETRIMENTS, VIRTUES

Before we can determine how the reduction of freedom may be less rather than more, three introductory observations should be made:

1. Democracy in unions is inherently difficult to achieve. A union is variously expected to be at one and the same time—as Muste[2] pointed out long ago—an army, a business, and a town meeting. Unions have usually ended up by being a business, serving the members but sometimes with those members having little more influence over the conduct of the business than stockholders have over a corporation. Unions have sometimes ended up as an army and have justified it, as Lloyd Fisher once remarked, in the terms the Communists have used to justify their "people's democracy," by reference to "capitalist encirclement." Unions have almost never ended up as a town meeting.

2. A good deal more democracy exists in unions than these comments and most outside observation would indicate. The national unions are the most visible entities and they are usually the least subject to democratic pressures. But at the local level, in many unions, there are contested elections, substantial turnover of officers, and face-to-face relations between members and leaders—here is the least entrenched bureaucracy. Particularly at the shop level, the relationship between shop stewards and workers is a responsive one. This local level is usually the most important to the workers. This is where he lives and where his grievances are handled.

3. It is sometimes argued that unions need not or even should not be democratic. Different reasons are given for this conclusion. One line of argument is that unions have become largely functionless organizations and nobody really cares whether they are democratic or not. The State guarantees full employment and social security, and the employer has been seduced by human relations. Consequently, the worker has a job—often paid above the contract rate—a pension, and a friend, perhaps even a psychiatrist; and there is nothing for the union to do.

Or, it is sometimes said, unions have become quasi-governmental bureaus. They help set minimum wages and schedules of hours, and they process grievances, as government bureaus sometimes do both here and abroad. Their work is largely routine and best handled in bureaucratic fashion; and so, again why worry about democracy? Occasionally it is also said, unions function best if they are removed from the pressures, of democratic life. They must respond to many pressures, not those of the membership alone but also the needs of the industry, the welfare of society, the concerns of other unions. They should take a longer view of events than the current membership is likely to take, for they are organizations with a continuing life. They will be more widely responsible to society and more businesslike in their operations if they are not subject to the demands and uncertainties of active democratic participation. The conclusion to this argument is that democracy causes internal and external strife and irresponsibility.

Each of these reasons has some point to it. Unions perform less of a function than they did 2 decades ago; their work has become more routine as pattern-following and grievance precedents have become established; and internal democracy can cause external trouble, particularly for employers.

But the case for democracy can still be persuasive. If democracy is a superior form of government, as most of us would insist, it should be preferred in practice wherever it is possible.

Second, the workers can have a more effective voice in industry if they have an effective voice in their unions; and they are more likely to be satisfied with society if they have a sense of participation.

Third, if the unions lose their responsiveness to the interest of the workers, an opportunity is created for other organized elements, more politically motivated, to move in to represent these interests, as has happened in certain European countries.

ONE-PARTY GOVERNMENT—THE UNION CASE

The overwhelming majority of all the organizations of man throughout history have been ruled by one-party governments. Most of the time in most parts of the world all organizations have been under one-party rule. In certain parts of the world at certain times in history there have been a few two-party (or multiparty) organizations; but one-party rule is the standard and wellnigh universal case. The trade union is no exception. The International Typographical Union is the single deviant specimen on a national level in the United States.

Even in the democratic United States, the corporation, the political party, the fraternal order, the religious denomination, the farm organization, the welfare group, the student government, are all one-party organizations. Only in the public area, where it is by all odds the most essential, do we have two-party government.

The neglect of the one-party model of government, in view of its significance, is astounding. The rare instances of two-party and multiparty government have attracted most of the study. Certainly two-party government, as Lipset[3] has persuasively argued, has much to recommend it. It provides criticism of the existing government, it makes ready an alternative government if the members want it, it reduces apathy, and does much else of value. But most men all of the time, and all men some of the time, function in one-party social organizations; and so do union members.

Why are unions one-party governments? There are several reasons. Partly, it is the requirement of unity in the face of external conflict. Partly, it is the control exercised by the leaders over the mechanism of the organization. But the answer lies much deeper than the fear of the enemy and the desires of the leaders. It is that there are no continuing conflicts except over ideology, and ideological conflicts tend to split unions rather than to create two-party systems within them. Witness the separate unions in several European countries and the split-off of Communist unions in the United States. Issues over wage increases, the handling of grievances, and so forth may lead to factions and leadership rivalry but not to two-party systems on a continuing basis.

Does one-party government mean that unions are inevitably undemocratic? If only two-party systems are really democratic, then the answer is obviously in the affirmative. But if organizations where the supreme power is retained by the members and which are reasonably responsive[4] to membership desires may be called democratic, even in the absence of a two-party system, then unions may be and many are democratic.

There are dangers in any one-party government[5] but the system may serve its members well. It is most likely to do so, however, in the long run, if it is under the proper pressures. Traditionally, this pressure on trade-union government in the United States has come from four sources, all of them, unfortunately, now largely of historical importance only. In the passing of these four sources of pressure lies much of our current problem.

1. When union membership was more voluntary, leaders had to be responsive to the workers to get and retain members and this was an effective check on authority. As noted earlier, union membership is now, one way or another, often compulsory, the law notwithstanding; and it is likely to become more so. Union security, with all its other advantages, and leadership responsiveness tend to move in somewhat opposite directions; the voluntary sale and the forced sale lead to different behavior in any walk of life. This is not to support voluntary membership through the compulsion of the State for it seems neither possible in many situations nor, on balance, wise.

2. When dual unionism, now largely a relic, was an active force, it had somewhat the same impact as voluntary membership. Not individuals but groups could and did shift allegiance, and this acted as a check and balance. The idea of one union in one jurisdiction, however, is so firmly embedded

[2] A. J. Muste, "Factional Fights in Trade Unions," in American Labor Dynamics, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1928.

[3] S. M. Lipset, M. Trow, and J. Coleman, Union Democracy, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1956.

[4] There are those, of course, who would argue that the proper test of an organization is not the degree of responsiveness to the needs of those involved, but rather the degree to which the persons involved actually and directly participate in the decision-making process. For them, only town-meeting democracy is fully satisfactory; and, given the nature of industrial society, their test can be met by very few consequential organizations. It should be noted that "responsiveness" is not only a different test from "participation" but is also different from the test of "performance." "Performance," in the sense of "bringing home the bacon," may be quite exceptional without, at the same time, having much connection with "responsiveness." "Performance" refers to results; "responsiveness," to the processes which connect leadership behavior with membership desires. Performance, however, may usually be expected to be superior in the long run where responsiveness exists; and this is one of the basic tenets of democratic thought. Perhaps it should also be noted that active participation, where it is possible, is often an effective means of assuring responsiveness but by no means guarantees such responsiveness; in fact, it can serve as a technique of control. The view taken here is that performance alone is not enough and that participation, as through a two-party system, is more than can be expected under the circumstances, and, consequently, that the appropriate test is responsiveness. Responsiveness rests on a minimum degree of participation and will yield, usually, a reasonable measure of performance.

[5] Particularly if there is no judicial protection against the use of arbitrary power, as is often the case. Due process can be as important as democratic assent to the leadership.

in American union philosophy that dual unionism can exist only sporadically and temporarily.

3. The more or less permanent faction, stopping short of a second party but hovering in the wings ready to rush out on any inappropriate occasion, was a check on the leadership in many unions. The old-line Socialists served this function for many years, but the New Deal and time brought their demise. The Catholic faction continues in a few unions, but usually only in those under leftwing control; otherwise there is little basis for a Catholic faction. There are few permanent factions today and fewer still in prospect.

4. The employer, particularly the recalcitrant employer, has historically been a check and balance on the union leadership. If the two organizations—the company and the union—appealing to the same constituency are in conflict, each will criticize the other and may even stand ready to try to destroy the other. But the day of fighting the unions is largely past, at least under conditions of full employment. The separation of interests between the leaders of the two organizations is decaying because industrial peace pays. Consequently, company pressure on most unions has been greatly reduced and in some instances has entirely disappeared.

UNION DEMOCRACY—THE POSSIBILITIES

With union membership increasingly compulsory, dual unionism declining, the permanent faction disappearing, and company opposition more rare, is there any hope for "democracy" or leadership responsiveness to membership interests in trade unions? There still is, for there are substitutes for these historical pressures. Six such possibilities will be suggested, with particular emphasis on the sixth.

1. Membership interest: Union memberships are traditionally apathetic except in some crisis, and very little can be done about it. Compulsory strike votes proved a farce in World War II and most bargaining issues cannot properly be put to membership vote. But some experiments might be undertaken with the polling of membership opinion, with advisory referendums, and even with the use of television as a way for leaders to reach members, who will seldom come to meetings.

2. Professional leaders: Much is written about management as a profession. Perhaps union leaders might also become professional in the sense that they might be specifically trained for their jobs and might develop an ethic to guide their conduct—an ethic which sets boundaries to their behavior. They might, like city managers, be specifically trained for their jobs and responsible to an elected governing board.

3. A new faith for the union movement: Certain leaders today, in unions where the last vestiges of active democracy disappeared long ago, still serve their members well because of their adherence to the old faith of the union movement. But the old faith attracts few new followers. It was a fighting faith that grew out of evil conditions for the workers and union-busting by the employers. The conditions which gave rise to it no longer exist in the United States, although they continue to a degree in England and Germany, there the old faith still sets standards for union leaders. The social reformer holds himself—and is held by his environment—to a higher code of conduct than the business leader of the business union who quickly takes on the coloration of the industry with which he deals. If its ethics are high, his will be also; if they are low, so are his. The business union is a segment of the business.

What might this new faith be? It cannot be either "more, more, more and now." It cannot be a vision of class conflict. It might lie, as suggested later, in the development of unions as a liberating force in industrial society; and this might carry the union leader more into the intellectual and less into the business community.

4. Local autonomy: Local unions, by their inherent nature, clearly can provide more opportunities for democratic participation by the members than can national unions. Consequently, the more autonomy there is at the local level, the greater the democratic life of the union movement is likely to be. The big drop in democratic participation comes in the move from the one-plant to the multiplant local or the district union. In the one-plant local, rival leaders can get known and be effective, issues can be discussed on a face-to-face basis, and democracy can be effective. In several European countries, for example, it is the local works council, with substantial powers, which arouses worker interest and participation. The multiplant unit serves the interests of the entrenched leadership in a most emphatic way. The one-plant local with real authority is the most democratic entity in the trade-union movement. Considerable constitutional reform in most unions would be prerequisite to effective single-plant locals. Among other things, the institution of the receivership by regional and national officials would need to be curtailed.

5. Union decertification: It is certainly desirable to continue some mechanism through which members can exercise an option in favor of another union, or of no union at all. Such an option will rarely be employed but it should be available. If it is available and is used occasionally, it can act as a minor check and balance on union leadership.

6. Discharge through rebellion: The two-party system within unions, as we have seen, is an historical oddity. The regularly contested election is a rarity. Yet union officials do get changed other than as a result of death or retirement. Union officials are, in effect, hired by the membership for the duration of their good behavior, as tested imprecisely by the membership. The trouble comes when they need to be fired. The mechanism then is a contested election in which the old leader is voted out of office. For such a contested election to take place two prerequisites are necessary: (1) It must be possible for a faction to form and for its members to be reasonably free from retaliation through the operation of an impartial judicial process; and (2) there must be secret elections at appropriate intervals. Other actors must be allowed to stand in the wings and be permitted to move on stage when the audience calls them. The dissatisfied individual and the antagonistic faction must be given an opportunity.

The term "competitive discharge" might be used in the sense that the leader is subject to constant evaluation by the members and is also subject to discharge through the process of electing a competitor who is free to appear when the conditions warrant.[6] In the two-party system the question is as to the better person; in the competitive discharge case, it is whether the incumbent should be fired or not.[7] Deposed union leaders usually feel—and they are right—that they have been fired, not that they have been defeated. Among other things, they almost never seek election again once they have been discharged. They are like the old bull in the buffalo herd brought to his knees by the young challenger.

If trade-union democracy is defined as a system of government where the supreme power is largely retained by the members and can be exercised by them in an emergency at any and all levels, then the effective right of competitive discharge, by itself, is a sufficient basis for trade-union democracy. The essential feature of a trade-union constitution is whether it guarantees this right of competitive discharge. This is the most we can reasonably expect, and it is also probably enough.

THE NEW INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM?

The central issue presented earlier was the impact of unionism on worker freedom. This issue goes beyond the internal relationship of leader to member, which we have just been discussing, to the rules the union makes or helps to make affecting the life of the worker as worker and to the span of activity of the union.

Industrial society, as we have noted, requires a great web of rules to bind people together and to secure their cooperative performance within an extraordinarily complex and interrelated productive mechanism. And the burden of these rules on the individual can vary quite substantially. It can be comparatively heavy or comparatively light.

If it is to be comparatively light, two principles are basic. First, the rules should provide the maximum power of individual choice consistent with efficient production, the greatest possible provision to move freely within limits set by the imperatives of industrial society itself. Second, each institution should be narrowly oriented toward its primary function, whether that function is production of goods, or representation of economic interest, or the salvation of souls. The individual will have greater freedom if the span of control of each institution with which he is associated is relatively narrow. The institution which encompasses the totality of the life of the individual can subject him to its power and control in a way no limited-function institution can.

The power to do as one pleases, which is the essence of freedom, rests on rules with broad limits and institutions with narrow limits. One of the great and continuing, and even eternal, challenges of industrial society is to construct the society in such a way as to increase to the highest possible degree not only the wealth of the world but also the freedom of man.

These general principles also apply to unions. The rules unions make or join in making can influence a large part of the occupational life of an individual. To begin with, all unions should be open unions, open to everyone without discrimination except on

---

[6] In one major Icelandic union, for example, this principle is explicitly recognized, rather than camouflaged. The incumbent officers are automatically reelected at each contract reopening period (if the stated election time may be so designated), unless a certain number of members petition for the placing of an opposition slate on the ballot, in which event a contested election is conducted. More common practice in the United States is to go through the formality of an election each time, but an opposition candidate will appear and the election will be contested usually only if the incumbent is in an unfavorable position.

[7] Such a question is most likely to be raised in an urgent fashion at the time of a crisis (a strike, an attack by a rival union, an unsuccessful wage negotiation, the disclosure of misuse of funds, etc.). Such crises hold within themselves the possibilities of constructive democratic action, if a minimum of democratic machinery is available; otherwise an open revolt, usually taking the form of the organization of a rival union, is the only alternative, and a very difficult one. Unfortunately, under the competitive discharge system an ineffective leader can retain his position much longer (i. e., until a crisis creates the condition for his downfall) than he could under the competitive election system. The machinery which is used to handle the competitive discharge can, of course, also be employed to handle the problem of replacement after the death of a leader.

the grounds of ability to perform the work. Additionally, the rules governing a man's working life should give him the greatest freedom of choice inside the union. Illustrations from three important areas will indicate the possibilities:

1. Seniority rights are important in almost all areas of human relationships. They are the basis for settling many problems; but they can be a prison too. Some unions allow the transfer of seniority rights from one place of employment to another, or permit some percentage of positions (in one case every fourth position) to be filled outside of local seniority lists. Such arrangements increase a man's opportunity to move around.

2. Private pension plans often have no vesting provisions and this tends to tie the worker for life to a single place of employment. His status becomes not unlike that of the serf on the manor tied to his lord, who in the modern case may be plural—the company and the union. Reasonable vesting rights aid the mobility and thus the freedom of workers.

3. Hours of work must be scheduled, but these schedules can provide for local option by individual groups of workers instead of a uniform national schedule. (A local group may prefer one holiday to another, or longer vacations and as a consequence longer hours per week.) Schedules can provide some part-time jobs for the aged or for women, or for men who want a second job. Developing an appropriate balance between time spent on earning income and time spent on leisure is an important aspect of welfare in any society, and it can best be done on an individual basis. The opportunities for experiment in this area are great.

Unions, like many other institutions, often seek to extend their sphere of activity until it covers more and more of the life of their members, not only as workers but also as consumers and citizens. If the limited-function corporation and the limited-function state and the limited-function church are desirable, so also is the limited-function union. Union paternalism (housing projects, vacation resorts, recreation facilities) has little more to recommend it than employer paternalism. Union political activity, while inevitable and often desirable, should not infringe on the rights of the member as citizen.[8] He should not be required to support, financially or otherwise, a political party or candidate not of his own choice. The union should find its primary function in relating to the worker as worker, not also as consumer and as citizen.

Trade unions have historically been fighting organizations. They have emphasized unity within their own circles and the standard rate in the labor market. But now they are established, secure, and accepted. Full employment in the economy and grievance machinery in the plant give the individual worker a status largely unknown 25 years ago. The union attitude of limited class warfare directed at the surrounding society and of discipline directed at the individual member is no longer required by the new situation.

Might the unions turn their attention from the old slogans and the old dogmas, and undertake a new orientation toward their role in industrial society? This new role might well be that of a liberating force in industrial society, of a force helping to build a type of industrialization which would meet the desires of the single individual as well as of the organized group. This would be a mission the employers might well join, for they too have pressed for conformity and against individuality among the workers.

THE WORKER, THE UNION, THE STATE

The title of this paper suggests that national policy might move from the "unions of their own choosing" of the 1930's to "union leaders of their own choosing" and even, to a degree, to "union rules of their own choosing." But how is this to be accomplished? Action by the unions themselves would be most desirable and there has been a surprising amount of it during the past year. Experience here and abroad, however, suggests it will not be sufficient, that behind the good intentions of most union leaders will need to stand the power of the law, as in the case of corporations in the past.

This is a troublesome issue. The pluralist will defend the private association from the control of the State. The individual, however, also needs defense against being controlled by the private government of the trade union, and ultimately this defense can be guaranteed only by the State. If the State is to interfere in the internal life of trade unions—as it does significantly already[9]—then it is important that this interference be wisely conceived, for the power to control is the power to destroy. Unions should in no way be destroyed as independent power centers. Clyde Summers has recently suggested[10] four guidelines for such interference and each one seems worthy of consideration: (1) it should be minimal, (2) it should be segregated from laws on other matters, (3) it should encourage responsible self-regulation by the unions, and (4) it should be enforcible.

In this discussion of the impact of unions on the freedom of the workers, six aspects of the problem were particularly emphasized; local union autonomy, a new faith for the union movement, secret elections of officers, independent judicial processes, permissive rules on entry to the union and on movement within industry, and narrow limits to union functions. Four of these areas may lend themselves properly to legislation:

1. In Australia,[11] union members can, under certain circumstances, ask the State for the conduct of secret elections of officers.

2. Again in Australia and to an increasing extent in the United States, union members can appeal to the courts for protection against retaliation for internal political dissent. In this connection the private external review boards of the Upholsterer's Union and the United Automobile Workers are a most interesting device, paralleling private arbitration of grievances against companies.[12]

3. Protection from discrimination in getting into a union, as well as in getting a job, is already provided in some States. Such provisions call for the open union instead of the open shop.

4. Prohibition of compulsory political contributions is now provided in both the United States and Great Britain.

Adequate legislation in these four areas would assure a reasonable degree of democracy and of individual freedom. Beyond what the law might require, many unions have provided and may provide considerably more democratic life and individual liberty. The ethical practices committee of the AFL–CIO has made a substantial contribution in these directions.

The trade unions are going through a period of crisis. This crisis originates as much from self-examination by labor leaders as from the more obvious external criticisms. Out of this crisis may well come more representative government within unions and more rights for the individual worker. Since unions are an important element in our pluralistic society, their effective functioning is a contribution to the national welfare. As an element of a democratic society, they should be responsive to their members. As an element of a society founded on the significance of the individual, they should contribute to his freedom. "More, more, more, and now" is no longer enough.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Arizona Republic of Tuesday, January 21, 1958, entitled "On the Right Track." I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by Mr. Victor Riesel dated February 10, 1958, which refers to the booklet written by Dr. Kerr.

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

[From the Arizona Republic of January 21, 1958]

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

The Fund for the Republic, operating under a grant from the Ford Foundation, has been studying "the basic issues underlying a free society." Since Robert M. Hutchins is president of the fund and such liberals as Herbert Lehman and Paul Hoffman are on the board of directors, the organization can hardly be accused of being a tool of the reactionaries.

One of the fund's latest studies is entitled "Unions and Union Leaders of Their Own Choosing." It was written by Clark Kerr, president-elect of the University of California and an expert in the labor-management field.

Mr. Kerr has reached some conclusions that union leaders won't like. He says unions are ruled by one-party governments, that they increasingly have captive memberships, and that they are, most frequently, compulsory organizations. All of which adds up to a loss of freedom for the union member. How to minimize this loss of freedom is the problem tackled by Mr. Kerr.

Since it is almost impossible to stir up voting interest in any one-party system, Mr. Kerr holds out little hope of the union ballot box as a means of democratizing the unions. However, he does suggest that union members must be "reasonably free from retaliation through an impartial judicial system" and "there must be secret elections at appropriate intervals." This allows the members to exercise a "competitive discharge" of a leader they no longer want, even though it is unlikely that two continuing factions will seek to run the union.

One way to give workers more freedom, it seems to us, is to put an end to compulsory unionism. If a worker is free to join or not to join a union, as provided in Arizona's right-to-work law, he obviously is freer than if he has to join the union and pay dues in order to get a job.

Although Mr. Kerr is opposed to right-to-work legislation, he says: "It is certainly

[8] The traditional union political activities in the United States—lobbying in regard to legislation affecting unions and workers as workers, and distribution of informational data on the record of candidates in the same areas—do not interfere with the rights of the union member as citizen. Compulsory political levies and political strikes do interfere with these rights, and also with the proper functioning of a democratic society.

[9] For a recent review of current American practice see J. T. Dunlop, "The Statutory Regulation of Internal Union Government," 1957.

[10] "Legislating Union Democracy," paper presented to annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, September 1957. See also comments by Dunlop, op. cit., and in "The Public Interest in Internal Affairs of Unions," 1957.

[11] See L. S. Merrifield, "Regulation of Union Elections in Australia," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, January 1957.

[12] The encouragement of the establishment of such private judicial processes better fits a pluralistic society with its independent power centers than the institution of a public labor court approach, as in Germany.

desirable to continue some mechanism through which members can exercise an option in favor of another union, or of no union at all." He also says: "Union political activity * * * should not infringe on the rights of the member as a citizen. He should not be required to support, financially or otherwise, a political party or candidate not of his own choice."

We think Mr. Kerr is on the right track. We have never questioned the fact that unions are here to stay, nor have we doubted their ability to contribute to the progress of the Nation. But compulsory unionism is not in accord with basic American beliefs. It is refreshing to find Mr. Kerr and the Fund for the Republic coming out squarely for democratization of the unions.

The Kerr report should have considerable impact on Congress, which will consider labor-management legislation at this session. The report cannot be considered unfriendly, but it does insist that "behind the good intentions of most union leaders will need to stand the power of the law." Congress will be making an important contribution to the welfare of the Nation's working men and women if it moves ahead in the directions suggested by Mr. Kerr.

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

First prize for identifying the following quote will be an exact replica of the bent wire in the first stage of the last Vanguard rocket. If you identify the writer do not rush to New York for the stack of giveaways; stay where you are. You are sufficiently well informed to make a fortune in the labor relations business. Says the quote:

"American unions are today undergoing * * * scrutiny. They * * * have become big and powerful and sometimes corrupt.

"It is said, by some, that only the unions can scrutinze themselves; that it is not the proper business of anybody else because they are private, voluntary associations. The corporations said this once too, and they were scrutinized. And the unions will be too.

"For, though they are private, their actions are clothed with the public interest; they affect the levels of wages and prices, the access of individuals to jobs, the volume and continuity of production, and many other aspects of society.

"Also, they are seldom really voluntary."

Since it originally stumped this expert, I rush to report that it comes from a booklet which has been causing much disturbance in labor's inner sanctums. The booklet is entitled "Unions and Union Leaders of Their Own Choosing." Its conclusions would have been enough to provoke some curbstone cussing. But this was compounded by the fact that it was published and widely distributed in intellectual circles by the Fund for the Republic headed by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. The fund can hardly be mistaken for a brother organization to the National Association of Manufacturers.

Furthermore, this sharp outcry for union democracy—written in the fullest sense of old-fashioned crusading pamphleteering—is the work of Clark Kerr, chancellor of the University of California. If Dr. Kerr needs any other imprimatur as a friend and sympathizer of labor, it need only be reported that he was one of the first chosen by Walter Reuther to serve on the United Automobile Workers' public review board.

This is a seven-man committee of nationally prominent citizens to which any auto worker can turn for help if he feels he has been denied his rights inside the giant auto union.

Dr. Kerr, therefore, is certainly grinding no one's philosophical ax when he says:

"The unions are different [from corporations—V. R.]. They have not had, like our Government, a long and successful experience in developing a system of checks and balances in limiting their sphere of endeavor, in defining and protecting the internal rights of their members. Unlike the corporation, they are founded on the assumption of internal democracy.

"They are associations of individuals, not collections of capital funds. Moreover, increasingly they have a captive membership. It is usually not possible for a union member just to withdraw in protest, without penalty, if he does not like the organization, its leaders or its policy.

"We have here most frequently, a more or less compulsory organization with substantial impact on the lives of its members."

It is precisely the friendship of this author which makes AFL–CIO chiefs so sensitive to his recommendations and has begun to awaken in them—as it did this past week in their executive council session in Miami Beach—a feeling that the all-out-for-labor intellectual has finally revolted. Dr. Kerr's proposals not only startled the national labor leaders but have also had their impact on pro-labor Congressmen.

Dr. Kerr, for example, believes that unions should adopt a sort of city manager plan. The elected union chief can be the equivalent of a mayor, but there should be an independent professional director or administrator to run the union's affairs.

Furthermore, the fund's report calls for a system in which the membership should have the right to vote itself out of an old union into a new one—or out of organized labor entirely. Dr. Kerr insists that it should be realized that, theoretically, union officials are hired by their membership—and the rank and file should absolutely have the right, without restraint, to fire such officials by voting them out of office.

As the McClellan committee turns to new exposures of Midwest gangsterism, labor's responsible leaders realize that they must move, too, to retain old friends.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Apropos of my statement that individual union members are often not well represented by their leadership, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, November 20, 1956, entitled "The Unions Take a Look at Themselves." I particularly call attention to this article because it is a survey that was made by the unions themselves, and some of the answers to questions which were asked these union members are particularly significant at this time.

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

THE UNIONS TAKE A LOOK AT THEMSELVES

(By John Herling)

A study of the attitudes of thousands of union members indicates why many of their national leaders may start reexamining their relations with the rank and file.

Every leader—from President Eisenhower down—is confronted with the problem of finding out what people think, and conversely, how to get them to understand what he thinks. Business leaders and union leaders are no exception. The growth and size of their organizations have created unprecedented problems of internal organization.

That's why the University of Minnesota set a team of experts to work in the field of labor relations to find out what union members and union officials think about their organizations.

This depth study affecting the "communication" lines inside the union was conducted by Walter H. Uphoff and associates among local unions, with total memberships of 14,000, in the Middle West and on the west coast.

THE LIST

Local officers and the membership of the following unions were studied: the auto workers, the gas, coke, and chemical workers, grain millers, lithographers, machinists, meatcutters, office workers, retail clerks, sheet-metal workers, tool and die workers, and woodworkers. About 1,250 answers were analyzed.

Here are some of the key statements presented to the workers in the study and the experts' comments on their reaction:

"If it were not for unions, we'd have little protection against favoritism on the job."

The great majority felt a union tends to provide protection against favoritism on the job. When taking the entire group (local officers and rank and file) and examining it on the basis of years of union membership, the data showed 74 percent of those who had been a member for 1 year or less giving favorable responses. But this percentage increased to 90 percent for persons with 10 to 14 years' membership and dropped slightly to 88 percent for those with over 15 years' membership in their union.

"I think the best man should be kept on the job regardless of seniority."

On this item 59 percent of the officers and 44 percent of the rank and file disagreed with the statement; they favored seniority. When the entire group was examined on the basis of years of union membership, only 33 percent of the workers with a year or less of membership and correspondingly low seniority rights disagreed. Apparently many who have not been on the job long enough to acquire much seniority are in favor of keeping the best man on the job. But as seniority rights increase, so does the percentage of responses favorable to the union.

"Employees of a firm have better wages and working conditions when all of them belong to a union."

On this item almost all who responded (94 percent of officers and 88 percent of rank and file) agreed that a union shop makes for better wages and working conditions. Even 85 percent of those with less than 1 year of membership agreed.

"We need more laws to limit the power of labor unions."

A total of 82 percent of the officers and 58 percent of the rank and file disagreed with this statement, while 21 percent of the rank and file agreed and 21 percent were undecided.

"Workers should have to join a union in order to hold a job."

Although the union members included many who were members by virtue of the fact they worked at a plant covered by a union shop clause, 77 percent of the officers and only 51 percent of the rank and file agreed with the above sentiment. In this case 38 percent of the rank and file disagreed and 12 percent were undecided. Again a higher proportion of those with more years of union membership were favorable than those who have joined more recently.

"In case of a strike I'm sure we'd stick together."

Although over two-thirds of both officers and rank-and-file members agreed with this item, the proportion of undecided was 16 percent and 23 percent, respectively.

"It is practically impossible to elect different officers in our national union."

This is another item where the percentage of undecided is very high (28 percent for the officers and 48 percent for the rank and file). How easy or difficult it is to change officers of national unions varies from union to union. On this item a larger proportion, 21 percent of the officers, who are generally better informed, agreed as compared to 16 percent of the rank and file.

"I regard my union dues as a good investment."

Ninety-five percent of officers and 82 percent of the rank-and-file members agree—

a high percentage favorable response when considering the fact that the random samples on which these results are based included many inactive union members.

"My union spends too much time and money on political action."

The question of how much time and money should be spent on political action is of interest to many people, both in and outside the labor movement. Sixty-five percent of the officers and 45 percent of the rank and file did not believe too much time and money was spent on political action. In fact, these favored such expenditures. But 55 percent of the rank and file opposed such expenditures—or were not sure about the time and money paid out for such activities. The younger members think too much time and money is spent on such activities. The older and more experienced members do not.

SOUTH DAKOTA IS BRIGHT SPOT ECONOMICALLY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to have my colleague from Arizona point out that in Arizona there is a good economic situation and that there is much confidence in the capacity of that State to move ahead. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that Arizona is not the only State in the West which has confidence in the present and faith in the future.

I hold in my hand a survey which has just been completed by the director of the bureau of business research of the University of South Dakota. Director V. E. Montgomery points out that 8 out of 10 business indicators, carefully weighed and analyzed, were higher by an average of 4 percent in South Dakota in 1957 than they were in 1956.

I sympathize with those of my colleagues who have had to rise and say that their States are in the doldrums, that they appear to have run their course, and that they are moving backward instead of forward. In Memphis, Tenn., the streets are full of people in the breadlines, according to the reports which I read in the RECORD, but certainly that is not a universal situation, and my sympathies flow out to Memphis and to Tennessee.

I invite the attention, however, of those who are looking for places to establish new industries to the fact that South Dakota is in a strong economic position. South Dakota, according to the indicators used by those who analyze business trends, is an inviting area into which to move. It is indeed the opportunity State.

I call attention, for example, to the fact that the last issue of the U. S. News & World Report lists unemployment statistics by States in the United States. These statistics can be read both numerically and percentagewise. I am happy to point out that there is less unemployment in South Dakota, both percentagewise and numerically, than in any other State in the Union, according to this report in U. S. News & World Report.

I think it is good to know that there are areas in the country today into which investment capital can move with confidence. There are areas in the country where there is opportunity for those who wish to establish branch plants, to locate in bustling cities, towns, and communities in South Dakota where they will be welcomed and which are facing the future with confidence. There is no pessimism about the future in South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Reports Show South Dakota Is Bright Spot," published in the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of February 26, 1958.

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

REPORTS SHOW SOUTH DAKOTA IS BRIGHT SPOT

Well-documented reports indicate that South Dakota is one of the economic bright spots in a Nation beset by "recession" jitters.

Reliable indexes from the business research bureau at the University of South Dakota, figures from the State-Federal Crop and Livestock Reporting Service and personal interviews and correspondence with farmers, businessmen, laborers, and government officials point to a quite substantial upswing in economic conditions in 1957 when compared with 1956.

"Nor can any valid foundation be laid for a pessimistic outlook in South Dakota this year," according to F. K. (Fritz) Olsen, Belle Fourche, who has made a 2-month study of the State's economy in the preparation of a March 11 24-page supplement to be distributed by the American-News and 12 other State newspapers.

Eight of 10 business indicators, carefully weighed by Director V. E. Montgomery, of the Business Research Bureau, were higher by an average of 4 percent in 1957 than in 1956.

Reversing the national trend, total income from the State's 62,500 farms also was greater than a year earlier. Grain stocks on farms generally are higher than the 1947–56 average with corn and hay supplies at record levels. Livestock is in an unusually strong position, both as to condition and the market price.

"If there are any soft spots in the State's overall economy they are in department store sales and construction, now in the off season. Even in these two fields, there is cause for optimism, based on individual wholesaler and retailer reports and the anticipated sharp expansion of highway construction when weather permits," Olsen said.

Bank debits of 17 reporting banks, life insurance sales, deposits in 138 State banks, and electric power consumption hit record high levels in South Dakota in 1957 while new car and truck sales, the 12-month department store sales, telephones in service and gross postal receipts were ahead of 1956.

Visiting each of the 13 cities from which the supplement will be issued, Olsen found convincing evidence that the accelerated industrial development program is making progress toward the goal of balancing South Dakota's predominately agricultural economy and providing more and more employment for farmers who are abandoning uneconomical units, and farm laborers who have been displaced by mechanization.

"City-by-city reports in the Associated Press survey of general economic conditions certainly substantiate the optimistic summary that will be presented in the Progress Supplement on March 11," Olsen said. "A few well-placed tranquilizers until the normal spring upswing in agricultural and construction employment seem more in order than any of the proposed Federal pump-priming at high cost to the taxpayers."

The supplement will be distributed to regular subscribers and with newsstand sales at the Aberdeen American-News, Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Rapid City Daily Journal, Mitchell Daily Republic, Huron Daily Plainsman, Watertown Public Opinion, Yankton Press and Dakotan, Pierre Capital Journal, Madison Daily Leader, Deadwood Pioneer Times, Lead Daily Call, Belle Fourche Daily Post and Brookings Register.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the analysis made by U. S. News & World Report.

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

Pay for the unemployed: How much, for how long

In—	Number drawing unemployment pay [1]	Average weekly unemployment pay [2]	Maximum duration in weeks of unemployment pay for a worker
Alabama	44,021	$22.84	20
Arizona	11,464	27.03	26
Arkansas	27,356	19.80	18
California	277,959	32.13	26
Colorado	14,542	31.95	26
Connecticut	58,949	33.59	26
Delaware	6,139	30.04	26
Florida	25,494	23.87	16
Georgia	43,770	23.47	22
Idaho	11,907	34.21	26
Illinois	152,693	30.76	26
Indiana	85,007	29.24	20
Iowa	20,615	26.47	24
Kansas	19,042	28.34	20
Kentucky	51,356	25.19	26
Louisiana	25,744	23.09	20
Maine	21,918	21.98	26
Maryland	44,322	31.22	26
Massachusetts	109,155	31.33	26
Michigan	189,850	35.29	26
Minnesota	53,370	28.16	26
Mississippi	23,717	21.18	20
Missouri	57,281	25.39	26
Montana	16,525	28.12	22
Nebraska	11,819	27.21	20
Nevada	7,117	38.71	26
New Hampshire	10,040	23.03	26
New Jersey	141,698	32.41	26
New Mexico	6,649	25.90	24
New York	343,397	31.22	26
North Carolina	62,049	19.70	26
North Dakota	7,264	27.56	20
Ohio	181,705	32.70	26
Oklahoma	22,666	25.14	26
Oregon	46,138	34.46	26
Pennsylvania	299,832	29.67	30
Rhode Island	27,633	28.05	26
South Carolina	22,930	21.85	22
South Dakota	4,120	24.81	20
Tennessee	66,880	23.46	22
Texas	60,813	24.13	24
Utah	11,803	31.23	26
Vermont	6,613	24.60	26
Virginia	31,358	23.49	18
Washington	71,386	30.02	26
West Virginia	39,707	24.26	24
Wisconsin	49,840	31.99	26½
Wyoming	4,306	32.46	26
District of Columbia	9,449	26.63	26
Alaska [3]	5,821	36.78	26
Hawaii [3]	3,582	27.30	20

[1] Week ended Feb. 1, 1958.
[2] For those totally unemployed.
[3] December average.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it is not true that there is a right-to-work law in his State?

Mr. MUNDT. There is a right-to-work law in South Dakota. The right-to-work provisions of the law, as a matter of fact, were established in the constitution of South Dakota by a statewide referendum. South Dakota, under Gov. Joe Foss, also enjoys sound State government; it has no State debt; it has no State income tax and its climate is

as inviting as its tax structure and its financial condition. We invite all those who enjoy the company of forward looking progressive people to invest with us in go-ahead, get-things-done South Dakota.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to comment that the State of Arizona also has a right-to-work law as a part of its constitution. Arizona is the second fastest growing industrial State in the Nation, and the second fastest growing State populationwise. I should also like to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota the fact that his State is well up in the economic indexes of the country, which further refutes the claims of persons who would trample on the freedom of the people, and who claim that right-to-work laws are injurious.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure that the people of Arizona, like the people of South Dakota, realize that the way to progress in any State is to get one's face away from the wailing wall and his foot on the highway of progress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And his fingers in his bootstraps, pulling.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Reporter Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times, has written an article which appeared in the March 2 issue of the Times, which strikes at the very heart of the real problem involving regulatory agencies. The Lewis article is based on a survey of lawyers who have appeared before the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. President, this article is the most damning indictment of governmental incompetence and irresponsibility that I have read in a long time. Mr. Lewis does not indulge in personalities. He does not charge dishonesty and corruption. He makes a far more important case against the Federal Communications Commission. His article shows that the Commission has even lost the respect, indeed has even earned the contempt, of the lawyers who practice before it, including, Mr. President, the notable winners of important television cases.

This article points out that exhaustive hearings are held before professional, nonpolitical Federal Communications Commission examiners, who generally do a good job. But after the examiner makes his decision, the Commission has little or no respect for the examiner's findings; but, Mr. President, the Commissioners almost never look at the record. To make the situation even worse, the Commissioners avoid the wise requirement in law that a judge justify his decision in an opinion signed by himself, as an essential protection against arbitrariness. Mr. Lewis points out that the Commissioners simply vote for one applicant or another. A staff of opinion writers then think up the reasons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of March 1, 1958]

LAWYERS DEPLORE FCC PROCEDURE IN DECIDING CASES

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—The uproar over influence peddling at the Federal Communications Commission has obscured so far the broader question that set off a Congressional investigation: How well are the regulatory agencies doing their job?

No one is in a better position to answer the question than the lawyers who regularly handle cases before the agencies. Their answer, sounded out in an informal survey, is a unanimous thumbs down on the FCC and strong criticism of other agencies.

The lawyers seem less disturbed about the specific problem of influence at the FCC than about the whole process of decision—the series of steps that ends, for example, with someone getting a television channel.

"It's a fraud on the public," one distinguished lawyer says.

He is one of several lawyers who have been discouraging clients from getting into the race for television channels.

"The heartache and the headache and the time are just not worth it," one man explains. Another says that the process at the FCC is so irrational that, in self-respect, he can no longer pretend to advise clients on how to win a case.

The lawyers' criticism is the more telling because it comes from notable winners of important television cases as well as from losers. Even some lawyers, regarded by their colleagues as having political pull at the FCC, have little good to say of the Commission.

The criticism does not necessarily go to personalities. Some lawyers do think some Commissioners have not been up to their jobs in recent years. But others believe the Commissioners are simply the victims of an evil system that they inherited.

One way to explain the general disrespect for the way things work at the FCC is to measure that process against an ideal.

A decision by a judge or quasi-judge, lawyers have said, should ideally be prompt, impartial, based on the record in the case, reasonably predictable (that is, related to precedent), and persuasively reasoned by the judge in an opinion. The critics find fault with the FCC on each of these characteristics.

No one would claim promptness as a Commission virtue. Contested television cases take up to 5 years for decision. A Pittsburgh channel authorized in 1952, for example, just recently went on the air.

In the well-known case of Miami's channel 10, 18 months passed from the oral argument before the Commission until its decision. There had been 2 years of proceedings earlier. And, of course, the case is still in the courts.

Money is involved as well as time. A losing applicant in a 4-way fight for a St. Louis channel says it cost him $141,000 before he went to court. Others put the total cost for all applicants in some big cases from $500,000 to $1 million.

Following is an account of what sometimes results because of the high cost and delay. This comes when a strong local company is the only applicant for a channel as the deadline nears.

At the last minute a hastily organized company puts in a bid. If it passes minimal qualifications, it is entitled to a comparative hearing, which may take years. It then offers to pull out—for, say, $50,000 and 30 percent of the original applicant's stock. In view of the cost and delay that a fight for the channel probably will involve, this price may be worth paying.

HEARINGS ARE EXHAUSTIVE

The hearings are held before FCC examiners, a largely professional, nonpolitical group of men and women. The hearings are exhaustive, reaching such fine points in a Tampa, Fla., case as the comparative convenience of toilet facilities in proposed studios.

Many lawyers feel that the examiners do a conscientious job. But after the examiner decides, the Commission decides all over again. And the lawyers are persuaded of these two things:

1. The Commission has little or no respect for the examiner's views.

2. The Commissioners almost never look at the record. Statistically they couldn't; there just isn't time. They read, if anything, staff summaries.

The result is to make lawyers consider the hearings almost irrelevant. It is as if one judge sat through a trial and then another came along to decide the case.

"You work on a case 5 years and build up a record this high," one lawyer says, "and then you know the decision has nothing to do with the record. You lose all respect for the agency and for yourself."

OTHERS WRITE THE OPINION

Equally bitter criticism is directed at the fact that the Commissioners do not write their own opinions. They simply vote for one applicant or another. A staff of opinion-writers—professional rationalizers, one lawyer angrily calls them—then thinks up the reasons.

The requirement that a judge justify his decision in an opinion signed by himself has always been regarded by lawyers as an essential protection against arbitrariness. Twenty years ago a defender of the administrative process, James M. Landis, spoke of the danger of letting agency heads delegate any opinion-writing. Mr. Landis, a former dean of Harvard Law School, once was a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Because FCC members take no responsibility either to know the record in a case or to justify their decision in an opinion, lawyers feel that there is no check on arbitrary decisions. The Commissioners are reduced, one man says, to nodding their heads.

It is this separation of the judges from the trial that critics think opens the way for influence peddling. The feeling is that after the record is completed—and while the matter is pending before the Commissioners—the parties and their friends at the Capitol make their private pitches to the judges.

"You get a fair trial before the hearing examiner," one lawyer says. "But you never know what happens after that, and you suspect the worst."

The Commission does have criteria to determine who is the best television applicant. How useful these criteria are, and how consistently they are applied, are matters of some dispute.

However well the criteria work in a competitive case, the process may ultimately turn out to be futile. This is so because the winning applicant may sell out to someone else without giving the competitors he has just beaten after years of hearings a chance to bid.

A company that buys an existing station must meet only minimum legal and technical qualifications. In fact, Congress in 1952 prohibited the FCC when passing on a purchase, from considering whether someone else could serve the public interest better than the purchaser.

Paradoxical results may follow, as in a well-known Denver case. After years of hearings the FCC gave a Denver channel to

applicant A largely because of its alleged superiority over B in the criterion of local ownership. The opinion dwelt on the number of local stockowners and directors.

Local ownership, the opinion said, gives "assurance of a more complete and effective response to the needs and desires of such community than would be expected of a nonresident applicant. Clearly, it [the winning applicant] is more firmly rooted in the community and is more representative thereof."

Four months after this winning company went on the air, it sold out to Time, Inc., at a profit of 2,400 percent.

Time, Inc., is a New York publishing corporation with no special ties to Denver. But when a complaint came in from applicant B, who had just lost out because of the inadequate "local ownership," the FCC dismissed it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times, wrote a second article on the Federal Communications Commission, which appeared in today's newspaper. This article cites a number of instances of absolute contradiction and unpredictability. On the basis of this competent and responsible article by Mr. Lewis, it appears no standard of justice, or equity, or responsibility is applied by the Federal Communications Commission in determining the allocation of the extremely valuable public domain known as radio and television frequencies. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Lewis be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CONFLICTS CITED IN FCC AWARDS—LAWYERS SAY STANDARDS FOR GRANTING VIDEO CHANNELS LACK RATIONAL BASIS

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Lawyers concerned with the Federal Communications Commission hope that Congressional attention will shift soon from corruption to what they regard as a graver problem—the standards used to award television channels.

A channel in a large city may be worth $10 million or more. Inevitably, therefore, competition for the strategic locations has been fierce. The lawyers' charge is that the FCC has often chosen between competing applicants on no discernibly rational basis.

The only guide Congress has provided for the distribution of this king's largesse, as one lawyer calls it, is that the award shall serve the public convenience, interest, or necessity. On this general foundation the FCC has built elaborate criteria to choose between competitors for the same channel.

For example, the FCC prefers that owners of a station be local residents. It weighs such factors as the integration of ownership with management and the proposed program plans.

CONTRADICTION SEEN

What concerns lawyers about the way the FCC uses these criteria can be illustrated by some events of August 4, 1954.

On that day the FCC announced its award of a television channel in Beaumont, Tex. Its opinion noted some question about the winning applicant's program plans but then dismissed the objection in these words:

"No applicant in a proceeding such as this can give anything but a hopeful estimate of what it thinks it will be able to present its viewers.

"The particular programs to be presented by the successful applicant will be determined, to a substantial degree, by a combination of forces beyond the present knowledge or control of the parties or of ourselves. And these forces, we believe, will operate regardless of which of the instant applicants is successful."

INDUSTRY APPROVES

These observations about the meaninglessness of program plans struck the industry as sensible, especially because the Commission makes no real effort to have winning applicants stick to their program proposals.

But on the same day, the FCC awarded a Florida channel to the St. Petersburg Tribune primarily on the ground that it proposed about 10 percent more local live programs than other applicants.

"The evaluation of program proposals is an important factor in determining which applicant will best serve the public interest," the opinion in the St. Petersburg case said.

"We deem that Tribune's proposal in this crucial area of comparison transcends that of [another applicant] and find this marked superiority to be decisive."

How could the same men, on the same day, call program proposals in one case nothing but a "hopeful estimate," of no significance, but regard them in another case as "an important factor," "crucial" and "decisive"?

OPINIONS STAFF WRITTEN

The answer is that the Commissioners did not write either of the opinions and probably did not read them. They simply chose the winner in each case, then assigned staff men to think up reasons for the decisions. Unhappily, the staff men apparently did not compare notes.

But that answer obviously raises a more disturbing question: What kind of game is it when the rules are changed to fit the desired results?

Among lawyers who practice before the Commission there are two views on the problem of criteria for deciding contested television cases.

One group thinks the rules of the game were sound but have been "manipulated" in the last 5 years by incompetent Commissioners—or worse.

The other group thinks that the recent and present Commissioners have done their best with a hopeless set of rules.

PROFESSOR QUOTED

The feeling of the first school was expressed in an article recently by one of the country's eminent teachers of administrative law, Prof. Louis L. Jaffe of the Harvard Law School. He wrote:

"Standards are announced only to be ignored, ingeniously explained away, or so occasionally applied that their very application seems a mockery of justice."

An example of what Professor Jaffe criticized was an Indianapolis case decided a year ago. The Commission, by a vote of 4 to 3, awarded a channel in that city to the Crosley Broadcasting Co.

The overwhelming guess in the trade had been that Crosley, a chain with numerous outlets in the Middle West, could never overcome local Indianapolis applicants because of its failure to meet the criterion of local ownership. But the FCC explained that problem away in these words:

"Despite the inability of Crosley to develop a record in this proceeding favorable to it in the matters of local residence and civic participation, its past record and experience provide us with strong assurance that its proposed Indianapolis operation will rapidly become an integral part of the community."

If the Commission is ready to forecast an outsider's rapidly becoming an integral part of the community, what is left of the criterion of local residence and participation, the critics ask.

The critics see a tendency of the Commission, illustrated in the Indianapolis case, to subordinate everything else to the criterion of experience. If true this would give a large headstart in any competitive case to the applicant who has other radio or television stations.

The Commission also has a policy of diversification, intended to discourage granting of additional channels to applicants who already control radio or television facilities or other mediums of communication, such as newspapers. But the critics feel that the emphasis on experience has submerged the diversification policy.

A notable example—one that may be before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight headed by Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, before long—is the case of Boston's channel 5.

Leading applicants for the channel were two independent local groups and the Boston Herald-Traveler, publisher of a morning newspaper and owner of AM and FM radio stations in Boston.

A witness for the newspaper testified that it would adapt to the programing of the TV station the best possible promotion of the Herald-Traveler where it is feasible to do so. There was testimony that the radio stations had been used to promote the paper.

Late in the case a competitor, the Boston Globe, charged that the owners of the Herald, in an effort to force a merger, had threatened to put the Globe out of business with the television station. The Globe asked for a hearing so that it could question witnesses as to the charge, but the FCC turned it down.

The Commission found that the independent applicants were as good as the Herald-Traveler, or better, in the local criteria, much preferable as to diversification, but weaker on past broadcast record and broadcast experience. It gave the channel to the Herald-Traveler.

STANDARDS CALLED CONFLICTING

The Yale Law Journal, in a study published last year, observed that experience can be gained with time but diversification cannot. In any case, emphasis on experience lessens the importance of local residence, diversification and other factors.

The lawyers who think the rules, not the men, are to blame, point to the criteria of experience and diversification as an example of the problem. The two are just contradictory, they say, and no one can reconcile them.

The heart of the difficulty, in the view of these lawyers, is that in many cases there are 2 or 3 or 4 applicants who are clearly qualified for the channel, with the differences between them minor and wholly subjective.

PROPOSE DIFFERENT SYSTEM

As long as anyone has to decide between essentially equal applicants, these lawyers feel, political decisions will be inevitable. One puts as follows what he believes goes through some Commissioners' minds:

"What difference does it make whether one applicant gets it or another? They'll all do about the same thing. So why not give it to our friends?"

These critics would solve the problem of television channel hearings by eliminating them. They would make any applicant meet high minimum qualifications. Then they would choose among those qualified by a deliberately arbitrary system.

For example, one lawyer with great experience in the field would award a contested channel to the man whose application was made earliest. Another suggests drawing lots among the qualified applicants. Others would have the applicants bid against each other, so that at least the Government would be paid for its grants.

But others consider these proposals the counsel of despair. They think that better men can make the criteria work.

"When you're dealing with a Government license," one says, "you have to try something

better than chance. You cannot eliminate the judgment factor. I think all you can do is to try to raise the level of ability and responsibility of the men who make the decisions."

WILL AMERICAN FARMERS BECOME PIECEWORK LABORERS FOR BIG BUSINESS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the long-range future of America's farming system is very understandingly discussed in an article in yesterday's New York Times by William M. Blair, one of the Nation's foremost farm writers.

In my opinion, Bill Blair raises the crucial question which confronts us in farm policy today; namely, will our family farmers retain their independence, or will our farming system be transformed into a form of contract labor or home industry paid on a piecework basis, similar to the pattern that developed in manufacturing at the beginning of the industrial revolution?

Vertical integration—the establishment of centralized direction in the farming, food processing, and food marketing businesses—threatens to eliminate our free, independent, family sized farm enterprises, if it is permitted to be imposed by big business from the top.

Undoubtedly there are many advantages to be gained from integration. But the destruction of economic independence is not an advantage, nor a development which we can afford if we are to retain the essential quality of widely distributed ownership, control, and enterprise in our American society. If there must be integration, I believe it should come under the control of the farmers themselves, through farmer-owned, farmer-controlled, farmer-directed business enterprises. It should be the object of the Government to encourage and enable our farmers to establish such enterprises.

I have introduced a bill which would provide for an REA-type of lending program to finance farmer-owned processing and marketing enterprises, so that the process of integration may be carried out under the control of the farmers themselves, rather than being imposed on them from the top by big business. I hope the Congress will give this problem its careful consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Blair printed in the RECORD.

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

HOG RAISERS EYE A CONTRACT PLAN—FARMERS IN MIDWEST STUDY MOVE TO STABILIZE INCOME

(By William M. Blair)

DES MOINES, IOWA, February 25.—Farmers in the Midwest Corn-Hog Belt are considering a scheme some think may be the means of gaining the collective-bargaining power and stable incomes they have sought so long. The idea is to produce hogs for meatpackers under contract, rather than offer the hogs on the open market.

This is called vertical integration. It means putting under single control all the steps from growing the food to getting it into the consumer's market basket.

So much controversy surrounds the idea that a meeting here this week to discuss it attracted 600 farmers and livestock producers from all over the State.

The plan could provide more stable incomes, a Tama County producer acknowledged. But he asked, "Will we become just hired hands, turning out pigs to specifications?"

His question posed the central issue of the controversy.

Pioneer farmers who put the plow to the prairies were integrators. They produced, processed, and ate their own food.

The application of the old idea in modern agriculture goes far beyond the pioneers' use, and has far-reaching implications for American farming.

Vertical integration, or contract farming, has been around for years but its application was limited until the last two decades.

Contracting has been common in the production of eggs for hatcheries, vegetables and fruits for canning and freezing, sugar beets, and a number of other specialty crops. It is carried on by agreements between farmers and business concerns including chain stores, or between farmers and their cooperatives.

The most startling application of integration has been in the broiler industry. It took the production of chickens away from the farmer's wife and put the job on an assembly line.

BROILERS TO ORDER

The Department of Agriculture estimates that about 90 percent of all broilers now are produced under contract farming agreements of assorted types. All some farmers do is provide housing and feed the chickens to specifications. The integrator controls the operation through to the marketing of the product.

Fired by the phenomenal growth of the broiler industry in the East and the South, the Midwest is rising to the prospects of hog contracting.

Three midwestern packing companies have started making contracts with hog producers to get a uniform product of high quality and an assured supply. Two of the major Chicago packers are feeling their way, one in Georgia and one in Tennessee. These actions are having an impact on big corn-hog States such as Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

Some enthusiasts believe it may go a long way toward solving the farm problem of chronic ups and downs in prices and income. They think it may enable farmers to produce more efficiently, cut costs, improve products and in the end lower costs to consumers. But many farmers still are wary.

PACKER AGREES TO BUY

The hog contracts operate much the same as in the broiler industry and other segments of agriculture. The contracts call for the producer to deliver so many hogs at a specified time to the contracting packer. The packer agrees to buy all the producers' hogs of the highest grade at the delivery day's average market price plus a premium. this can be as much as 50 cents a hundred pounds of live hog.

The packer can afford the premium because the producer must follow expert advice on breeding and feeding to get hogs with leaner pork. Hogs of this quality bring better prices and compete better with beef and poultry.

The farmers' marketing risks are eliminated. They raise more hogs, delivering 500 or more 6 times a year instead of current 2-a-year deliveries.

Auction markets could disappear. No longer would the farmer have to truck or ship his livestock to market and pray prices held up.

HAM FAT'S IN THE FIRE

Right now there are more arguments over the idea of hog farming under contract than over price supports and Ezra Taft Benson.

Producers at the Des Moines meeting peppered agricultural management specialists and Iowa farm bureau officials, who sponsored the gathering, with all kinds of questions.

"Will we be able to control our own farming?" queried a Jessup farmer.

"How will it affect farm population?" asked another farmer.

"How much money will it cost for us to set up a packing plant of our own so that we can keep control?" asked another.

Earl F. Crouse, vice president of the Doane Agriculture Service, a St. Louis farm management concern, told them southern farmers were moving heavily into hog production.

"If you don't want them to take over your traditional product, don't spare the horses," he urged.

The middle westerners were well aware that production of corn and other feed grains was shifting to the South, and threatening to upset their farming operations.

CONTRACTS WITH DEALERS

Mr. Crouse said southern farmers were turning out pork under contracts with feed dealers. The feed dealers own the pigs in some contracts; in others the feed dealer supplies the feed and credit to the hog producers. It has proved a boon, he said, to smaller farmers who were without adequate credit and facilities.

The old auction market is on the way out, he said, and specialty buying, with the customer setting the standards, is gaining.

Joseph Kramer, a young farmer from Black Hawk County, was skeptical. "It's all right for the small fellow who barely makes out but the efficient producer has lots to lose and not much to gain."

Neal Johns of Tama County remarked:

"It still is a long way off."

BUT THEY STAYED ALL DAY

But they and their fellow farmers stayed all day, listened and asked questions. They and others questioned whether they would lose their individuality and become mere employees. But they perked up their ears at talk that the farm bureau might set up a cooperative to build a plant to handle hogs in an integration deal of their own.

The farmers know also that the West is challenging the Corn Belt in the feeding of beef cattle. Part of this growth in Western States is due to contracts by which ranchers, packers, and even speculators turn over steers to giant feedlots to be finished for market.

In the last 25 years, the eastern section of the Corn Belt has doubled its volume of cattle feeding. The western end of the Corn Belt has added three-fourths to its volume.

But the West has increased the number of cattle on feed by three times. This has cut the Corn Belt's share from 80 percent to 70 percent.

MECHANIZED FEEDING

These large feedlots are mechanized operations, dealing in scientific feeding to speed gains on cattle while controlling quality. Some lots handle 25,000 head a year.

In Kansas City, the Staley Milling Co. has laid out a foolproof system of bigtime hog production for farmers who make contracts with the three Midwestern packinghouses, Maurer-Neuer Co. of Kansas City, Hunter Packing Co. of East St. Louis, Ill., and Cudahy Packing Co. in Omaha.

Similar plans are being drawn by other farm interests, including cooperative ven-

tures of private business, farmers, and State colleges.

The Staley plan and others spell out almost every detail of hog raising, including breeding pens, farrowing huts, finishing pens and feed formulas for getting meat-type hogs.

These piggeries use buildings instead of pastures. The day of the hog wallowing in the mud would disappear in the new-style housing. Some plans provide for a small dirt exercise yard for sows but otherwise the pigs will be born and finished for market on concrete.

PLANNED PIG PARENTHOOD

These systems stipulate when sows are to be bred, when they should be placed in a farrowing hut equipped with heat for winter and ventilation and spray nozzles for hot weather, when weaning should take place, and when the sows should be moved to a colony pen and the babies to a nursery area.

They also set down when the piglets should be out into finishing pens and details on selection of unbred female hogs for a new cycle. Boars would be chosen by the producer in cooperation with the packer from top-quality stock.

This is the type of contract operation that has reduced the life cycle in the broiler industry from 15 weeks to 9, and cut the amount of feed needed to raise a 3-pounder from 12 pounds to 8 pounds. It has raised production more than 300 percent in 10 years and increased consumption of chickens from about 18 pounds in 1947 to more than 25 pounds last year.

Is contracting coming to all farmers as a part of the technological revolution now enabling farmers to turn out record products on shrinking acres?

Orlin J. Scoville, of the Department of Agriculture's Farm Economic Research Division, said that "contract farming can contribute to more efficient use of agricultural resources." But, he added, "its ultimate effects on farm incomes and the welfare of farm people remain to be seen."

Up to now, he went on, contract farming has not altered the traditional dependence of American farms on family labor. But the production contracts may have a profound effect on the role of the family farmworker.

In some instances, he said, the contracting farmer may become "essentially a piece wage worker." Such a development, he added, "probably would be accompanied by increased efforts of contract farmers to organize themselves into bargaining associations."

That is exactly what many farm leaders are urging farmers to do. If farmers are to continue to control their own businesses, they contend, they must be the integrators from the field to the retailer. Otherwise, they say, the day will come when farmers will be hired hands working for wages.

To get their own integration, these farm specialists are urging farmers to set up integrated cooperatives, bargaining associations, or commodity groups to become quality farmers who set their price.

Howard Hill, a corn-hog farmer and president of the Iowa Farm Bureau, is noncommittal on integration. But he asserted:

"We can't look to Washington forever for answers to our problems. We must explore everything."

EZRA TAFT BENSON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's newspapers, Mr. Drew Pearson cites chapter and verse to prove how enormously Secretary of Agriculture Benson has increased the cost of the farm program. Mr. Pearson points out that between the time when Benson took over the Department, and today, 20,000 extra bureaucrats have been added, and there has also been added $1 billion of expenses. This billion dollars does not include the cost of crop supports or the soil bank. It covers only the operations of the Agriculture Department itself.

Mr. President, the Pearson article very ably compares the administration of the Department of Agriculture of Secretary Benson and its administration under his immediate predecessor, Charles Brannan. It establishes a strong case that Mr. Benson's program has not only seriously damaged the American farmer, as contrasted with the program of Mr. Brannan, the champion of the farmer, but the article goes even further, to show that Ezra Benson has been enormously more costly to the American taxpayer than Charles Brannan ever was.

In only 4 weeks the order of Secretary Benson torpedoing the American dairy farmer by cutting price supports on dairy products will be put into effect unless the Congress acts to stop it. Mr. Pearson's article suggests how the Secretary of Agriculture can reduce costs without destroying farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Pearson article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

BENSON, BRANNAN COST COMPARED

(By Drew Pearson)

President Eisenhower's stanch defense of Ezra Taft Benson results first from the fact that Benson is a sincere gentleman with whom nobody can differ personally; second, from the fact that Ike's brother, Milton, is Benson's strong champion. Ike always relies on Milt, who served under Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace; for his farm advice.

However, in the latest report of the House Appropriations Committee on agriculture are some interesting figures which neither Ike, nor Milton, nor most farmers of the Nation know much about. They tell a significant story of what's wrong with Ezra Taft Benson's administration of American agriculture.

The figures are official and come from the Agriculture Department itself. They show that between the time Benson took over the Department and today he has added almost 20,000 extra bureaucrats and $1 billion of expenses. This billion does not include the cost of crop supports or the soil bank. It only covers the actual bare-bones operation of the Agriculture Department.

Here is a breakdown of the figures:

In 1952, the Agriculture Department budget under outgoing Secretary Charley Brannan was $706 million. Under Benson, the 1958 budget for operating the Department is $1,728,000,000.

The overall agricultural budget as Brannan went out of office, including the cost of storing surpluses, crop-price supports, and everything else was $1,045,000,000.

The overall budget under Benson today is $7 billion. This is an increase of about 700 percent.

SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS MORE

The big question is, How did the overall budget jump from less than 1 billion to more than 7 billion in 5 short years, when Benson simultaneously reduced price supports from 90 percent of parity down to below 75 percent of parity?

He was reducing price supports in order to get rid of surpluses, yet his costs and his surpluses increased. What is the reason?

Though it cannot be spelled out in a few words, here is part of the answer:

1. Bureaucrats versus volunteers—Benson immediately fired the farmers' committees which were enforcing the farm-acreage program and substituted paid bureaucrats. The volunteer farm committeemen had been paid $57 a year, chiefly for travel to attend meetings. The bureaucrats are each paid around $5,000 a year.

This not only increased Benson's budget, but it tended to put policemen in charge of farm acreage restrictions. Volunteer farm committees did an excellent job of restricting acreage. They knew exactly what each neighbor was doing and let no one get away with anything.

But when paid bureaucrats took over, the psychology of the program shifted. It was like the Russian peasant who is always out to beat the Soviet inspector on the collective farms. So there was less compliance with crop reduction, less cooperation with the Agriculture Department.

2. Middleman's profit—Benson has operated the Agriculture Department with an eye to helping the middleman, not the farmer.

To illustrate:

In 1956–57 when Benson moved into the hog market to support the price of pork, he omitted from his hog-purchasing contract a clause which requires packers to buy hogs at parity prices. He signed contracts with the meat packers to buy up pork, with a guaranty to take it off their hands. But he did not require them to pay the farmer a guaranteed price.

Thus they could step into the hog market and buy below parity, and sell to Benson at a guaranteed price, which was exactly what they did. Result was that the price of hogs went below parity, the farmers didn't benefit, the packers did benefit, and the taxpayers paid out $98,600,000 supposedly to support the price of pork, while the price of pork simultaneously was going down and down.

In contrast, Charley Brannan stepped into the market to support hogs in 1949, but put a clause in his contract by which the packers had to buy hogs from farmers at parity prices. As a result, the price of hogs did not drop below parity except on 1 day. Brannan then gave his surplus hams immediately to the school-lunch program, thus saving the cost of storage. The total cost to the taxpayer was $18 million.

The farmers and school children, not the meat packers, profited.

And if you want to see who is making the big money today, take a look at the stock-market quotations during last fall's Wall Street slump and see what happened to the big packers and middlemen's stocks. They went up while the stock market went down.

More on Mr. Benson's snafus in an early column.

AMENDMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 2, the New York Times carried an editorial strongly supporting the Kennedy-McCarthy unemployment compensation improvement bill, and calling for its prompt enactment.

In view of the responsibility, carefulness and economic conservatism of the New York Times, its support of a bill that would greatly benefit the unemployed of America is extremely significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JOBLESS PAY: THE CHALLENGE

More people covered by unemployment insurance are now out of work than at any time since the Federal-State system went into effect in 1938—3.1 million, representing 7.5 percent of the 42 million insured.

The national figures, released last week as of February 15 by the Department of Labor, are deeply disquieting—even though claims fell off somewhat between January 11 and February 7 and haven't varied much, up or down, since then. But only those workers are included who are covered by unemployment insurance. The total number of people out of work now is estimated at about 5 million—more than in any year since 1941.

These figures should be of grim concern to the Government in its efforts to turn back the tide of the present recession. So should they be also to both employers and organized labor, in whose hands are the decisions, as to plant and prices and as to wage increases, which so largely determine the ups and downs of the health index of the economy.

But most directly challenged is the adequacy of the existing unemployment-insurance system. The present situation calls for its thorough reappraisal and for bold efforts to bring it more in line with its objectives—both to aid the unemployed and to keep up purchasing power when the economy needs it the most. It isn't only the individual worker who needs help in times like these. It is also his butcher, his grocer and his landlord.

The unemployment-insurance system is administered at Federal expense by the several States, which set their own terms as to benefits paid. The Federal Government levies a tax on employers everywhere, against which offsets are allowed proportionate to taxes they pay to each State. Five years ago President Eisenhower urged the States to enact minimum adequate standards as "a valuable first-line defense against economic recession." But Senator KENNEDY has said in a recent speech in Congress, that "not one State has met the standards the President requested."

In the meantime increases in wages and in the cost of living have largely outdated the benefit scales, which were originally intended to provide at least half of the workers' regular earnings. Senator KENNEDY estimates that actual benefits today average only one-third of lost wages. Part of the difficulty has been the failure to lift the ceilings on benefits as wages and living costs have gone up. Then, too, there are other serious inadequacies and divergencies—in coverage, eligibility and the duration of benefits.

The time has come—is indeed long past—to meet this nationwide problem with nationwide and adequate minimum standards set up and enforced by the Federal Government. A group of Senators, led by Senator KENNEDY, and another group in the House, have introduced a bill to do it. The Kennedy-McCarthy measure, now before both Houses, deserves wide attention. Its details may be open to question, but its objectives are sound—and especially timely at this particular moment.

FARMERS' INCOME TAX RETURNS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter of great importance which I have received from Mr. Bruce M. VanSickle, a member of the Legislature of North Dakota, and one of the outstanding accountants of my State. I might add that I have received a great number of complaints from my constituents in North Dakota about the complex income tax forms. The letter goes into great detail, and suggests changes which I hope may be brought to the attention of the appropriate committee.

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

FEBRUARY 18, 1958.

DIRECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This writer has had his attention called to a letter from the District Director of Fargo, N. Dak., addressed to a small, one-secretary business office which attempts to prepare farmers' tax returns for them. The letter advised the tax form preparer that he must use the official tax forms. It based its directive on Revenue ruling C. B. 54–64 C. B. 1954–1, 82, and the letter included the following language:

"In the event that schedule returns are submitted without respect to the requirements stated (the requirement that all returns must be made on a facsimile of the official Internal Revenue form) it may be necessary to return the unaccepted schedules to the taxpayer, instructing him to prepare it once again using official Government forms or reasonable facsimiles of such forms."

In the instant case, as in many other cases throughout the country, the tax preparer has evolved a system of a single sheet on which he places: Income minus expense equals adjusted gross income.

Then the tax preparer clips that simple accounting sheet, done in typewriter and clearly legible, to the official form 1040.

It should be remembered practically all States and many cities have now imposed income taxes.

If the United States Treasury Department attempts to require that only the United States Treasury version of the present schedule F (Statement of Farm Income and Expense) is permissible, then it must follow that the taxpayer in the rural areas and any taxpayer who must use the schedule system or the return, as distinguished from an employee who has his returns prepared for him, must necessarily pay for two complete preparations of returns, because the State governments have no obligation to accept the Federal return forms and the Federal Government has signified no willingness to prepare its forms so that they can be filled for the purpose of determining State tax burdens.

Where a simple income and expense statement can be used to present the statement of adjusted gross income for both the Federal and State governments, a considerable saving can result to the taxpayer.

We have discussed this problem with the Federal tax men before. Their arguments are:

(A) It makes the tax man work.

Answer:

(1) The report is clear and concise, easily interpreted; and

(2) Work is what the tax man is paid by the taxpayer to do.

(B) The Federal tax official has no duty to consider the problem of the State income taxpayer.

Answer: The raison d'etre of the State or Federal tax man is to serve the citizen and in this case the citizen is the same person.

Since the income-expense sheet is basic to a computation of income; is clearly intelligible; and furnishes the information to both the governments; it seems to us to be a presumptuous exercise of administrative authority for the Federal or State governments to insist that only their form is acceptable.

We enclose for your examination:

(1) Copy of Federal schedule F.

(2) Copy of the State tax return showing on page 3 the State income and expenses.

(3) A copy of the common income-expense sheet which the Federal tax officials say is not acceptable.

Please notice:

(A) It is manifestly impractical to fill the Federal form with a typewriter.

(B) It is impractical to fill the State form with a typewriter.

(C) Both forms demand practically the same information.

(D) A simple income-expense sheet furnishes the information.

To resolve this problem, we would suggest that:

(A) Revenue ruling C. B. 54–64 C. B. 1954–1, 82, be revised so that a simple statement of income and expense may be prepared and used wherever income tax returns must be filed; or that

(B) Every taxpayer who is required to prepare a schedule F or the facsimile or original United States Treasury Department form, receive a credit expense against his taxes of $50, to compensate him for the additional cost and burdensome inconvenience of preparing 2 returns on 2 separate forms where 1 clear, accurate, easily readable statement would suffice.

Yours truly,

McGEE & VAN SICKLE,
BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE.

INCOME

Grain sold (Berthold Farmers Elevator)	$8,432.00
Grain sold (Commodity Credit Corporation)	3,968.43
Dividends (patronage refund, Berthold Elevator)	251.75
Grain reseal payment (Commodity Credit Corporation)	300.88
Agricultural conservation program refund	121.02
Sale of building	$70.00
Oil lease	240.00
Total income	13,384.08

EXPENSES

Labor (men hired)	521.95
Board (men hired)	152.34
Repairs and maintenance machinery	1,116.51
Tools and supplies, farm	545.97
Oil and gas trucks (3)	368.91
Truck upkeep (3)	456.57
Blacksmith	149.28
Drainage and hauling farmland	379.75
Crop spraying, aerial	804.77
Fuel and lubricants, farm	630.60
Farm building repairs	57.57
Seed purchased	230.00
Fertilizer purchased	232.00
State hail insurance premium	253.08
Taxes, real and personal property	608.64
Safety deposit box rent	6.60
Attorneys fees	20.00
State tax commissioner	42.75
Truck insurance (3)	96.42
Truck license (2)	50.50
Farm building insurance premium	11.70
Farm agricultural periodicals	31.50
Interest paid (farm notes)	624.69
State sales tax	105.49
Depreciation	3,960.67
Total expenses	11,468.26
Adjusted gross income	1,915.82

Depreciation

Item	Bought	Cost	Estimated life	Depreciation
Truck, 1½-ton	52	$3,300.00	15	$220.00
Truck, ¾-ton	51	2,335.00	10	223.00
Truck, ½-ton	57	450.00	4	112.50
Tractor, Minneapolis-Moline U	56	1,565.00	5	313.00
Tractor, Minneapolis-Moline GB	57	4,361.29	10	436.13
Tractor, Minneapolis-Moline GB	57	4,361.29	10	436.13
Tractor, John Deere G	52	3,400.00	12	226.66
Plow, John Deere	57	780.56	10	78.06
Plow, John Deere	57	780.56	10	78.06
Plow, John Deere	57	780.56	10	78.06
Packer	57	120.00	5	24.00
Packer	57	120.00	5	24.00
Packer	57	120.00	5	24.00
Press drill and fertilizer attachment, John Deere	57	823.65	8	102.96
Press drill and fertilizer attachment, John Deere	57	823.65	8	102.96
Press drill and fertilizer attachment, John Deere	57	429.00	8	53.62
Disc, John Deere	56	500.00	5	100.00
Swather, self-propelled (⅓ interest)	56	1,400.00	6	233.33
Combine, John Deere self-propelled	55	5,800.00	8	725.00
Combine, John Deere self-propelled (⅓ interest)	54	2,742.50	8	342.80
Boss harrow	57	132.00	5	26.40
Total depreciation				3,960.67

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY SALMON FISHERIES IN COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ways to keep alive the migratory fish runs of the Columbia River Basin while proceeding with a vast program of multiple-purpose dam construction is one of the most perplexing problems facing the people of the Pacific Northwest. Policy questions in the controversy between fish and dams came to a head recently when the Federal Power Commission issued a decision supporting the construction of a 700-foot dam at the Nez Perce site which would cut off a major spawning ground of Columbia River Chinook salmon and steelhead in Idaho's Salmon River.

As a result of the commission's opinion, I introduced a bill (S. 3185) to give the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service collateral jurisdiction with the Secretary of the Army and Corps of Engineers in the issuance of FPC power project licenses. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the able chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has scheduled hearings on S. 3185 for March 6 and 7. I am grateful for the decision of the distinguished committee chairman to hold prompt hearings on this proposal. I am hopeful that testimony developed at the hearings will lead to fuller understanding of fishery problems involved in future Columbia River power development, and to consideration of possible additional governmental action in providing fish facilities and hatcheries so the beneficial fish runs may be perpetuated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks an editorial from the Evening Astorian-Budget for Tuesday, February 4, 1958, describing the need for control over FPC license authority so that more adequate consideration is given to fish and game resources. This newspaper has a long record of thoughtful concern for the Columbia River fishery, and I wish to commend its opinions for consideration by my colleagues.

The commission decision favoring Nez Perce dam has been interpreted throughout the State of Oregon as a recommendation detrimental to survival of Columbia River fishery resources. There has been considerable speculation about the pressures which motivated the commission in this action. Some background on these aspects of the decision is given in an editorial in the Oregonian of February 3, 1958, and in an article written by Washington correspondent A. Robert Smith, which was published in the East Oregonian of January 28, 1958, under the title "Was FPC Attempting to Reestablish Integrity?" I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and article also be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Astorian-Budget, Astoria, Oreg., of February 4, 1958]

LEGISLATION TO SAVE THE SNAKE

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has forwarded a copy of his remarks on the United States Senate floor when he introduced a bill to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the same collateral jurisdiction over Federal Power Commission licenses affecting rivers with migratory fish runs that the Corps of Engineers now has on navigable rivers.

This is an extremely important bill which certainly deserves Congressional approval. In fact, some such legislation ought to have been enacted several years ago before the FPC, with contemptuous disregard of fishery rights and State laws, permitted power dams to be built on Cowlitz and Deschutes Rivers, blocking them to fish passage.

NEUBERGER's bill is, of course, inspired by the FPC's same contemptuous disregard of fishery rights as exemplified in its recent denial of permits for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams on the Snake, in favor of a proposed dam at Nez Perce, 700 feet high, which would block fish runs going up the Snake above the Nez Perce site.

Here is NEUBERGER's explanation of the nature and purpose of his bill:

"Mr. President, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service collateral jurisdiction in FPC decisions where rivers are involved with important fisheries resources.

"Today, and for many years past, the FPC has had to consult the Corps of Army Engineers whenever the FPC licensed projects on rivers with navigable reaches. Surely, parallel participation in FPC verdicts ought to be required by the Fish and Wildlife Service where the streams at stake are the habitat of fish pilgrimages worth many millions of dollars, both from the standpoint of commercial and sports fisheries.

"As I have said, Mr. President, the Federal Water Power Act now restricts the Commission's licensing authority by providing that no license affecting the navigable capacity of any navigable waters of the United States shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting navigation have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.' In the management of our Nation's water resources for their full multiple-purpose benefits, the continuance of major fisheries certainly deserve protection equal to that afforded the requirements of navigation. The bill which I am introducing merely extends the law so that no license shall be issued until the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Service, has determined that the dam and project works are not detrimental to migratory fish and to game and wildlife."

It is certainly time that a halt was called to the high-handed procedure of the FPC.

Certainly no Federal agency should have such dictatorial power over use of the waters of the Columbia Basin as now exercised by the FPC.

NEUBERGER's legislation seems a good way to limit this dictatorial power.

The Oregon Senator called attention to another aspect of the ghastly FPC ruling regarding the Snake River dams—the FPC's blithe and casual comment that the problem of getting fish past high dams is well on the way to being solved.

This remark was snatched up immediately by Canada's Gen. A. G. L. MacNaughton, one of the principal advocates of a project to divert Columbia River waters into the Fraser River for power development.

This project has been blocked in Canada, up to now, by the interests protecting the valuable Fraser River sockeye salmon runs. High power dams, they pointed out, would destroy these runs. But now MacNaughton can seize the FPC arguments and use them in favor of diverting the Columbia into the Snake.

The FPC opinion that fish will soon be able to pass high dams is not based on fact—actually, biologists are still dubious about getting this done. But when a supposedly responsible agency of the Federal Government makes such a baseless statement, no wonder advocates of stream damming at any cost snatch it and use it.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 3, 1958]

FISHERY CURB ON FPC

The flagrant and persistent policy of the Federal Power Commission in disregarding the effects of high dams on migratory fish (as in the Cowlitz, Deschutes and Middle Snake rulings) is well established. Comprehensive development, as required by law, means power development to the FPC. In making such decisions the FPC has ridden roughshod over State laws in Oregon and Washington.

An effort to persuade the Power Commission to consider the fishery resource now is being made by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon Democrat. He was given the unanimous support of leaders of national conservation organizations meeting with him Friday for his S. 3185. This bill, newly introduced, would require FPC to give the Department of the Interior the same consultative and collateral voice in consideration of licenses that the United States Army Corps

of Engineers now is accorded on flood control and navigation problems.

Specifically, S. 3185 amends the Federal Power Act by adding this provision: "That no license shall be issued until the plans for the project have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, as not being detrimental to the conservation of migratory fish and game."

This amendment would give the Secretary of the Interior approximately the same veto power over FPC that the Oregon Fish Commission once had over the State Hydroelectric Commission. One foresees a rocky road in Congress. But, certainly, FPC should be required to take the fishery into consideration. And it would be the Interior Secretary, not the Fish and Wildlife Service, who would be responsible.

The Neuberger bill was the direct result of the FPC decision rejecting licenses to Northwest Power Co. for dams at the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites. In this ruling, FPC held that a high dam at the Nez Perce site, which would totally block migrations of fish into and out of the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers, is the dam to build in that section of the Snake. Obviously, FPC would look with favor on a private utility application to build Nez Perce.

Discussions are now being held in Washington looking toward a workable bill to declare a moratorium on dam building which would affect fish migrations in the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers, while research in high dam passage continues. This also was recommended by the Oregon Water Resources Board. Another proposal is for Congress to declare the Salmon, Imnaha, and Grand Ronde Rivers a fish sanctuary by barring dams over a maximum height, or all dams. But no one yet has figured out how Nez Perce in the Snake could be blocked by that means—and if Nez Perce were built, the Salmon and Imnaha sanctuaries would soon be fishless.

[From the East Oregonian, Pendleton, Oreg., of January 28, 1958]

WAS FPC ATTEMPTING TO REESTABLISH INTEGRITY?

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Power Commission's rejection of Pacific Northwest Power Co.'s application for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams was a bold political decision reached as a consequence of the terrible beating the FPC has taken from Congress the past 2 years over the Hells Canyon case.

This was the explanation of a veteran FPC official who was involved in the running Snake River development controversy.

The FPC was anxious to remove the stigma of being regarded as pro-utility for having granted Idaho Power Co. a license for several smaller dams in that stretch of the river where an FPC examiner found that high Hells Canyon dam would have been superior.

SORE AT COMPANIES

Other pieces fit into this Snake River puzzle. The administration has been sore at the member companies of Pacific Northwest Power Co. for having sent representatives to testify before Congress last spring in favor of Federal funds to start John Day Dam as a Government project when the administration was clinging to its partnership idea for private utility construction. Congress soon thereafter added $1 million to start John Day, and now the administration is stuck with having to go through with this project at a cost of $310 million.

Somehow the administration refused to accept the political realities which the utilities had faced after the 1956 election, sponsors of partnership power bills—Sam Coon, Harris Ellsworth, and Douglas McKay—were all defeated by Oregon Democrats who favor Federal construction.

THEY SHARE RELUCTANCE

While the FPC and the administration protest any hint of collusion in these power cases, it is a fact that all five Commissioners now sitting at the FPC were appointed by the administration and share its reluctance to support Federal dam building.

When Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton a year ago came out for a higher dam at Pleasant Valley, he was quickly boxed in by the opposition of FPC Chairman Jerome Kuykendall and the White House.

Since then, however, Kuykendall—and the reputation of the FPC as an impartial regulatory agency—suffered the humiliation on Capitol Hill of having the Chairman's reappointment for a new term delayed for 2 months while critics of the FPC whaled away. With support from Democrats from gas-producing States, Kuykendall was confirmed, but the reputation of the FPC was none the better for the experience.

IKE VETOED THE BILL

The FPC had also been pictured as friendly to the powerful gas lobby because it favored a bill to exempt producers from Federal regulation of rates—a bill which Eisenhower found it necessary to veto because of public indignation against the $2,500 gift which a gas lobbyist was disclosed to have given one Senator.

From outward appearances, the five-man commission did not take this Snake River case under advisement until the oral argument late last November. In that 1-day hearing, the argument for Nez Perce was made by an FPC staff attorney, Joseph Hobbs, whose presentation in the view of many who heard it was flimsy and virtually incoherent. The Commissioners were smiling tolerantly before he was through.

The weak argument in behalf of Nez Perce mattered not at all, according to this informed FPC official, for the decision to back that project had been made by the Commission in consultation with the staff several months before.

IT'S YET TO BE VOICED

Likewise to no avail, then, was the contention of the power companies that Nez Perce could not feasibly be built in the foreseeable future because it would kill off all the migratory salmon which now depend on getting up the Salmon River to spawn.

Still smarting from bad reaction to its Hells Canyon decision, suffering the indignities of being portrayed as too favorable to the gas and electric utilities it is supposed to regulate, the FPC grasped the high Nez Perce Dam as a means of trying to reestablish its basic integrity.

If there is a more persuasive explanation for the Commission's support of a dam which no one wants to build, it has yet to be voiced.

IMPORTS OF JEWELED AND PIN-LEVER WATCHES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent report issued on February 28 by Gordon Gray, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I have reference to his announcement, and the publication of supporting findings by ODM, that imports of jeweled and pin-lever watches and clocks are not threatening to impair the national security.

This conclusion was based on Mr. Gray's evaluation of the facts developed during an exhaustive investigation of the relationship of the domestic horological industry to military and essential civilian requirements in a future emergency. Mr. Gray pointed out that in the years intervening since 1954, when this subject was last officially reported on by the Office of Defense Mobilization, not only has a marked reduction in mobilization requirements taken place, but a substantial expansion of precision skills and plant capabilities has become incorporated in our industrial economy.

The far-reaching aspects of the earlier decision manifested themselves in my own State of Maryland because of the support it lent to other actions taken by the Government since 1954 which tended to curtail our trade with Switzerland. The reduction of watch imports has had a grave impact on the sale of Maryland tobacco to that democratic nation, which has never to my knowledge requested or received any aid from the United States.

During the past few years, I have on more than one occasion called for improved trade relations with Switzerland. Therefore, it is most heartening to note the forward-looking action taken by Defense Mobilizer Gray which will doubtless make a significant contribution to this objective.

In his six-point summary, Mr. Gray refers to the views of other agencies which he considered in arriving at his conclusion. The Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce and the inter-agency Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry are among those cited whose findings lent support to the conviction expressed by Mr. Gray that, on the basis of evidence developed, there is no reason to believe that the level of imports of horological products threatens to impair the national security.

In a larger sense, it is noteworthy that this decision comes at a time when the question of extending our reciprocal trade program is before the Congress. It would be unwise not to recognize the support which this action gives to that cause.

Because Mr. Gray's presentation of the factors considered and the facts arrived at in rejecting the pleas for further protection of the domestic industry represents such a logical and thorough handling of this difficult subject, I request permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the letter which the Defense Mobilizer sent to each of the three petitioners:

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1958.

On December 26, 1955, the American Watch Manufacturers Association, Inc., and the Bulova Watch Co. jointly requested the Office of Defense Mobilization to initiate immediate action under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 (Public Law 86, 84th Cong.) to remove a continuing impairment to the national security. On April 18, 1956, the Clock and Watch Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., filed a similar petition. Inasmuch as both jeweled and pin-lever segments of the horological industry have produced a variety of essential timing and other devices used by the military and the civilian economy, it was decided to consider and answer these petitions for the

horological industry as a whole. Accordingly, this letter replies to the two section 7 petitions.

It should be borne in mind that, in conformity with the responsibilities of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization fixed by law, this study has been directed solely to the national security aspects of this problem.

The Office of Defense Mobilization responded to the above-mentioned filings by causing an exhaustive investigation to be undertaken which included:

1. A review by the Department of Defense of all contracts it awarded to horological firms for the years 1951 through June 1957.

2. Estimates of mobilization requirements in the horological field made by the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce.

3. The appointment of a consultant to undertake and coordinate an examination of the jeweled-watch segment of the horological industry. A consulting engineer was appointed to assist with engineering advice.

4. The holding of public hearings.

5. Surveys, visits and discussions by Department of Defense teams with manufacturers of 26 missiles; 37 nonhorological firms with capacity for producing safety and arming devices; domestic jeweled watch plants; clock and pin-lever watch plants; key manufacturers of missile guidance systems; technical laboratories of the Defense Department; and an installation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

6. Studies of pertinent skills by the Department of Labor in several domestic jeweled-watch plants; one imported jeweled-watch assembly plant; several clock and pin-lever watch plants; and a number of precision manufacturing plants outside of the horological industry.

7. A review by the interagency Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry of the data developed.

An account follows of the principal actions taken and facts and data developed.

ORDER BOARD REVIEW

The Defense Department reviewed the order boards of all domestic horological firms, covering prime contracts, subcontracts, research and development and parts supply from 1951 through June of 1957. This review was necessary in order to measure the volume of horological products produced for military needs as well as to identify the items for which an alternate source of supply would be needed if they were not produced by the horological industry. The review also developed data useful in the preparation of requirements estimates. These data were made available to the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor and to this Office.

REQUIREMENTS

Studies by the Department of Defense indicate that new weapons and changed concepts have greatly reduced current military mobilization requirements for jeweled timepieces and timing devices. As an indication of the reduction which has taken place, military requirements reported as of December 1956 for jeweled watches and chronometers were drastically reduced from World War II requirements; and were down to about one-half of 1954 estimated requirements.

The most recent Department of Defense estimate, based on the latest strategic concepts, indicates a further reduction in volume in military requirements since December 1956 of as much as 75 percent in those timing devices which have been major items of military production by the horological industry. Mobilization requirements for watches and clocks have also declined since the December 1956 estimates.

A Department of Commerce estimate of essential civilian requirements for jeweled watches as of December 1956 was based largely on World War II experience here and abroad, on specialized civilian and industrial needs and on annual market sales volume. A more recent review indicates a reduction in specialized needs.

Civilian and industrial requirements for watches exceed the military requirements but there are tens of millions of watches and clocks in use by individuals in the United States and several millions more in trade channel inventories that could be available for essential needs in an emergency.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

At hearings held on January 7, 8, and 9, 1957, 28 witnesses were heard. The hearings were conducted in an informal manner. Every aspect of the question of the essentiality or nonessentiality of the horological industry to the national security that parties at interest, outside of the Government, wished to present was included in the record.

CAPACITY AVAILABLE IN MOBILIZATION

The Department of Defense has programed and assigned to individual firms certain military production which is to be undertaken should an emergency arise. The production of a portion of safety and arming and other timing devices has been assigned to horological firms. A study was made to determine (a) the items together with the volume planned for production in an emergency by the horological industry, (b) the scope of planning with plants outside of the horological industry which had the capability to make the items referred to above, and (c) the capacity of nonhorological firms to produce safety and arming devices. Surveys of 37 selected nonhorological firms revealed both the capability and capacity to design and manufacture far in excess of the volume of orders assigned to horological firms without disturbing the production of other military items already planned for the particular firms.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE MISSILE PROGRAM

In the surveys of missile plants by the Department of Defense teams, particular attention was directed toward the kind of precision operations being conducted, as well as to parts or components procured by the missile manufacturers from horological firms. Specific inquiry was made of both the technical and executive level and especially of the procurement, production, and design engineers to determine if there were items or components used in missiles upon which it was felt reliance must be placed on the horological industry to produce. The purpose of the survey was first explained to the executive management, after which the engineering staff was interviewed. A second meeting with the executive group was then held in order to obtain confirmation of the engineers' report as to the experience of the firm in the use of horological industry firms and other sources of manufacture.

The Department of Defense reported that many of the officials and engineers interviewed had been with missile projects during the period of research and development and many of the missiles studied were in various stages of development. No missile manufacturer questioned indicated a dependence upon the horological industry either for production or research.

The Director of Guided Missiles stated that "Viewed solely from the standpoint of the potential contribution to the guided-missile programs, it is evident that the horological industry cannot be considered to be essential to these programs. To the extent the facilities of the horological industry are available to us, we shall continue to utilize them in competition with other qualified producers in nonhorological industries."

SURVEYS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TEAMS OF TECHNICAL LABORATORIES

Safety and arming devices represent the largest volume in terms of either dollars or units which horological firms produce for use in missiles. The service laboratories having technical responsibility for safety and arming devices reported that many firms outside the horological industry have the capability and capacity to design and manufacture these complex items and are presently doing so.

SURVEYS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TEAMS OF HOROLOGICAL FIRMS

These inspections were made in order to observe the manufacturing processes in the various plants, with special emphasis on an examination of the firms' research and development capabilities. While operations in this field reflecting real credit on the industry were noted, there did not appear to be an unusual research or development capability that could not be found elsewhere. This view was shared by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.

STUDIES BY LABOR DEPARTMENT TEAMS

In the studies conducted in various plants by the teams of the Department of Labor, an examination was made of nine skills agreed upon by the jeweled-lever industry as being representative of key skills in the industry to determine the characteristics and employment of such skills and to obtain information as to the training period required to reach proficiency. Examination was also made of the skills in a number of pin-lever and nonhorological precision plants in order to determine if similar skills were to be found in such plants, and the length of time required to reach proficiency upon transfer from one group to the other. The wartime requirements for jeweled-lever industry skills were estimated on the basis of the production programs provided by the Department of Defense.

The Department of Labor investigation showed that in most of the skills examined, with a brief training period, there was relative ease of interchangeability between the jeweled and pin-lever segments of the horological industry, and with training periods of varying lengths, there could be some interchangeability of key skills between precision manufacturers outside the horological industry and those within the horological industry.

CONSULTANT'S REPORTS

The consultant referred to above read and considered all evidence presented up to September 25, 1957, the date of his report. In the process of his investigation he visited the plants of the domestic jeweled watch manufacturers, observed the operations of a number of importers, and also spent several days visiting jeweled watch plants in Switzerland. While he did not have the benefit of data developed by investigations made in recent months by the Department of Defense, his conclusion read as follows:

"It is desirable to have a jeweled watch industry in being in this country for the contribution it can make, along with other precision manufacturers, for production of the timing devices and other items needed by civilian and military users both in peacetime and in emergencies. However, due to significant reductions in recent years in the mobilization requirements for jeweled movements, the tremendous advances in the diffusion of precision production techniques and the availability of necessary skills and production capacity, there does not appear to be a threat to the national security because of imports of jeweled watch movements."

The engineering consultant, after visits to horological plants, to precision manufacturers outside the horological industry, and to a number of missile plants, reported in June 1957 that he had identified four items for military use which he believed only the jeweled watch industry could produce. Based on this belief and his study of the subject

from an engineering and organization standpoint, he concluded that the jeweled watch industry was essential to national defense.

Investigation later made by the Department of Defense established that three of these items were then being produced outside of the horological industry and the fourth had been found unsuitable for use in the missile complex in which it had been expected it could be beneficially incorporated.

CHANGES IN TECHNOLOGY

In the years intervening since 1954 when this subject was last officially reported on by this agency, a substantial expansion of precision skills and plant capabilities has become incorporated in our industrial economy. This trend was developing rapidly by 1954 but had not reached its present degree of maturity and application. These skills and capabilities may now be found in many industries with a consequent enlargement of the base in precision production.

SUMMARY

1. On the basis of the studies it has conducted, the Department of Defense has concluded that the horological industry is not essential in the supply of items critically needed by the military in times of national emergency.

2. It is the opinion of the Department of Commerce, after giving consideration to all factors, that essential civilian requirements for high precision jeweled timepieces during a national emergency could be met from domestic production that would be available, from inventories of such movements that are constantly widespread throughout distributive channels, and such imports as may be possible from foreign sources.

3. The mobilization requirements for watches and clocks have markedly decreased.

4. New weapons and new strategic concepts have drastically reduced the requirements for the types of military items in the production of which the horological industry has participated.

5. The base for precision production and skills in our industrial economy has expanded substantially.

6. The interagency advisory committee on the watch industry is of the opinion that the level of imports of horological products does not threaten to impair the national security.

CONCLUSION

I have examined the report of the Department of Defense on this subject transmitted to me by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the report made by the Department of Labor, the report of the consultant appointed to undertake and coordinate an examination of the jeweled watch segment of the horological industry and the report of the engineering consultant. I have also considered the requirements data submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce, the evidence presented at public hearings and the briefs and statements subsequently filed. In addition I have had the benefit of opinions of a number of individuals knowledgeable in this field and have considered the advice of the interagency Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry.

On the basis of the evidence developed by the study, I am unable to find there is reason to believe that the level of imports of horological products threatens to impair the national security.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON GRAY,
Director.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM PROGRAM FEATURING STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a supporter and cosponsor of bills providing for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, I commend the Columbia Broadcasting System and Mr. Edward R. Murrow for the "See It Now" television program of March 2, which featured the statehood aspirations of these two great Territorial possessions of the United States.

I felt this was a public-service program of the highest order. It was factual, complete, unbiased, and thorough. I have never visited Hawaii, but I have been to Alaska on many occasions, and served there in our Army during World War II. From my personal knowledge of Alaska, I can truthfully say that the portion of Mr. Murrow's program devoted to Alaska was accurate and authentic.

While I undoubtedly am prejudiced myself, I doubt if any neutral citizen of our country, seeing the broadcast in its entirety, could fail to believe that the case for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii was far stronger than the adverse case in each instance. I was particularly impressed by the direct and effective manner in which brave combat veterans of our Armed Forces challenged the canard that any substantial number of Hawaii's residents are subversive or unpatriotic.

I congratulate Edward R. Murrow and CBS for this excellent presentation, and I look forward to more programs of an equal caliber.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon has the floor.

CANCELLATION OR SUSPENSION OF AWARD OF TELEVISION CHANNEL NO. 10, MIAMI, FLA., TO NATIONAL AIRLINES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a letter I have written to the Attorney General of the United States:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
March 3, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I should like to inquire what steps, if any, are being taken by the Department of Justice toward canceling or suspending the award of television channel No. 10 in Miami, Fla., to National Airlines.

It would seem to me most distressing if Commissioner Richard Mack should resign under fire in this chaotic situation, while the beneficiaries of his dubious activities were allowed to benefit permanently by retaining a television channel valued in the neighborhood of some $1 million.

It is my hope that the Department of Justice will study the possibility of bringing a suit in court, which seeks to vacate the licensing of channel No. 10, in Miami, and to require a totally new series of hearings and proceedings by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the granting of this channel.

As a Member of the Senate, I urge such a course of action upon your department.

With good wishes, I am,

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

AUTHORIZED PUBLIC-WORKS PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding public-works projects in Arkansas, together with a table listing the projects and their cost.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Economic indicators are pointing downward. An exception is the cost-of-living index, which in January rose to a record high. It is paradoxical that the cost-of-living index continues to rise as unemployment goes up. There has been much discussion in the Congress recently on ways to improve the current economic situation. Every section of the country has felt the effects of the economic slump, and the outlook for rapid recovery is not as rosy as some would lead us to believe. Even at the risk of being labeled a pessimist for admitting that we are in the midst of a recession, I cannot avoid facing the facts, and I think that many will agree that the time has come for the Federal Government to take action to bring about an upturn in the economy.

The President has recommended on several occasions recently that as an antirecession device, public-works expenditures should be increased. However, the budget which he submitted to Congress this year does not reflect this thinking. If the administration intends to accelerate construction of public-works projects, or initiate new programs, evidence of this intention has not yet come to my attention. The administration has not requested supplemental funds for existing projects, nor has it requested that new projects be authorized; and while we can talk indefinitely about the plight of the unemployed, merely talking about it does not supply them with jobs or provide food for their families.

I want to mention briefly the situation in Arkansas, where the picture is not very bright. Cotton is the main cash crop in my State, and we suffered a disastrous cotton-crop failure last year. Some of us in the Congress have been trying for months to get Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture to recognize the seriousness of the disaster. Because of abnormal weather conditions—prolonged and torrential rainfall—our cotton production last year was only 69 percent that of 1956. This is reflected by the fact that there was a 22-percent decrease in farm income in Arkansas in 1957, and this decrease has had severe effects throughout the entire State and in every economic activity; for in Arkansas, as in any agricultural State, when the farmer suffers, everyone suffers. At mid-January unemployment in Arkansas was over 60,000—a 20-percent increase over this same period last year—and I understand that the situation in Arkansas is typical of all the States in the Mississippi delta region.

We need help, and the most effective way to assist us is through a speedup of public-works projects—the quickest and surest way to increase jobs and circulation of money. Hundreds of projects throughout the country—some of them in my State—have already been authorized, the planning has been completed, and the projects are under construction. Many more have been authorized, the planning has been completed, but there have been no funds appropriated for construction.

These projects have been approved by the Congress and the executive branch, and they are ready to go. They are not merely make-work projects; they are sound, economically feasible projects which have been stalled by lack of support from the administration.

I have asked the Corps of Engineers of the Army to prepare for me a tabulation of the amount of funds which could effectively be used on all authorized public-works projects in Arkansas during the next fiscal year. This list is quite revealing when compared to the amounts included in the budget for fiscal year 1959 and gives an indication of the administration's attitude toward acceleration of the public-works program. I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation to which I have referred, prepared at my request by the Corps of Engineers, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Mississippi Valley Association urging increased appropriations for public-works projects in the Arkansas River Basin be inserted in the RECORD.

The Arkansas River Basin program is one of the most encouraging developments in our area. Increased appropriations for these projects will provide jobs for the rapidly growing list of unemployed persons in my State and should act as a catalyst on the entire economy of the region. For the public-works projects authorized in Arkansas, the Corps of Engineers indicates 22,199,000 more dollars can be effectively used in fiscal year 1959 than has been included in the budget.

I hope that when the public-works appropriation bills come before the Congress in the near future the projects can be accelerated.

Authorized projects in Arkansas

Project	Estimate fiscal year 1958 obligations	Amount included in budget for fiscal year 1959	Amount that could be effectively used in fiscal year 1959	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Navigation:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Ark.-Okla.:				
General studies	$520,900	$900,000	$900,000	
Emergency bank stabilization	1,616,800	541,000	541,000	
Bank stabilization (exclusive of emergency)	80,000	0	5,900,000	
Ouachita River and tributaries, Ark.-La	56,800	0	204,000	
Flood control:				
Bayou Bartholomew, Ark.-La	0	0	40,000	
Calion, Ark	318,600	0	0	Complete with fiscal year 1958 funds.
Conway County Drainage and Levee District No. 1, Arkansas.	250,000	0	0	Do.
Maniece Bayou, Ark	146,000	0	0	Do.
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark.-Tex.	6,300	0	300,000	
Walnut Bayou, Ark	69,400	575,000	575,000	Complete with fiscal year 1959 funds.
Multiple-purpose projects:				
Beaver Reservoir, Ark	319,900	250,000	850,000	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	0	0	85,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.-Mo. (additional units 5 and 6)	25,000	500,000	500,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam	911,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	
Greers Ferry Reservoir	948,100	2,000,000	5,500,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark.-Mo	16,046,900	12,400,000	12,500,000	
Narrows Reservoir	0	0	117,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, initial project, Arkansas and Missouri	57,100	0	0	
Norfork Reservoir, Ark	30,200	0	0	
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:				
Mississippi River levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	2,200,000	1,800,000	2,747,000	
Channel improvement, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	17,866,000	18,000,000	26,100,000	
St. Francis Basin, Ark.-Mo	4,525,600	2,600,000	3,080,000	
Lower Arkansas River, Ark	354,800	300,000	453,000	
Tensas Basin, Ark.-La	1,147,800	800,000	1,123,000	
Deferred projects:				
Clarksville, Ark	2,400	0	0	
DeGray Reservoir, Ark	50,000	0	350,000	
Murfreesboro Reservoir, Ark	12,800	0	0	

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM ADOPTED AT MEETING OF MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, HELD IN ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 9–12, 1958

We commend the 85th Congress, 1st session, for appropriating funds to continue construction of this important comprehensive project.

We urge Congress to make further appropriations sufficient to expedite the authorized program in the Arkansas River Basin for flood control, bank stabilization, navigation, water supply, and incidental hydroelectric power. We request that increased appropriations be made as rapidly as the Corps of Engineers can handle such funds in order to bring about the completion of this program in the next 11 years.

We call to the attention of Congress the importance of Keystone, Eufaula, and Oologah Dams in Oklahoma, emphasizing the need for early completion of these projects so that Dardanelle (now under construction) and Ozark Dams in Arkansas may be constructed on schedule. We urge consideration of increasing the budget recommendations on the following projects: Dardanelle Dam in Arkansas, Keystone and Eufaula Dams in Oklahoma, by an amount which will insure completion of the entire program in a period of 11 years.

We urge that the ban on new starts be lifted in the case of Strawn Dam (Burlington site) on the Neosho River in Kansas and that sufficient construction funds be appropriated to get this project underway. Floods in 1957 clearly demonstrated the serious deficiency of flood-control storage on this stream.

We also request that construction funds for bank stabilization be appropriated so that work can be initiated on the reach of the Arkansas River between Wilson's Rock and the Short Mountain Dam site. During the 1957 floods, a natural cutoff approximately on the line of the planned project occurred in this area. If the bank-stabilization program here can be initiated promptly, it will be possible to take advantage of this situation and to make a substantial saving in this portion of the work.

We urge that work on the bank-stabilization and navigational features from Fort Smith, Ark., downstream, beginning at the mouth of the Arkansas River, be progressed simultaneously with work on the upper reaches as rapidly as feasibly possible, with the view of securing as early return of benefits as can be had.

We urge that Congress provide adequate funds to continue planning of badly needed authorized projects on the Verdigris and Neosho Rivers and their tributaries in Kansas and Oklahoma, so that the benefits may be made available at the earliest possible time. We conclude this request by emphasizing that the Arkansas River is the only major undeveloped river in the Nation.

	Carryover money, fiscal year 1958	Funds requested for fiscal year 1959	Bureau of Budget recommendations
Keystone	$1,197,911	$28,300,000	$4,000,000
Oologah	2,661,160	13,700,000	10,000,000
Eufaula	1,791,275	21,200,000	4,500,000
Short Mountain	----------	100,000	----------
Dardanelle	225,346	5,000,000	1,500,000
Navigation locks, dams and channel improvement	----------	870,000	----------
Bank stabilization	45,351	7,350,000	541,000
Total	----------	76,520,000	20,541,000

AMERICANS WITHOUT WORK—OIL IMPORTS CAUSE MORE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the latest official report by the Texas Employment Commission lists unemployment in Texas in nonagricultural jobs at 181,200, which means that a known 30,000 additional Texans could not find jobs last month.

In my opinion, the figure of 181,200 as the number of persons unemployed is ultraconservative. Yet these figures are serving notice that the bread and bacon picture of Texas today is not good. These figures show that 24,000 men and women in the Houston area alone can no longer find jobs to earn their living; and 29,600 workers in the Dallas-Fort Worth area are without jobs. Among the smaller cities, in Texarkana, 12 percent of the labor force is now unemployed; at San Angelo, more than 8 percent of the people are hunting jobs; and in Amarillo, 7.5 percent of the working force can find no work.

This picture of mounting unemployment becomes even more serious when one considers that Texas is now on a 9-day oil production allowable, the lowest days per month production schedule in history. This 9-day crude-oil production schedule, forced on Texas by a continuing flood of cheap foreign oil imports, can only mean more jobless men and more people without wages for groceries.

This administration knows of this situation, and it has the authority to stop this flood of foreign oil. Yet the administration continues to listen to the wants of the giant oil cartel, instead of to the needs of the people. If this trouble were confined to Texas, it would be bad enough. But that is not the case. Our neighbors in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and all other Southwestern and Midwestern oil-producing States are also feeling the effect of this weak administration.

Mr. President, two-pronged action is needed: First, a tax on the imports of oil; second, a mandatory 20-percent reduction in the oil imports.

Mr. President, for the enlightenment of this administration, in order that it may recognize how it is jeopardizing national security by its policy of greater cartel profits and faulty foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following information on this subject:

First. A resolution by the Abilene Christian College board of trustees concerning the gravity of the situation.

Second. From the February 23, 1958, Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, an article entitled "The Publisher's Scratch Pad."

Third. From the February 20 publication of the Baytown Employees Federation official magazine, the BEF News & Views, an exceptionally fine article by R. R. Dawson, federation president, on the subject "Foreign Oil—Our Number One Problem."

Mr. President, at Baytown there is a very large refinery which is owned by the Humble Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. The article states what is happening to the employees there as a result of the imports of foreign oil.

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

OIL IMPORT RESOLUTION, ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, ABILENE, TEX.

Whereas the oil allowable for the State of Texas has been forced to the lowest amount in the history of the oil industry, thereby critically reducing the invested endowment income of Abilene Christian College, affecting the revenues of our public and private schools, increasing unemployment and jeopardizing the investments of thousands of individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the board of trustees of Abilene Christian College, respectfully petition that the Congress of the United States take speedy action to remedy this critical situation.

[From the BEF News & Views for February 20, 1958]

FOREIGN OIL: OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

(By R. R. Dawson, BEF president)

An 11-day producing schedule for Texas oil wells coupled with such headlines as "Crude Imports Jump 15 Percent" almost tells the story of our sick Texas oil industry without elaboration. I don't remember when our production was ever at an 11-day level before. Some companies appearing before the Railroad Commission asked for even less producing days, and in view of our rising gasoline stocks, 11 days' production is having a hard time finding customers. Yet most any paper you pick up carries news of increased imports of both crude and finished petroleum products. The domestic market is down from last year and our foreign market is, for all practical purposes, nonexistent due to the large number of refineries built in foreign countries in recent years. At the present time the United States has fallen below 50 percent of the world's refining capacity for the first time in history. All this has tremendous impact on us both as oil workers and as citizens of Texas and the United States. As oil workers we see more and more attempts on the part of management to squeeze the workers in order to reduce costs so that we can compete with refined products produced in foreign countries with cheap foreign labor. We see refinery runs cut as domestic production falls. And as we all know cuts in refinery runs increase the costs per barrel of refining crude. And the crowning blow to top all crowning blows we find our Federal Government buying foreign jet fuel and other refined products for the Armed Forces.

As citizens of Texas we see our economy in general suffering. Many of our Texas industries are based on the drilling, exploring for, and refining of oil. As production is cut lower and lower these activities slow down with resulting adverse effects on our income and employment. We find our State tax income being cut sharply as severance taxes become smaller and smaller. Glaring headlines declare that our State government must find millions of dollars in new revenue and if past practice is continued, these taxes will come out of the pockets of the working people in increased sales taxes.

As citizens of the United States we find ourselves faced with a deficit in our national budget as those major importers get double depletion allowances on their profits from imports. If we should be forced to defend ourselves we would find that our petroleum reserves have been neglected due to the cuts in production. Wildcatting isn't a very profitable business when you will be restricted to a very low production and that on an 11-day schedule.

What has been done? What can be done? What are we going to do? The first is easy to answer. Commissions and committees have been appointed to study the situation. That has been a favorite pastime in Washington. Appoint a committee to study the import situation and report to the administration. Finally after several such reports, a vountary import curtailment program was started. This voluntary plan was based on imports of several years ago and favored the major importers who were virtually the only importers at that time. Independent refiners now are trying to get quotas amounting to 200,000 additional barrels daily. Some of these independents are not complying with the voluntary control program. It was hoped to hold imports to 12 percent of the domestic production, but this figure has not been met, and domestic demand has dropped about 9 percent below last year. Governor Daniel has appointed a committee to study the effects of imports on the Texas economy. This almost comes in the category of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. Texas has been suffering from the effects of imports for several years, and the Governor finally appoints a committee to study the situation.

Senator YARBOROUGH has called for a Senate investigation of purchases of foreign oil and products by the Defense Department. These purchases amounted to $334 million in the fiscal year of 1957. I quote Senator YARBOROUGH as he asked for the investigation, "Remember these are American tax dollars that are being spent outside this Nation, that every $1 million spent is money that can never find its way into the pockets of the oil workers, the royalty owner, the refinery workers, and the American company employee."

As we see, very little of real importance has been done to curb imports. A lot has been said, but little has come of it. The President of the United States has the power in the palm of his hand to remedy the situation overnight. He has the full authority to set an import quota. To those of you who might deplore Government interference, let me remind you that the Texas Railroad Commission controls the Texas oil production right down to the last barrel. With our Texas regulatory agency cutting production every month (the Bureau of Mines predicts a lower demand in March than for February) it certainly behooves the Federal Government to step in and control imports to protect our domestic industry. We realize that there is nothing to be done about our foreign markets that have been lost due to increased refining facilities abroad, but there is no reason for our people to suffer so that these importers can get fatter and fatter on their very profitable imports. Of course, I realize that since the administration has shown its lack of consideration for the people of Texas by suing for recovery of the tidelands, that we can expect very little consideration from that source. I am afraid that it will be up to the Congress to do something. Several alternatives are open to them: A tariff on foreign crude and refined products, cancellation of the depletion allowance on crude produced outside the United States, a bill setting up rigid import quotas. I think all these possibilities should be considered. Certainly we should discontinue subsidies in the form of depletion allowances to American companies engaged in the production and importation of foreign crude.

What are we going to do? We are going to contact all our representatives in Congress, and bring to their attention the urgency of the situation. We are going to do what we can at the State level to give the railroad commission more power to meet the situation head on. At present their hands are tied by law. As demand (measured by nominations of purchasers) falls, they are obligated by law to cut our Texas production. They should be given more leeway in setting their quotas, and any resulting oversupply would be the responsibility of the Federal administration. The Federal Government should control imports to protect our Nation and its citizens.

We have just begun to fight. After we have contacted our Senators and Congressman, we will let you know their answers.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald of February 23, 1958]

THE PUBLISHER'S SCRATCH PAD

(By C. K. D.)

In the wake of the cutback in Texas oil production for the month of March to only 9 days, there is evidence that the gravity of the situation is becoming apparent in other States. At last, Texas will get help from States which have not cooperated in the past.

Louisiana announced Saturday it will reduce production 48,140 barrels per day in March.

Oklahoma's Governor Gary said his State will act Tuesday, being expected to make a reduction of 50,000 barrels daily, Gary said: "We're helpless. There's nothing the States can do. We hope this will force Washington to reappraise its policy with the view of making a drastic reduction in imports."

Meanwhile, Gov. Price Daniel continues his fight against excessive imports. He will be the first witness at the initial hearing Tuesday of his special oil imports study commission.

Total petroleum imports into the United States hit a new record high during the week ended February 14, averaging 1,897,500 barrels a day, of which 1,217,300 were crude. This is a big jump from the week-before average of 1,238,500 for all imports and tops the previous record high average of 1,795,200 set last September.

The News Herald's recent open letter to President Eisenhower and Texas Members of Congress has been the basis of several editorials in other newspapers and has brought the following comment from officials:

Olin Culberson, Railroad Commission Chairman: "Congratulations on that editorial of February 3. It was a bull's eye."

Ernest Thompson, member, Texas Railroad Commission: "Your open letter on imports is excellent. The President has full authority under section 7 (b) of the Trades Act to do

all things necessary to control imports whenever they threaten to imperil the national security. * * * I notice that more companies are applying to import oil. The new requests total some 200,000 barrels daily. We have too much oil now."

United States Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH: "I am enclosing a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 13. On pages A1259 and A1260 I inserted in the RECORD the complete text of the open letter which appeared on the front page of your issue of February 3. Your open letter presented a very graphic picture of the grave situation created by the ever-continuing flood of foreign oil imports. In my opinion your presentation of these conditions will be of no small importance in influencing the opinions of those who are unaware of the gravity of the problem. Please know that I am doing everything that I possibly can to call the attention of Government officials to the oil import crisis and its effects on the economy of Texas. If at any time I can be of service to you in helping on this, or any other matter, please call on me."

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH: "I assure you I will continue to try to help our east Texas oilfield people, producers, and all." Mr. BECKWORTH attached the following letter, dated February 11, written him by Capt. M. V. Carson, Jr., Administrator, Voluntary Oil Import Program, United States Department of the Interior:

"Your courtesy in sending me the copy of the Kilgore News Herald for February 3 is very much appreciated. I read with real interest the 'open letter' presented therein concerning imports of oil.

"Information which I have sent to you previously has shown that the imports of crude oil into districts I–IV during October, November, and December 1957, were below the Government-recommended level contained in the report which was approved by the President on July 29, 1957. Preliminary estimates indicate that crude-oil imports for January 1958 also were below the Government-recommended levels.

"The current petroleum situation, understandingly, is a matter of real concern to the people of Kilgore, Tex., as well as other communities in the oilfields. For this reason, I am glad to be able to report that the voluntary oil program has been operating with a considerable degree of success. Actual imports during the past 4 months in the district east of the Rocky Mountains have been below the total of the allocations to the importing companies. The Independent Petroleum Association of America, in its magazine for January, commented on the program and said:

"'* * * to date, the Government's import program has accomplished definite and substantial reductions in crude-oil imports. This provides a basis for encouragement that imports will continue to be restricted in the interest of maintaining a healthy domestic industry for national security."

The above letter from Captain Carson, who is a native of Hearne, Tex., is appreciated. His work is being widely praised. But the mass of industry opinion appears to be that the voluntary program does not go far enough. Some producers are thumbing their noses at Uncle Sam. Many are pressuring for new import quotas. And our Government continues to buy oil products from other nations. As a result of the overall situation, and despite sharp cutbacks in production, threats of a severe price break which could prove disastrous continue, and signs of gasoline wars are appearing.

Among the many recommendations for action are those made Saturday by the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, calling for Congress to place on imports (1) an equalization tariff, (2) quotas or quota-tariff combination, or (3) source-country quotas under which importers would bid competitively for import privileges.

Details of TIPRO's plan appear on page 5, this section. On the same page is a story telling the arguments made to Captain Carson by some of the companies who want to get into the importing business. Usually the basic plea is, "foreign oil is cheaper."

Commenting on the News Herald's open letter, the Marshall News Messenger said: "It may make sense to curb the economy of this country so as to save our resources, but it makes just about as much sense as saving food by skipping meals. Oil imports are hurting Texas, the economy suffering more and more as cumulative effects are felt." And the Panola Watchman at Carthage observed: "The Kilgore newspaper points out quite correctly that imports are hurting Texas * * * We are all appreciative of the fact that a certain amount of restrictions must be observed to save our resources, but if the restrictions push our independent oil operators to the wall, while giving special favor to foreign imports, it just doesn't make sense."

"Regardless of which remedy is applied," the Tyler Telegraph said in an editorial, "the fact persists that mandatory controls loom larger each month as the only way open for the rescue of the domestic oil industry in which east Texas has such heavy stakes. The continuing necessity for the month-by-month allowable cuts is enough to convince one that the President's plan for voluntary imports reduction is not giving the desired results."

The Dallas News commented Saturday that "imports should not exceed 10 percent of the market demand * * * There is no oil bank to duplicate the soil bank, no largess for oil operators who do not produce except insofar as they can make their money in the market * * * Stifled operations cost heavily oil workers as well as oil operators * * * One aim of conservation, assured supply in the event of war, is adversely affected if domestic production is so limited that the technically skilled manpower for production is made unavailable because it must seek other jobs * * * The key to the situation remains import oil."

This corner would like to ask Washington one question: What would happen if imports of cars and steel should cause Detroit and Pittsburgh plants to shut down and produce only 9 days in the month of March?

UNWISDOM OF PROPOSED REDUCTION IN STRENGTH OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time I wish to go on record as being opposed to the administration's proposal to cut the National Guard strength by 10 percent, from 400,000 to 360,000 officers and men. In my judgment, any cutback in the National Guard in light of Soviet Russia's standing fighting force of 175 divisions would be foolhardy to say the least.

My State of Texas, which has its own 36th National Guard Division—a fighting unit which has written a brave and glorious record through two world wars. Texas also has a number of other very fine National Guard units. All the people of Texas are very much concerned about the proposed cutback. I have received many, many letters and other messages opposing this cutback.

In order that this administration and the Senate may have the benefit of some of these communications, I wish to have the following excerpts from letters printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mayor E. K. O'Shea, of the city of Mercedes, Tex., wrote:

We are 100 percent for reduction of expenditures wherever it can be done; but, with existing conditions and problems in the security of our Nation, and knowing the worth of the National Guard system during peace and war, our city and our chamber of commerce are very much opposed to drastic reduction in the National Guard.

Mr. V. A. Mohr, president of the Texas district, American Lutheran Church, and a leading churchman in our State, wrote:

I have been reading and hearing with increasing alarm of the reduction in strength in National Guard personnel. If and when another world war occurs, our National Guard will be doubly necessary for home protection. With the present personnel at a mere 400,000 for the Nation, it is certainly inconsistent with common sense to cut in this area of our defense spending. By reducing the Army National Guard to 360,000 men, whole divisions as well as highly trained nondivisional units, will have to be completely wiped out. Hundreds of millions of dollars expended by Federal and State Governments for facilities, equipment, and administration will be completely lost. When war comes, this loss will have to be respent, since we will necessarily have to have such men available as the Army National Guard trains.

We must support the Army National Guard at the minimum of 400,000 men, which in itself is really too small a force.

May I urge you to take the necessary action to prevent the reduction in strength of National Guard personnel? Wherever my work takes me throughout the State of Texas in my visits to more than 80,000 of my church members, I ask opinions of various individuals. Their reaction is the same.

Mr. A. J. Carnesi, vice president of the First National Bank at Brownsville, Tex., wrote:

Brownsville and this area have some peculiarities with which I am sure you are familiar, that is, we are almost 300 miles away from San Antonio and approximately 175 miles from Corpus Christi. In addition, of course, we are on the border of Mexico. Keeping these things in mind we would depend heavily on our National Guard unit in the event of any civil disturbances or disasters.

We would appreciate your reviewing this situation and request your support in keeping our National Guard at its present strength.

Mayor Joseph Faust, of the city of New Braunfels, Tex., wrote:

New Braunfels is very proud of its guard units and of their splendid record and accomplishments both in war and in time of local emergency. From its inception in 1937, the National Guard has been considered an integral part of the community and we are justly proud of the men who have served their country and community so well.

Seven thousand one hundred dollars was expended by the city of New Braunfels to provide a site for the construction of an armory to house the local units because of the responsibility felt toward the National Guard for their many contributions to the community.

It is my opinion the National Guard is vital to our security. The 185 enlisted men and 17 officers of our local unit, as well as those in units throughout our great land, are a Ready Reserve, well trained and economically maintained, should be preserved to keep the United States militarily and economically strong.

Mr. President, these excerpts from letters from mayors of cities, businessmen, and churchmen, are merely a sampling of the protests that I have received from Texas at this mentioned reduction of National Guard strength. In event of a general war, every city would become a battlefield. In event of a hot so-called brush war all of our few 15 active divisions might be called overseas, and our National Guard would then be called into active service. In these days of uncertainty, it seems to me to be very unwise to impair the efficiency of the National Guard at this time.

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] delivered an address in Richmond, Va., on February 28 on the occasion of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

His speech was received with much acclaim by the democracy of Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER HELD AT THE JOHN MARSHALL HOTEL IN RICHMOND, VA.

Governor Almond, Senator Byrd, Senator Robertson, Governor Stanley, Governor Battle, Governor Tuck, members of the Virginia Congressional delegation, Delegate Thomson, Mrs. Glass, Mrs. Williams, distinguished officials, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of the Democratic Party of the Commonwealth of Virginia, my first words must be to congratulate your able and courageous Governor and the Democrats of the Old Dominion for your magnificent and sweeping victory at the polls last November.

The overwhelming majority of the people of the State of Georgia join me in saluting you for your doctrine of massive resistance.

We are proud to be in the fight at Virginia's side.

We honor the electorate of Virginia for sending word north across the Potomac that this Commonwealth and all the States of this Nation still are sovereign and—by the grace of God and the red blood which flows in the veins of the American people—ever will remain so.

Your invitation for me speak to you on this occasion is one which I always shall cherish for, with the exception of recognition accorded by one's own people, I can think of no greater distinction than to be afforded the opportunity to address Virginia democracy.

While it would be presumptuous indeed for me to attempt to convey the significance of representative government to the descendants of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Mason, Marshall, Monroe, Wilson and the other immortal patriots which this Commonwealth has produced, I am happy to meet with present-day leaders in the seedbed, so to speak, of constitutional government, economic responsibility and public morality.

My association with your leaders during the past years in the governors' conferences, in the Democratic conventions, in the Congress and in other forums, demonstrates to me that the people of Virginia have kept faith with her illustrious past and that this Dominion is democratic in the fullest sense of that cherished word.

You have selected your leaders over the years in a manner which reflects great credit upon the good name of Virginia. You have held high the sacred ideals of those early Virginians—the ancestors of many Americans who endured grave hardships and made many sacrifices during our Nation's formative years.

I have found your officials deeply conscious of their responsibilities. Some of the fondest memories I cherish are of my association with them in the fight to uphold the rights of the people which some would destroy.

I speak of Bill Tuck and his wise and sagacious leadership, his eloquence in defense of constitutional government and his devotion to duty.

I speak of John Battle and all of the qualities of statesmanship he demonstrated at the National Democratic Party Convention in 1952 and on many other occasions.

I speak of Thomas Stanley and his ability and courage in leading this Commonwealth through a most trying period.

I speak of Lindsay Almond who, having stepped into the breach, has earned the plaudits of all thinking Americans for delineating the issue precisely and for steadfastly refusing to yield at any point along the line.

I speak of your two United States Senators—your distinguished senior Senator, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, and your able and respected junior Senator, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

They are unsurpassed as statesmen and none commands more respect in the world's greatest deliberative body than they.

Having completed my first year as a freshman Senator, I want to thank the Senators from Virginia for the kindness, help, and patience they have shown me during this period.

HARRY BYRD has spoken in Georgia on a number of occasions and he is greatly admired by the people of my State. I, personally, have been an admirer for many years of his outstanding record as a farmer, a publisher, an administrator, a sound, honest, and courageous public official and a statesman of renown.

I share the joy of Virginians and the millions of Americans who admire and trust Senator BYRD in his decision to accede to the wishes of his friends and seek reelection to the Senate.

In this time when the ranks of true Americans, true patriots, and true statesmen in positions of responsibility in our country are growing thin, it is a source of great comfort to all who are concerned about the future course of this Nation that we are not to be deprived of the wise and dependable leadership of HARRY BYRD when we need it most.

Americans are not unmindful of the great personal sacrifice which this decision entails for Senator BYRD and they love him all the more for it. Such devotion to public service and such response to the call of duty is in keeping with the highest traditions of those great Virginia statesmen of the past whose words and deeds are forever enshrined in the hearts of their countrymen.

Senator BYRD, you, too, have earned that recognition which comes only with sacrifice and history will record in glowing terms the selflessness and dedication with which you are serving your State and Nation.

I join with your friends here tonight in saluting you and in expressing the hope that the Nation will have the good fortune of having the benefit of your boundless experience, your valued counsel, your matchless wisdom, and your confident leadership for many years to come.

It is on this occasion that Democrats of every State and region honor Thomas Jefferson, the Virginian and father of the Democratic Party, and Andrew Jackson, the Tennessean who came to the Presidency as the standard bearer of a revival of democracy and a fuller realization of Jeffersonian principles.

To both men we owe much.

While there was great difference between the two—Jefferson being the more intellectual and precise and Jackson being the more rugged and persistent—they both possessed qualities of leadership which are sorely needed in this critical hour of our Nation's existence.

At a time when Virginia stands as the No. 1 target of those who would destroy home rule, self-determination, and local self-government in this Nation, we can take comfort, you and I, in the words Jefferson penned as follows when he assumed the Presidency:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Virginians and Georgians who share a common heritage still subscribe proudly to that oath today.

In all history of mankind no mortal possessed greater vision than Jefferson. He foresaw the very abuses of power which make us a country divided today.

In 1820 he warned of judicial usurpation in constitutional matters in these words:

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated Republic. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. This will lay all things at their feet. * * * They skulk from responsibility to public opinion. * * * An opinion is huddled up in conclave, perhaps by a majority of one, delivered as if unanimous, and with the silent acquiescence of lazy or timid associates, by a crafty chief judge who sophisticates the law to his mind, by the turn of his own reasoning."

The far-seeing patriarch of Monticello warned further that the germ of dissolution of our Federal system lies in the Federal judiciary with the Supreme Court "working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one."

To this terrible prospect Jefferson was dauntlessly opposed, and for good reason because, as he said:

"When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government or another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.

"If ever this vast country is brought under a single government, it will be one of the most extensive corruption, indifferent, and incapable of wholesome care over so wide a spread of surface."

That is a part of the prophecy left us by the hand of the man who penned the Declaration of Independence and who insisted that a Bill of Rights be included in the Federal Constitution.

No American who values his freedom can afford to look with apathy on his words.

Nor can we overlook the courage and rugged integrity which that other great Democrat—"Old Hickory"—Andrew Jackson brought to the White House.

Georgians remember Jackson best perhaps for the occasion when he refused to send troops into our State to enforce a Supreme Court decision by military force. He said then that he would submit his decision to the people in the presidential election which was at hand and the voters could say whether

they approved or disapproved of his decision not to invade a sovereign State.

That was the philosophy of Jackson—a man of the people.

He expressed it on one occasion thusly:

"Distinctions in society will aways exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth, cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law. * * * There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing.

"Nor is our Government to be maintained, or our Union preserved, by invasion of the rights and powers of the several States. In thus attempting to make our general Government strong, we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States, as much as possible, to themselves; in making itself felt, not in its power, but in its beneficence; not in its control, but in its protection; not in binding the States more closely to the center, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit."

Jackson believed with Jefferson that the true protectors of liberty in this country are the State governments.

Jackson believed with Jefferson that the States should be watchful to note each and every material usurpation of their rights; to denounce them in the most preemptory terms as they occur; to protest against them as wrongs; and to stand immutable for their correction.

For, as Jefferson wrote:

"* * * It is certain that though written constitutions may be violated in moments of passion or delusion, yet, they furnish a text to which those who are watchful may again rally and recall the people; they fix, too, for the people the principles of their political creed."

It is on this day, this February 28, 1958, that we rededicate ourselves to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

We call on the National Democratic Party and Democrats everywhere to join us in this solemn consecration to these imperishable principles.

We pledge ourselves to these precepts which have stood the test of time, have been tried in the crucible of hard experience, and have never been found wanting insofar as the best interests of the people are concerned.

We send word, here and now, to our brothers in National Democratic Party councils that we believe the American people are tired of mediocrity.

They want something better.

The American people are tired of the same old warmed-over policies and half-baked ideas.

They want—and are entitled to—leaders and leadership.

While we would be loath to be driven from the house of our fathers, we must admit that neither of the two major political parties has shown the capacity for offering that brand of two-fisted, hard-hitting, honest leadership we must have to save this country.

The administration now in Washington has failed the American people again, again, and over again.

This administration has delivered the worst blow to constitutional government in the entire 182-year history of our Republic.

This administration has failed to maintain our national defense posture.

This administration has failed us on the economic front.

This administration not only has failed the farmers of the Nation but also has been blithely indifferent of their plight.

This administration has been one of waste, extravagance, special privilege, high interest rates, high taxes, runaway inflation, tight money, and mounting debt.

What we are getting today is a far cry from the brave promises which were solemnly made to us in the so-called crusade of 1952.

The Supreme Court in its May 17, 1954, decision in the school segregation cases has torn the Nation asunder at a time when world conditions dictate it should be united as never before.

This decision handed down in arbitrary fashion is the most irresponsible act ever taken by a supposedly responsible arm of an established government.

Although directed solely at the Southern States, no section of our Nation is being spared its evil effects. You have read the ominous headlines from New York City, Brooklyn, Detroit, Chicago, Washington, and other communities outside the South about the violence in their schools.

All men and women of conscience are shocked when the public schools—which bear the responsibility of training our youth for good citizenship—are thwarted in the discharge of that responsibility by strife, friction, and violence arising from no other cause save that tragic decision of the Supreme Court.

The people of Georgia, as well as the people of Virginia, I am sure do not for a moment entertain any thought of turning their children over to the Supreme Court for psychological experimentation.

Georgians and Virginians alike are determined to prevent the occurrence in their schools of such outbreaks of lawlessness as have taken place in Brooklyn and other cities. And left alone to manage their own school affairs, I am confident that Georgians and Virginians will see that there will be no rapes, riots, assaults or suicides to mar the good name and tranquillity which our schools now enjoy.

I am further confident that, left alone to solve their difficulties in accordance with the customs and wishes of the people concerned and free from the distracting influence of pusillanimous politicians, the people of Brooklyn, Detroit, Chicago, Washington and other strife-torn cities will be able to restore order to their schools and public places and make sure there is no repetition of their present difficulties.

I assure you, my friends, that Georgia stands with you in the fight to preserve Virginia schools for Virginians and Georgia schools for Georgians.

I commend your Governor and the members of the General Assembly of Virginia for enacting important legislation at this session to protect your schools. This act, I am told, says in no uncertain terms that Virginia school boards and Virginia school trustees will continue to direct the affairs of the schools of Virginia. It makes it abundantly clear that Virginia schools are not the province of Federal marshals or Federal troops and, if they should seek to interfere with them, that the doors of your free public schools in any locality affected would be closed until such time as the unwarranted invasion of the inherent rights of this Commonwealth shall cease.

We deplore the fact that a good part of our national strength in the last few years has been dissipated on internal dissension.

It is a great tragedy that much of last year's Congressional session was wasted by those who insisted on enactment of the so-called civil rights bill. Time spent on more constructive legislation would have added far more to our national defense and well-being.

Since World War II we have seen Russia, a second-rate power a quarter century ago, outdistance us in both the fields of world politics and in marshaling our available resources for defense. We have seen her pull ahead of us in several critical areas of missile development.

During recent weeks we have seen military man after military man and scientist after scientist testify before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that our political leadership in Washington has been asleep and insensible to the peril to our existence as a nation.

How much better, my friends, it would have been if we had laid aside civil rights and similar petty questions and centered our best efforts in devising ways and means to defend the people of this country.

We have seen our military men punished, and one even banished to Central America, because they dared to tell the American people the truth about the sad state of our defenses.

American prestige has suffered and dropped as never before all over the world.

We learned from General LeMay's testimony the awful truth that for several weeks in mid-1957 the mighty bombers of our Strategic Air Command lay prostrate as sitting ducks. This was because the penny-wise-and-pound-foolish Budget Bureau in Washington failed to furnish sufficient funds for fuel.

I ask you, in the name of reason and common sense, what kind of a leadership do we have which squanders millions on an arrogant, illegal and unconstitutional invasion of the sovereign State of Arkansas, yet, does not have 1 red cent for fuel to power our bombers to be used in retaliation should a surprise hydrogen-bomb attack be launched against us?

We cannot have a streamlined and coordinated defense program until the bickering, lost motion, appalling waste and needless duplication of effort is eliminated from our Defense Establishment.

We must face the stark economic fact that if we succumb to current pressures for further deficit spending, the savings, the bonds, the insurance policies, the bank accounts, the retirement benefits of all Americans—which already have been reduced over 50 percent since 1939—are going to be further endangered and threatened with complete liquidation.

The policy of the present national administration of tight money for the people and easy money for the bureaucrats simply does not make good sense to me.

The economy will never make a complete recovery or achieve its full potential until we get an administration in Washington which recognizes the dire condition of the Nation's farmers. And until we get an administration which moves with boldness and vigor to assure the farm family its fair share of the national income.

Secretary Benson's policies have driven many farmers off the land and have kept those who have remained under constant threat of bankruptcy.

We have had enough.

The farmers of this Nation must look to an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress and a new Democratic administration in Washington dedicated to old-fashioned Jeffersonian-Jacksonian democracy to right these wrongs, to resolve this unfairness and to do something meaningful for the American people.

The President proposes almost four billions more for foreign aid giveaways in the new budget.

Every day foreign potentates or their representatives are in Washington making unprecedented demands on our country.

And Foster Dulles and DICK NIXON are there ready to give them the keys to the Treasury.

The overall budget proposed by the President seeks to make cuts where reductions are undesirable.

It seeks to make increases in nondefense spending where increases are undesirable.

The administration would weaken our most reliable first line of defense by cutting the National Guard by 44,000 men at a time when our military superiority hangs in the balance.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid so that it may continue to shower our economic substance on a Communist satellite like Poland, which has received nearly $200 million in American credits and other assistance within less than a year's time.

The administration says that we must further cripple the farmers of this Nation.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid to stimulate foreign crop production.

The administration says that we must double interest rates on REA loans.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid to subsidize tax cuts and debt reduction in foreign lands.

The administration would leave our farmers to shift for themselves in case of drought, flood, or other disaster.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid so that vast hydroelectric dams and irrigation and river development projects can be carried on all over the rest of the world.

The administration would reduce assistance for our old people, our dependent children, our needy blind, and our totally disabled.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid to do such things as to set up a pension program for over-age Chinese Nationalist soldiers.

The administration would terminate grants to local governments for operation of schools in federally impacted areas.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid so that it can continue to send abroad hundreds of millions of American tax dollars annually to Middle Eastern potentates, one of whom, King Ibn Saud, of Arabia, maintains a personal establishment of 10,000 wives, concubines, slaves, royal retainers and bodyguards, a fleet of 250 air-conditioned Cadillacs, a wing of private airliners, and 24 luxurious palaces.

The administration would shift to States and localities the responsibility for public housing.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid to add to the $62 billion post-war-aid program under which American taxpayers have built railroads, steel mills, factories, generating plants, schools, hospitals, office buildings, communication systems, and a host of other magnificent projects in some sixty-odd foreign countries.

The administration would curtail hospital construction to meet only urgent needs.

Yet, it asks billions in new aid so that it can continue such projects as building public restrooms in the Philippines and bathing facilities for Egyptian camel drivers and providing collapsible toothpaste tubes for Cambodia, dress suits for Grecian undertakers, and iceboxes for Eskimos.

Suggestions have been made by administration-appointed committees that veterans' compensation and pensions should be drastically reduced and many veterans' benefits curtailed.

Yet, the administration asks billions in new aid for such boondoggling projects as sending hot-lip musicians on foreign tours at higher salaries than the President, and opera singers to Italy, for giving Arabs free trips to Mecca, and for building grain elevators in Pakistan.

What kind of a policy is this, my fellow Democrats, which has billions for foreign giveaways, but seeks to deny our own people?

Is it any wonder, then, that this is a time of frustration, anger, and concern?

Our people cannot understand, and rightly so, why our Government is so free and easy with our tax money in foreign giveaways, yet, when homefolks simply ask respectfully for their rights they are subjected to redtape, humiliation, embarrassment, and denial.

I believe that the people all over this Nation realize that the time has come for a genuine housecleaning in Washington.

As your own Thomas Jefferson said:

"The people may be misled or deceived for a time, but where the avenues of truth are open there men will learn to reject what is false and harmful. Where the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied upon to set them to rights."

Like Jefferson, I put my faith in the American people.

I am confident that this Nation will survive in spite of all the mistakes our governmental leaders may make.

You ask, How can we insure America's future strength and safety?

The answer to that question is clear.

Now is the time for a return to fundamentals.

We must go forth among the people of this Nation, no matter in what section they may live and urge renewed respect for the true meaning of our written Constitution.

We must send officials to Washington who will insist upon the establishment of sound business principles into the operations of this Government.

There must be a sincere determination on the part of all public servants everywhere to keep faith with the people.

Americans must be freed of the tryanny of big government so they may once again be masters of their own destiny.

And above all else, there must be a full rededication to the time-proven teachings of the Holy Writ.

Now is the time for leaders and leadership to guide the American people back along the pathway of lasting values.

As we prepare ourselves to meet our secred obligations as citizens of this great Republic, we do so humbly and with prayer to Almighty God for His benevolence and guidance.

We do so with solemn resolution on our part to do the work that needs to be done and to make the sacrifices that need to be made.

Doing that, we and our posterity can look to the horizons of tomorrow with the assurance that peace and security under God will continue to be our heritage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 5809, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5809) to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is prepared to explain the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill has a very simple purpose. The battleship *Arizona*, as all of us sadly know, is lying upside down in Pearl Harbor. One thousand one hundred United States citizens are entombed in that ship. For some time there have been complaints and criticisms that no suitable memorial has been erected to the men who lost their lives in that battleship.

The pending bill will permit the Pacific War Memorial Commission to raise funds publicly, by subscription, for the erection of a proper memorial in connection with the battleship *Arizona*. When sufficient funds are raised to pay for a design by the Navy of a memorial to be constructed by the Navy, the bill will authorize that the funds be turned over to the Navy. In that way the memorial will be designed and constructed.

None of the construction costs will be borne by the Government. When the memorial is constructed, the United States Government, through the Navy, will maintain it in the years to come.

The Navy estimates that the cost of maintaining such a memorial will be no more than the cost it now incurs in maintaining the battleship *Arizona* in its present condition.

That is the purpose of the bill.

The Armed Services Committee has unanimously reported the bill, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that last November it was my privilege to visit the battleship *Arizona* as it lay sunken in Pearl Harbor. I had an opportunity to observe the condition of the battleship. I believe it is very important that the Congress pass a bill authorizing the construction of such a memorial.

While I was there, on the battleship itself as it lies in the waters of Pearl Harbor, I was greatly impressed to observe visiting there a father and mother whose son lost his life in that catastrophe. Ever since the battle of Pearl Harbor, they had been saving their money, so as to be able to visit Pearl Harbor and place a wreath on the remains of the battleship, in tribute to their son. I happened to be there on that occasion.

It will be a truly great memorial, and Congress should assist in every way it can to make it a permanent one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we cannot overemphasize the propriety of our action when the Senate passes the pending measure to provide for a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor. History is replete with examples of the tragedies resulting from the failure of nations—among them our own—to give adequate consideration to their preparedness and military strength in main-

taining their own security within the framework of international society. Fortunately, we had sufficient time to recover from the devastating blow that came out of the skies over Hawaii that Sunday morning. But, Mr. President, should a similar attack come, we may not be given that second chance.

Today when free men everywhere are faced with the horrors of nuclear incineration, it is imperative that we be prepared at all times either to win a war against Godless communism or to prevent such a war by being so strong that the dictators in Moscow will be afraid to drop the first bomb.

It is, therefore, appropriate that, through this memorial, we focus our attention on our most striking example of unpreparedness, so that we may be perpetually reminded of the security that is found in strength.

In closing I request permission to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, the names of the young men from Arizona who are forever entombed in the remains of the battleship *Arizona*.

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

Murphy, James Joseph, seaman first class, Bisbee, Ariz.; Skeen, Harvey Leroy, seaman, second class, Miami, Ariz.; Horrocks, James William, chief gunner's mate, Nogales, Ariz.; Bertie, George Allan, Jr., seaman, second class, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hollowell, George Sanford, coxswain, Phoenix, Ariz.; Van Horn, James Randolf, able seaman, Tucson, Ariz.; Cremeens, Louis Edward, seaman, first class, Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I rise to speak, not on my own behalf, but as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. I wish to clarify the purpose of the pending measure.

For the information of the Senate, let me say that the American Battle Monuments Commission is composed of some very distinguished citizens, not including the present speaker. The Chairman of the Commission is General of the Army George C. Marshall. The Vice Chairman is Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid. The other members are the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle; Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift; the Honorable John Phillips, of California; Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.; Mrs. Wendell L. Wilkie; Gen. Carl Spaatz; Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis; the Honorable Forest A. Harness and myself. I am pleased to have the honor to serve on the Commission.

One of the problems confronting the Commission has developed as a result of the fact that over the years several groups representing various branches of the armed services, and even units of particular branches of one or another of the services, have erected monuments and memorials in practically the four corners of the earth. That has been done because of a spirit of patriotism and a strong feeling of honor and pride in the services represented. But we found that after a period of time, the interest subsides; and today many of these wonderful memorials have been left to disintegrate, rather than to serve as memorials to the units concerned and to the men in them, who served with such distinction.

The disintegration of such a memorial is, of course, a disgrace to the unit memorialized; certainly is not a tribute to the men who served in it.

It is because of this situation that the American Battle Monuments Commission has considered this problem. Let me state that the Commission has worked under the direction of the President of the United States. When I was first appointed to the Commission, President Eisenhower said to me that one of the things the Commission would have to be extremely careful about would be to avoid having all branches of the service or units of the various branches build memorials throughout the world, but without any general plan as to how the memorials would be maintained.

I believe the Battle Monuments Commission has done an outstanding job in connection with the erection of memorials for the men who served in World War I. I think practically all the memorials for World War II have been completed.

So far as the U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial is concerned, the Battle Monuments Commission already has plans underway for the construction of a memorial for all persons who served in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the Pacific area, located at the site commonly referred to as the Punch Bowl. A memorial is to be erected in that area in memory of all those who gave their lives for their country.

I should like to invite attention to the following points: The Congress established the American Battle Monuments Commission to plan and erect memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces inside and outside the United States, as the Commission should determine. The Commission has produced a program of memorials which gives proportionate and complete memorialization to all the services and all campaigns and battles. It has often received from various sources requests for the erection of memorials reflecting their particular interest, but which, if consummated, would lay undue stress upon, or lend undue prominence to, the events concerned, and, incidentally, set the precedent for a flood of analogous requests.

There is a precedent for the memorial in Hawaii, namely, the memorial in the Philippines. If the trend continues, the Army will make a request for a memorial at Okinawa; the Marines will make a request for a memorial at Iwo Jima; the Air Force will make a request for a memorial at another place. The whole concept and purpose of establishing the Battle Monuments Commission, including provision for and the maintenance of memorials, would be completely subverted by requests from the various services, and even by units of a service, which would raise funds to erect memorials throughout the world.

The Battle Monuments Commission has been faced with that problem. For example, a monument was erected by friends of the 28th Division in Europe, which was made up of the Pennsylvania National Guard. Of course, there is a great deal of State pride, as there should be, in that outstanding division. Funds were raised and a memorial was erected in France to commemorate the memory of that great division. Today that memorial is a disgrace. It has been allowed to disintegrate, and has not been properly maintained.

It certainly is not an agreeable reflection upon the wonderful services the 28th Division rendered during World War I.

All of us have a deep feeling of gratitude for the wonderful service the Navy performed, and particularly for the victims of the attack at Pearl Harbor. However, rather than rendering a service, rather than really paying a tribute to them, we may find ourselves in the position of doing them a great disservice by adopting the pending proposal.

It is true that funds for the memorial will be raised by public subscription, and that the Navy will be authorized to maintain the memorial; but I can assure Senators that once the memorial is established, bills for other memorials, will be introduced by the score, with each branch of the service trying to raise funds to erect memorials for particular battles. If that should happen, we might as well abolish the American Battle Monuments Commission. I think most of those who have visited the Battle Monuments Commission memorials recognize that they constitute a real tribute to the Armed Forces.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am one of the many Members of Congress who have visited Hawaii and seen the hulk of the *Arizona*. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he does not see in the attack at Pearl Harbor, and in the fantastic, incredible effect on the battleship *Arizona*, something that far transcends any special memorial to any special service or any special location. That morning or afternoon was "it." It was morning there and afternoon here. It was the stroke of fate. Not to recognize that event in some way seems incredible to me.

Mr. POTTER. I may say to my distinguished friend that the event is being recognized. The memorial at the Punch Bowl, which overlooks Pearl Harbor, is a memorial to those who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor. I might say further to my distinguished friend that while I fully realize that December 7 was a great and tragic day in the life of America, I am sure if this bill should be enacted there will be request upon request for memorials to so-called special days or tragic days, whichever they may have been, when the members of one branch of the service, or another, make the supreme sacrifice. If that should prove to be the case, then I say we might as well abolish the Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me? Has the Senator from Vermont completed his inquiry? I did not want to interrupt the colloquy. I thought he had completed his question.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am through for the present, until further light shines upon the subject.

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Michigan has alluded to the fact that if the bill were enacted the Congress would be flooded with similar requests. The distinguished Senator from Michigan was a Member of the 83d Congress, and I believe he will recall that during that Congress a measure was passed which created the Corregidor Bataan Commission. I forget what the exact title is. Although I am actually a member of the Commission, I have forgotten what the exact title is.

Mr. POTTER. I recall it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator if there has been a flood of bills on the subject since that bill was passed by Congress.

Mr. POTTER. I may point out that the bill presently before the Senate is an example. The establishment of the Philippines Commission, or the Corregidor Commission—whatever the exact name of it is—was used as the precedent for the pending bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator call one bill in 5 years a flood of bills?

Mr. POTTER. No; but as we keep chipping away at the authority and responsibility of the Commission, there may be a flood. If we should enter into a program for erecting monuments for each branch of the service, for each specific battle in which it engaged, then we might as well abolish the Commission, and allow each branch of the service to act as its own lobby for that particular service.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this proposed legislation attempts to create something a little different from a battle monument, to my mind. This ship actually is a tomb. There are 1,102 Americans who died on Pearl Harbor Day who are still within the hulk of the U. S. S. *Arizona*.

I do not understand why the Senator from Michigan keeps referring to the proposed memorial as a battle monument. To me, this ship has a more sacred place in the hearts of Americans as a tomb for these 1,100 men. We are never going to get them out. I can think of no more fitting branch of the service to take care of this memorial than the Navy.

With all due respects for the argument of the Senator from Michigan, to my mind this ship's hulk is not a battle monument, it is a tomb. It is a tomb in which are the bodies of more than 1,100 Americans. If it is a monument to anything, it is a monument to the stupidity of the United States. I do not like to see monuments erected to our shortcomings. I should like to think of this as a tomb upon which Americans can always look reverently because of the men who gave their lives for their country.

I am sincerely hopeful that the Senator from Michigan, who is a close friend of mine, will not insist on any changes in the suggested legislation, so that we can go ahead with the job that confronts us and perpetuate the memory of the men who are entombed in this hulk.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator realizes that I am not insensitive to the tragic hour when the men of the Navy lost their lives on the U. S. S. *Arizona* and other ships at Pearl Harbor. I, like every other American citizen, join in the desire to pay all the tribute a thankful country can render to those men and their memories.

The point which I raise is urged, not only on behalf of myself, but on behalf of a very distinguished Commission. I feel that, if the requested procedure is to be followed at the present time, it will have an effect upon the American Battle Monuments Commission. An amendment has been prepared with respect to the bill, which would allow the American Battle Monuments Commission to carry out the plans for the erection of the memorial, and to provide for its maintenance. I realize that procedure is a little unusual, because the funds for the memorial are to come from private sources rather than Government sources.

I know the distinguished Senator from Arizona has traveled throughout Europe. The Senator has seen, as I have, the memorials there. They were erected, I am sure, with the same patriotic intent the Senator from Arizona expresses today. Some of those memorials, however, were left untended. Rather than constituting a source of pride for Americans, some of the memorials are more a sickening and disheartening sight, and certainly not a tribute to the men they were intended to honor.

I know it is the intention of the American Battle Monuments Commission that those who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor should receive the same high type of memorial program we have provided by other memorials erected throughout the world. I do not know—and the Senator from Arizona does not know—the type of memorial the Navy will erect. It might be a memorial which would be extremely offensive. I do not think that would be the case, but it could be. We would have no supervision over that matter.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to Public Law 792, which was passed in the second session of the 84th Congress. The bill, which became a law, was S. 3498 at that time. The public law specifically deletes control by the American Battle Monuments Commission over memorials on the property controlled by the United States Government.

I invite the Senator's attention to the last paragraph of section 3 of the act, which provides:

> The Commission shall control as to design, and provide regulations for, the erection of all memorial monuments and buildings commemorating the services of the American Armed Forces erected in any foreign country or political division thereof, which may authorize the Commission to perform such functions.

That language was adopted, really, at the request of the American Battle Monuments Commission itself.

Mr. Thomas North, brigadier general, United States Army, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, wrote the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a letter dated April 11, 1955. I will not read all the letter, but I wish to read the comment on the third paragraph of the section. Mr. North states:

> The third paragraph of this section is amended by deleting the Commission's present control over the erection of memorials upon federally owned or controlled property in the United States or in its Territories and possessions. The exercise of such control by the Commission has been found to be impractical.

That was the letter of the Secretary of the Commission, written to the Senator from Montana.

The Senate report on the bill stated in part:

> * * * this section is amended by deleting the Commission's present control over the erection of memorials upon federally owned or controlled property in the United States or in its Territories and possessions. The exercise of such control by the Commission has been found to be impractical.

This memorial is to be built by the Navy. It will be designed by the Navy, and will be built by use of funds contributed by the public. When it is completed, the memorial will be maintained by the Navy. The proposal relates to what is essentially a Navy ship. We are considering what really is a one-service affair.

As I understand, the Battle Monuments Commission objects to making provision where there is involved a one-service affair, since they would rather remain out of such a situation. They desire to participate when there is under consideration a memorial for all the services, such as the so-called "Punch Bowl" which is on the island.

I hope that the Senator will not offer any amendment, and will permit the bill to be passed as is.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

It is true that the American Battle Monuments Commission asked for and obtained an amendment to the basic law, which gave them authority to erect memorials on American soil.

I also wish to assure the Senator that no individual branch of the service is normally so honored. Memorials in honor of those who may have served in a given area are the ones generally considered.

I hope that my remarks are perfectly clear. I am acting as a spokesman. While my service happened to be in the Army, I have no antipathy toward the Navy; as a matter of fact, quite the opposite is true.

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

Mr. POTTER. By the same token, I feel that the American Battle Monu-

ments Commission has done an outstanding job. Unless it is made clear in the debate that this matter has been considered, I feel we perhaps would be making a mistake. I think we are all voting for something blind, because the Senator from Massachusetts and I do not have any idea of the type of memorial which may be erected. Perhaps it will be something very offensive to some of the constituents of the Senator from Massachusetts or of the Senator from Michigan, though I doubt that that would be the case.

However, by following the suggested process we will lose the experience and knowledge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, which has the reputation and has the personnel to do an outstanding job in this field. That Commission will be left out of the picture, and the work will be turned over to an agency of Government which does not have that function as a prime responsibility.

I think the Senator well remembers that when the cemetery at Punch Bowl was under the jurisdiction of the Army, since the Army has constantly been undermanned, the Punch Bowl in many cases has been not necessarily a disgrace, but has not been maintained as it should have been maintained. That was under the jurisdiction of the Army. I should hope that if this bill were enacted and the Navy were put in charge of maintenance, it would not have the same experience which the Army had with the Punch Bowl.

I do not wish to labor the point. I know the sentiment of Members of the Senate today. I shall not offer my amendment. However, I believe that before another bill of this kind comes before the committee the situation should be carefully studied. There is a tendency among all of us automatically to say, "Yes" to this type of legislation without considering it very carefully. I hope the members of the Battle Monuments Commission will be called in, and that we will sit down with them and determine whether we are completely to subvert the Battle Monuments Commission. If so, we should abolish it and turn over all the memorials to the various branches of the service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no one who could more properly debate this subject than our distinguished friend from Michigan, who is now discussing it. In this instance he is debating it as a member of the Battle Monuments Commission. He is very properly a representative of that Commission.

I hope, from a practical standpoint and also from a sentimental standpoint, from the Navy point of view, he will permit the bill to be passed in its present form. I believe that what he has said has stimulated our thought, so that in another case of this kind, if one should arise, involving federally owned territory, we should consider the subject very carefully before recommending any bill.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the committee was unanimous in its action on the bill. It gave the bill very careful consideration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Having been at Pearl Harbor a number of times, and having seen the area we are discussing, I am very happy to identify myself with the Senator from Massachusetts in recommending passage of the pending measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AVOIDANCE OF SPECIAL ELECTIONS TO FILL CONGRESSIONAL VACANCIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to invite attention to an amazing article in the New York Times. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], with his background, might be interested in it.

I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled "GOP Is Shunning Special Elections," written by Richard Amper and published in the New York Times of this morning.

I could not understand what the significance of it was until I read further along in the article:

> Top officials in the Eisenhower administration have adopted a rule against risky special Congressional elections.

The article seemed to leave the impression that because an election might be risky, the Republicans wished to avoid special Congressional elections. I was very much surprised. I thought perhaps the minority leader or the Senator from Massachusetts might clarify the situation, and either tell us that the article is incorrect or confirm it.

Reading further from the article:

> Fearful that the political tide is running Democratic this year, they have made it a policy to avoid Federal appointments from Congressional ranks that would open the way for a special election.

I think that is highly discriminatory against Members of Congress. They ought to have equal rights with everyone else in seeking appointments.

Reading further:

> A high Republican here said Attorney General William P. Rogers had established a "rule" against appointing a Congressman to the Federal bench at present.

I wondered whether or not the Senator from Massachusetts could confirm that rule. I wonder if he can tell us whether or not a rule has been established that from now on no Member of Congress may be appointed to the bench.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hasten to answer the question so far as I am concerned. I know of no such rule or regulation. I do not know that the majority leader would necessarily be informed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was speaking of the minority leader. I thought he should be informed. The majority leader misunderstood. I did not expect the Senator from Texas to know the answer. I thought perhaps the minority leader might know.

Reading further:

> This policy presumably accounts for the Republican refusal to call a special election in Wisconsin to fill a vacancy caused by the death last January of Representative Lawrence H. Smith. Republican Gov. Vernon Thompson said he would leave the seat vacant until the general election in November.

It is my impression that that situation would be most unusual in nearly every State. If an appointment cannot be made to fill a vacany, nearly always there is an election at an early date. I think the rule usually followed is to hold an election within not less 30 days nor more than 60 days.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am surprised by what the Senator has said. Does the article mean that the particular seat in the House from Wisconsin will not be filled between now and January?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what the article says. The article states that the Governor has said that he would leave the seat vacant until the general election in November.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that there is a move on foot on the part of Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, to make inquiries of the executive branch concerning what its definition of secrecy is. I understand from what the distinguished Senator has said that in the executive branch it has been decided that there will be no appointments of Members of the House of Representatives to vacant judgeships because of the fear of possible reprisals at the polls; in other words, Republican defeats. I have heard rumors to the effect that there is some sort of agreement between the President and the Vice President as to what would happen under certain circumstances in the line of succession. How does the Senator explain this air of mystery and the maneuvering which seems to be going on within the executive branch at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not explain it. I am shocked and amazed at the story that the Republicans are unwilling to trust the people to fill vacancies. I do not understand.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am rather surprised that my good friend from the State of Arkansas, whom I have always considered to be a great believer in our constitutional form of government and the rights of the States, should fall into the error involved in the argument he is making. My reading of the Constitution tells me that when a vacancy occurs in the House of Representatives, whether by death, resignation, or any other cause, the vacancy is filled by the

governor of the State issuing a writ of election. Some States follow one policy and others follow another.

I was wondering whether the Senator from Arkansas was advocating that the power to make the determination be taken away from the governors of the respective States. The determination is not made by the executive branch of the Government in Washington.

I do not know whom the distinguished Senator is quoting in the article he is reading.

We who live in the Nation's Capital know that a great many speculative stories are put out from time to time. I am sure the Senator has been familiar with the speculations which have occurred relative to both Democrats and Republicans. However, unless he is quoting some responsible spokesman of the administration, I do not think he would wish, merely on the basis of a newspaper story, to make the charge that a certain policy has been laid down. I will say to the Senator that, as minority leader in the Senate, I know of no such policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am reassured by the Senator's statement. I am glad that he has sought to clarify the situation.

To be more specific, the article to which I have referred is entitled "GOP Is Shunning Special Elections." It is written by Richard Amper and published in the New York Times of March 3, 1958.

The word "rule" is in quotation marks. The writer undertakes to convey the idea that this is a quotation from the Attorney General.

I may say to the Senator from California that I believe he is right when he says that the governor has the power; however, usually it is exercised in such a way that the people can fill a vacancy at the earliest possible opportunity. I may go further and say—and I am sure the Senator will agree with me—that it is very likely that conditions will be much worse in November than now, and that the Senator's party would have a much better chance of winning now than next fall. Therefore I think it would be bad political judgment to delay further.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I, too, read the article to which he is referring. I regret that I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Arkansas first discussed it. However, what struck me about it was with relation to the facts prevalent in the Midwest. The Senator may recall that there is a vacancy in one of the House seats because of the death of a Representative from the State of Wisconsin. The Governor of that State is a very fine gentleman, whom I respect. He is a Republican. The Senator is also aware that we had some elections in the Midwest which can hardly give the Republican Party any reason for jubilation or ecstasy. For example, there was the election in which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] won a smashing victory by more than 100,000 votes. Then there was the Congressional election in the First Congressional District of Minnesota. Senators will recall that the press from my section of the country had reported that the Governor of Wisconsin would not call a special election in Wisconsin until he saw how the election resulted in the First Congressional District of Minnesota. I am happy to note that the Governor of my State, a Democrat, called an election to fill the vacancy in the First Minnesota Congressional District, and that he called it very quickly. That election did take place. So far as the unofficial tabulations are concerned, the Republican nominee seems to have won, if his winning can be called a victory.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the space of 100 years in that District, only one Democrat had ever been elected; that was in 1893. Since 1893, no Republican candidate in that district ever received less than 61 percent of the vote. That was until February 1958. In the special election held last month, the Republican candidate received 50.3 percent of the votes, as compared with 49.7 percent of the votes received by the Democratic candidate.

I can understand why the Republican Governor of Wisconsin might have some reluctance in calling an election in his State. After all, it is fair to say that the First Minnesota Congressional District was more Republican than McKinley, and perhaps even more steadfastly Republican than Coolidge. Even that fact was not enough, apparently, to stave off the storm of protest which came from the various precincts. Many of the voters in the rural areas were unable to participate in the election because of the snowstorm. However, in the areas which had been predominantly Republican, the vote was 2-to-1 and even 3-to-1 Democratic. Had the farmers been able to get through the snowbanks and had they been able to reach the polls and register their protest, I am convinced that the results would have been even more devastating for the Republican Party.

I wish to join the Senator from Arkansas in saying that if the Republicans cannot win now, I hesitate to say what will happen in November, because it is my prediction that what is going to happen to the Republican Party in November should not happen to any fellow American. I believe some words of comfort and solace should be said for what is about to transpire.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Minnesota saying that a certain Midwest governor is not going to allow an election to be held until the snow comes again, so that the farmers will not be able to go to the polls?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Republicans would not mind having things frozen for a while; that is true. I might say that I have been trying to get Mr. Benson to freeze some price supports. I am only trying to help my Republican friends. I have been trying to get them to help the farmers and to stabilize the business economy. However, there are always some persons whom one cannot help, and who insist on driving themselves to ruin and despair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GOP IS SHUNNING SPECIAL ELECTIONS—RISK OF DEFEATS BRINGS BAN ON FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS FROM CONGRESS RANKS

(By Richard Amper)

Top officials in the Eisenhower administration have adopted a rule against risky special Congressional elections.

Fearful that the political tide is running Democratic this year, they have made it a policy to avoid Federal appointments from Congressional ranks that would open the way for a special election.

A high Republican here said Attorney General William P. Rogers had established a rule against appointing a Congressman to the Federal bench at present.

This policy presumably accounts for the Republican refusal to call a special election in Wisconsin to fill a vacancy caused by the death last January of Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH. Republican Gov. Vernon Thomson said he would leave the seat vacant until the general election in November.

Wisconsin Republicans were jolted last year by the victory of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat.

The party was made even more election shy by the results of a special vote 2 weeks ago in Minnesota's First Congressional District, traditionally regarded as Republican. The Democrats came within 668 votes of scoring an upset.

The aversion to risking a defeat stemmed not only from an unwillingness to lose a Republican seat in Congress, but also from the awareness of the adverse psychological effect on the party in this year's regular Congressional elections.

This fear of Democratic strength contrasted with the recent optimism voiced by Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Meade Alcorn, party national chairman, and Leonard W. Hall, former chairman, in exhortations ostensibly designed to stiffen the party's campaigning spine.

A key Republican leader here said the new rule had stymied efforts to win Federal judgeships for Representatives FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of Manhattan, and HENRY J. LATHAM, of Queens.

"But it's a two-edged sword," he said of the policy. "If you wait too long, the Democrats [in the Senate] won't confirm any judges for you."

The situation also has hampered a move by some Republican leaders to replace Mr. COUDERT as a candidate for reelection this year in the 17th or "Silk Stocking" District.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to read two short paragraphs which seem to sum up the situation:

The aversion to risking a defeat stemmed not only from an unwillingness to lose a Republican seat in Congress, but also from the awareness of the adverse psychological effect on the party in this year's regular Congressional elections.

This fear of Democratic strength contrasted with the recent optimism voiced by Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Meade Alcorn, party national chairman, and Leonard W. Hall, former chairman, in exhortations ostensibly designed to stiffen the party's campaigning spine.

I believe it is most unusual for a governor to use his constitutional power to prevent the people from expressing themselves at elections at the earliest opportunity. It is certainly a very great departure from practice.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I have not had the advantage of reading the article to which the Senator is referring. Do I correctly understand that the writer of the article asserts that what he says is the actual situation; that he states categorically that that is the case, that the elections are being postponed by governors; or is it merely his interpretation of what a governor may have said?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is familiar with the New York Times, I am sure. I have referred to a special article printed on the first page of that newspaper of this morning. The first paragraph of the article reads:

Top officials in the Eisenhower administration have adopted a rule against risky special Congressional elections.

That is a direct assertion that he knows.

The New York Times, having supported the Eisenhower administration very vigorously and devotedly, certainly has access to the top officials in the Eisenhower administration, and therefore I believe it is worthy of credence.

Mr. BUSH. My interest stems from the very bad record the New York Times has in forecasting election results. I was thinking that possibly Mr. Amper was again falling victim to the bad errors which the Times has made in the past in forecasting election results. I have in mind the election results of 1956. Previous to that election, the New York Times sent observers to all parts of the country to find out at the grassroots level, as it said, how the election would turn out. The record of its forecast was 50 percent—so bad that some of those who participated in making the survey decided that it was a futile endeavor and hoped that it would never be tried again.

I have the greatest respect for the New York Times, as the Senator must know. However, whenever it undertakes to forecast election results, as far away as next November, I do not give the Times any competence in that field.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whatever competence the New York Times may have in forecasting results, its judgment of the quality of a candidate, especially for the Presidency, is even worse. It is very poor, indeed, I would agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that, so far as filling the vacancy in the Wisconsin Congressional District is concerned, the vacancy will exist for almost a year, and that certainly has no relation to prognostication on the part of the New York Times.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was going to add that the Senator from Connecticut did not hear the first part of the article I read. It is a direct statement that the Republican Governor of Wisconsin is not going to call a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Smith.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Did he say why?

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It says they are afraid of the results.

Mr. BUSH. That is Mr. Amper's conclusion, is it not? I ask the Senator whether the Governor said that that was the reason he would not call an election, or whether that is merely Mr. Amper's conclusion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read:

This policy presumably accounts for the Republican refusal to call a special election.

Mr. BUSH. "Presumably."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. That is presumed by Mr. Amper.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no affidavit submitted by the Governor that he refuses to do it for fear of losing the election.

Mr. BUSH. There is not even any statement by the Governor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But that is the clear implication.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is aware, is he not, that the vacancy occurred in January?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Governor did not call for an election in January. February has gone, and he did not call for it in February. We are now in March, and he has not called for it in March.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. The presumption is quite clear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not also true that this District has been almost as Republican as the one about which the Senator from Minnesota was speaking?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Wisconsin is traditionally a Republican State.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think I could give the able Senator an answer. In the winter time, in Wisconsin, there is much snow and ice, and the people simply cannot get to the polls. The Governor wants to wait until May or June, when there will be no ice or snow, so that everybody will be able to go to the polls and vote. That is the real reason why he has not called the election.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Indiana has put his finger on the real point. The great mistake which will be made by the Governor, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, is that if he waits until later, when there will be no ice and snow, and the farmers can get to the polls, the Republicans will not win the election.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Governor wants to wait until the sun is shining bright.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We want to help the farmers get to the polls.

Mr. BUSH. I have great respect for the judgment of my very good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, but I do not like to see him fall into the same trap into which the correspondents of the New York Times fell in making a long-range forecast. The Senator's reputation for accuracy is very good, as a rule. But long-range forecasts about political elections often have very sad results for the prophets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not rise to make any forecasts; I really rose to comment upon the practice or the rule which the Governor of Wisconsin apparently is developing, or at least the course he is now about to follow, of denying the people of Wisconsin the opportunity to elect a Representative and to have him in Congress to look after their business. I think it is a serious breach of our democratic system to deny the people of that district a Representative. A Representative can do much good for the State of Wisconsin. I think the matter is quite serious.

I hope this will not establish a precedent which will be followed in the case of every vacancy, because many vacancies occur in Congress every year, especially in the House of Representatives.

In the Senate, the situation is different. Appointments may be made by the Governor, who can appoint whomever he wishes to appoint. So apparently there would be no difficulty in that case. But Attorney General Rogers, apparently, has established a rule that Representatives cannot be appointed, and to follow the procedure which is being followed by the Governor of Wisconsin is a very serious breach of the established practice, which is to have full representation at all times and elections as soon as possible in the House.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before the Senator yields the floor, perhaps I might be helpful to him. Several Midwestern newspapers, including the Milwaukee and Minneapolis newspapers, pointed out, prior to the election in the First Minnesota District, that the Governor of Wisconsin was waiting to see how things turned out. I guess he wanted to see if special elections could be held in Minnesota in the middle of winter. He saw, and he got chills; there can be no doubt about that. But the voters were warm, and they went to the ballot boxes and cast a vote which was startling in terms of the political history of the Midwest.

Furthermore, I must say, in defense of the Governor of Wisconsin—and I want to defend him here, because he is a very fine man—that, after all, he had a special election in the Seventh District, when LESTER JOHNSON was elected in a traditionally Republican District. The Governor did have a special election for a Member of the Senate, and it was, of course, conceded, by all the prognosticators, I gather, even including the New York Times, that there would be a victory for Mr. Kohler.

A Mr. Kohler—it is a different Mr. Kohler—is now testifying before Congress about a labor matter, but it is not related to the business of the United States Senate. The present junior Sen-

ator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] won a tremendous victory.

So I say to the Governor of Wisconsin, "After you have been to bat two times and have fanned both times, or after the voters have been to bat two times and the Democrats have got two home runs, I do not believe you can be blamed."

I can say, further, that there will be memorial services when the dairy-support prices drop down to 75 percent of parity. I do not think the Governor will find any Republicans in Wisconsin after that happens.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota trying to tell us that his own Governor was unable to read the signs of the times?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Our Governor is a man of courage, integrity, and wisdom. He called the election. He had faith in the public. He had faith in the processes of democracy. Not only did he have faith, but his faith was almost overpowering, because the Democratic candidate came within 600 votes of victory.

Mr. BUTLER. He probably also had faith that he did not have the votes, and it was well founded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe every State is entitled to have elections. I join with the Senator from Arkansas in the belief in constitutional government and the responsibility of the people. I do not really believe the Governor will be better off in the late fall of 1958. It seems to me that it would be better if he called the election now, before the full impact of hard money, tight credit, high interest rates, and lower price supports go into effect—at least, in Wisconsin.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 916. An act to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 1828. An act to retrocede to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway and its connections with the Glacier National Park road system, and for other purposes.

INCREASE IN EMPLOYEES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Friday evening, while the Senate was debating the classified pay bill, a discussion took place concerning the increase in the number of employees in several agencies of the Government. In a colloquy, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] asked me if I had the figures for the Department of Agriculture I regretted that I did not have them then, but since that time I have secured them.

The Senator from Minnesota stated that there had been a great increase in the number of employees. I now have the figures submitted to me by the Bureau of the Budget.

For the fiscal year 1954, there were 63,690 employees in the Department of Agriculture. For the fiscal year 1959, it is estimated that there will be 80,722.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

United States Department of Agriculture—Analysis of average annual positions budget for 1959 compared with fiscal year 1954

Fiscal year 1959 (estimated)	80,722
Fiscal year 1954	63,690
Increase	17,032
Increases resulting from legislation for new programs	
Public Law 566, Small Watershed Protection Act	1,079
Soil-bank programs	1,179
Great Plains conservation program	260
Mandatory poultry inspection	770
Public Law 480	698
Agricultural attachés'	229
Acreage allotments for corn and rice and marketing quotas on rice	309
National Wool Act	106
Total new programs	4,630
Increases for strengthening and expanding existing programs	
Brucellosis eradication program	1,275
Research on crops, livestock, forestry, soils and water, utilization and marketing commodities	3,423
Forest land management and roads and trails	1,908
Increased volume of price-support activities	701
Increases for strengthening and expanding existing programs—Continued	
Brush disposal and other improvements on national forest (primarily from fees and deposits)	1,289
SCS technical assistance to farmers, districts and services to ACP	1,151
Disease eradication and pest control (including fire ant and screwworm)	991
Inspection and grading of farm products other than poultry (financed from fees)	618
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities under section 32	311
All other (net)	735
Total increases to existing programs	12,402
Total increases	17,032

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that since 1953 several new agencies have been added to the Department of Agriculture. They are as follows:

Public Law 566, the Small Watershed Protection Act, accounts for 1,079 new employees.

The soil-bank programs account for 1,179 new employees.

The Great Plains conservation program, 260.

The mandatory poultry inspection, 770.

Public Law 480, 698.

The agricultural attachés, 229.

Acreage allotments for corn and rice and marketing quotas on rice, 309.

The National Wool Act, 106.

The total number of employees required by the new programs is 4,630.

I call attention to this information because these are new agencies which have been created in the past 3 or 4 years, and they account for a large number of additional employees.

The total increase in the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture from 1954 to 1959 is 17,032.

Mr. President, I have also a table showing the average annual positions, permanent and otherwise, from 1950 to 1955, for the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that that table also may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

United States Department of Agriculture—Average annual positions, permanent [1] and other (man-years) 1950–59

(Based on 1959 budget estimates and adjusted for comparability with the 1959 appropriation structure. This table reflects the average annual positions under the appropriation and funds indicated, including those applicable to transfers, allocations, or allotments to organizations other than the agency receiving the appropriation.)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 estimated	1959 estimated
Agricultural Research Service:										
Permanent	14,253	13,350	12,311	11,685	11,767	12,157	12,877	13,661	14,633	15,452
All other	1,402	1,195	999	820	806	1,887	2,278	2,382	2,364	1,550
Total	15,655	14,545	13,310	12,505	12,573	14,044	15,155	16,043	16,997	17,002
Extension Service:										
Permanent	232	237	226	227	202	221	243	251	258	243
All other	1	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	1
Total	233	240	227	229	204	224	245	254	261	244
Farmer Cooperative Service:										
Permanent	108	109	90	90	82	96	102	106	117	116
All other										
Total	108	109	90	90	82	96	102	106	117	116

[1] Full-time positions, regardless of status of employees (permanent, temporary, etc.) who occupy same.

United States Department of Agriculture—Average annual positions, permanent and other (man-years) 1950–59—Continued

(Based on 1959 budget estimates and adjusted for comparability with the 1959 appropriation structure. This table reflects the average annual positions under the appropriations and funds indicated, including those applicable to transfers, allocations, or allotments to organizations other than the agency receiving the appropriation.)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 estimated	1959 estimated
Soil Conservation Service (excluding flood prevention):										
Permanent	10,663	10,657	10,703	10,883	11,013	11,180	11,694	12,482	13,245	13,267
All other	1,045	870	736	1,112	1,269	1,259	1,274	1,237	1,352	1,331
Total	11,708	11,527	11,439	11,995	12,282	12,439	12,968	13,719	14,597	14,598
Flood prevention:										
Permanent	971	1,024	813	609	696	704	672	698	799	790
All other	308	262	170	169	251	268	321	348	409	322
Total	1,279	1,286	983	778	947	972	993	1,046	1,208	1,112
Great Plains conservation program:										
Permanent									217	216
Other									45	44
Total									262	260
Agricultural Conservation Program Service:										
Permanent	992	953	911	934	818	771	765	689	779	779
All other	34	26	28	39	34	44	26	26	24	24
Total	1,026	979	939	973	852	815	791	715	803	803
Agricultural Marketing Service:										
Marketing research and service:										
Permanent	3,728	3,599	3,559	3,513	3,170	3,092	3,274	3,484	4,012	4,864
All other	142	86	67	58	193	233	286	343	387	362
Total	3,870	3,685	3,626	3,571	3,363	3,325	3,560	3,827	4,399	5,226
School lunch program:										
Permanent	278	237	220	176	167	164	154	158	184	184
All other	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1
Total	279	238	221	177	167	165	155	158	185	185
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities:										
Permanent	634	565	479	510	536	555	643	738	837	840
All other	3	3	2	1	3	3	7	8	10	10
Total	637	568	481	511	539	558	650	746	847	850
All other, Agricultural Marketing Service:										
Permanent	1,379	1,435	1,877	1,953	2,126	2,283	2,449	2,840	2,933	2,475
All other	51	52	41	39	49	80	96	123	190	184
Total	1,430	1,487	1,918	1,992	2,175	2,363	2,545	2,963	3,123	2,659
Foreign Agricultural Service: [2]										
Permanent	257	319	424	538	698	291	403	486	509	440
All other	9	4	2	20	5	10	10	12	10	7
Total	266	323	426	558	703	301	413	498	519	447
Commodity Exchange Authority:										
Permanent	100	110	117	125	119	117	125	126	128	128
All other										
Total	100	110	117	125	119	117	125	126	128	128
Soil-bank programs:										
Conservation reserve program:										
Permanent							5	355	531	536
Other								20	30	30
Total							5	375	561	566
Acreage reserve program:										
Permanent							40	346	552	556
Other							6	26	57	57
Total							46	372	609	613
Commodity Stabilization Service:										
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas:										
Permanent	864	794	517	474	740	810	868	786	875	875
All other	36	22	12	11	27	52	48	57	39	39
Total	900	816	529	485	767	862	916	843	914	914
Sugar Act program:										
Permanent	203	198	170	189	157	172	161	160	180	180
All other	5	4	3		4	3	3	4	3	3
Total	208	202	173	189	161	175	164	164	183	183
Administrative expenses, Commodity Credit Corporation:										
Permanent	4,499	4,419	3,008	2,982	3,763	4,310	4,818	4,935	5,374	5,101
All other	39	32	11	21	35	46	18	16	18	18
Total	4,538	4,451	3,019	3,003	3,798	4,356	4,836	4,951	5,392	5,119
All other, Commodity Stabilization Service:										
Permanent	308	288	342	293	199	361	348	313	367	353
All other	9	8	8	9	5	13	8	7	3	4
Total	317	296	350	302	204	374	356	320	370	357
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:										
Permanent	500	551	593	594	490	474	498	497	552	554
All other	210	253	232	243	231	254	318	366	417	426
Total	710	804	825	837	721	728	816	863	969	980

[2] Figures for fiscal years 1950 through 1953 do not include positions for agricultural attachés, since data are not available to segregate such man-years from other personnel paid from the same State Department funds.

United States Department of Agriculture—Average annual positions, permanent and other (man-years) 1950–59—Continued

(Based on 1959 budget estimates and adjusted for comparability with the 1959 appropriation structure. This table reflects the average annual positions under the appropriations and funds indicated, including those applicable to transfers, allocations, or allotments to organizations other than the agency receiving the appropriation.)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 estimated	1959 estimated
Rural Electrification Administration:										
Permanent	1,199	1,318	1,177	1,125	1,017	983	1,010	1,027	1,027	1,021
All other	2	3	5	6	3	5	4	3	4	4
Total	1,201	1,321	1,182	1,131	1,020	988	1,014	1,030	1,031	1,025
Farmers' Home Administration:										
Permanent	5,971	6,250	6,184	6,187	5,480	4,791	5,056	5,318	5,353	5,321
All other	397	493	448	433	399	700	726	894	721	686
Total	6,368	6,743	6,632	6,620	5,879	5,491	5,782	6,212	6,074	6,007
Office of the General Counsel:										
Permanent	488	491	428	420	392	365	382	385	406	417
All other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2
Total	489	492	429	421	393	366	383	388	408	419
Office of the Secretary:										
Permanent	609	564	541	592	568	596	596	585	607	607
All other	2	6	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Total	611	570	542	593	570	597	597	586	608	608
Office of Information:										
Permanent	192	193	209	127	122	116	119	122	120	120
All other	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	194	195	211	128	123	117	120	123	121	121
Library:										
Permanent	188	174	170	171	153	145	149	151	139	129
All other	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	190	175	171	172	154	146	150	152	140	130
Forest Service (excluding forest roads and trails):										
Permanent	7,225	7,248	7,185	7,300	7,404	7,295	7,749	8,371	9,787	9,782
All other	5,556	4,918	4,712	4,809	5,591	4,865	6,197	6,350	6,870	6,909
Total	12,781	12,166	11,897	12,109	12,995	12,160	13,946	14,721	16,657	16,691
Forest roads and trails:										
Permanent	1,129	1,111	1,366	1,367	1,469	1,440	1,529	1,657	1,735	1,736
All other	1,312	1,239	1,169	1,332	1,430	1,275	1,345	1,505	1,670	1,623
Total	2,441	2,350	2,535	2,699	2,899	2,715	2,874	3,162	3,405	3,359
Defense production activities, salaries and expenses:										
Permanent		449	535	280						
All other		10	5	6						
Total		459	540	286						
Miscellaneous appropriations for prior year programs:										
Permanent	7									
All other	1									
Total	8									
Recapitulation:										
Permanent	56,977	56,643	54,155	53,344	53,348	53,489	56,729	60,727	66,256	67,082
All other	10,570	9,494	8,657	9,135	10,342	11,005	12,978	13,736	14,632	13,640
Grand total	67,547	66,137	62,812	62,479	63,690	64,494	69,707	74,463	80,888	80,722

Prepared by Office of Budget and Finance, Division of Budgetary and Financial Reporting, Jan. 24, 1958.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for the very factual report which he has given to the Senate. My inquiry has been fully answered.

My inquiry of, I believe, Friday last was for the purpose of seeking information concerning the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture, as one example of the increase in employment in a permanent department. I said then that I believed the employment had increased by about 20,000. I was in error; it is only 17,032. The 17,032 additional employees for the fiscal year 1959 are giving subsidy service or alleged service to fewer farmers by approximately 500,000 farm families as compared with 1954. In other words, as the Department of Agriculture grows in size, in terms of the number of its employees, the number of farmers being served by the farm programs, decreases. As the agricultural population decreases, the population of the Department of Agriculture increases.

If I were sure that the same persons who are being driven off the land are being employed by the Department of Agriculture, I suppose my complaint would be less vigorous. However, I am afraid there is no relationship whatsoever between those who are being driven off the land and those who are being employed in the Department of Agriculture Building, on the banks of the Potomac River.

Furthermore, although the number of persons involved is important—and it was to that subject that the Senator from Kansas appropriately directed his remarks—what is most important is the reduced results which are being obtained from the Department of Agriculture. In fact, Mr. President, I believe that a new law has developed—Benson's law. It is predicated on the proposition that the greater the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture and the greater the amount of its appropriations the fewer the results and the lower the prices of agricultural commodities. That is one of the products of this administration.

Now all can see that as the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture increases, the number of farmers decreases; and as the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture increase, the income from agricultural commodities decreases.

I know that many of my colleagues like to quote Drew Pearson. I wish to call attention to an article entitled "Benson, Brannan Costs Compared," written by Mr. Pearson, and published today in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I must say that Mr. Brannan indeed was a tightwad. He operated the Department of Agriculture with a limited number of employees, and apparently with no regard for the desire of people to have jobs. And he operated that Department with a limited budget.

Mr. President, all during my formative years I was led to believe that New Dealers and Fair Dealers were extravagant and were spendthrifts, and had no regard for the value of the dollar. I was also led to believe that a man of great convictions and of good solid character, a Republican would watch over the value of the dollar and see to it that the appropriations of the Government were reduced again and again. As I recall vividly, in two presidential campaigns the Republican Party proclaimed—most specifically, in 1951—that it would reduce the bureaucracy; and Mr. Benson himself stated that if he became the Secretary of Agriculture, he would take steps to remove from employment those in the Department of Agriculture who were not doing good jobs, and in that way he would reduce the number of employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Minnesota serves with me on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I believe he will agree that the number of employees in the top brackets of the Department of Agriculture has been rapidly increasing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There can be no doubt about that. In fact, that has occurred, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but also in all the other branches of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There have been substantial increases in the number of what are called managerial personnel.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Minnesota also will agree with me that more and more propaganda is being issued and more and more speeches are being made by persons in the Department of Agriculture who are trying to "sell" their program to the farmers; and I believe the Senator from Minnesota will likewise agree that such activities are constantly increasing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it would take many more persons than those now engaged in that activity to "sell" their program, because even a good salesman must have some commodity or some product if he is to make a sale.

Mr. President, I do not wish to say the figures stated in this article are accurate to the penny or to the dollar, but I submit that they are substantially accurate; and I shall be more than happy to have them carefully scrutinized by both friend and foe, alike.

In the article to which I have referred, Mr. Pearson presents a breakdown of the figures pertaining to the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

In 1952, the Agriculture Department budget under outgoing Secretary Charley Brannan was $706 million. Under Benson, the 1958 budget for operating the Department is $1,728,000,000.

The overall agricultural budget as Brannan went out of office, including the cost of storing surpluses, crop price supports, and everything else was $1,045,000,000.

That is an accurate figure.

I read further:

The overall budget under Benson today is $7 billion. This is an increase of about 700 percent.

Mr. President, I would say the increase is a little closer to being somewhat more than 600 percent.

However, I would not be commenting on this matter if the program were producing good results. However, the fact is that even in this quarter of 1958, agricultural net income, according to the analysis which was revealed as of yesterday, is dropping another $500 million, at an annual rate, as compared to the figure for the last quarter of 1957. In 1957, net agricultural income was lower than it was in 1956. It has dropped from approximately $15,200,000,000 in 1953 to $11,600,000,000 in 1957. Those figures show the situation which has developed. Agricultural commodity prices have dropped more than 20 percent. Farm operating costs have risen substantially. The interest rates have risen. Agricultural surpluses have risen. The cost of operating the Department of Agriculture has risen. The number of farmers has decreased. Agricultural commodity prices have decreased. Farm income has decreased. Farm mortgage indebtedness has increased.

Mr. President, I conclude by noting that some of our friends in Congress have been saying to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the President of the United States that Mr. Benson should resign. They have been asking for his resignation. I notice that some of them have asked Mr. Benson himself to resign, even though they have voted for his program. Mr. President, I do not think that is proper. I believe that Members of the Congress, of either party, have a right to request that Mr. Benson resign if they have opposed his program. However, I notice that some of those who have asked that Mr. Benson resign base their request, not on a belief that his program is wrong, but on a belief that he is a political liability.

This situation is similar to the one to which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] alluded a moment ago.

Mr. President, I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture holds his convictions sincerely. However, the fact is that a number of Republican Members of Congress have been saying to him, "Mr. Secretary, we voted for your program and for the man who appointed you to be Secretary of Agriculture; and we have advocated the adoption of your program and we have defended you—until last Monday. But even though you have a program that we like"—say those Republican Members of Congress—"and even though we urged the election of the one who nominated you, and even though you were appointed by the man for whose election we worked, and whom we continue to support, we think you should retire."

Why do they want him to retire? They want him to retire, Mr. President, because, as they say, "We think you are a political liability."

Mr. President, the President of the United States took care of that situation courageously and honorably. At his press conference last week the President said, "Mr. Benson is staying." The reason why Mr. Benson is staying is that Mr. Benson's program is the Eisenhower program and the Republican program. So I say it is good to have this clarification.

Mr. President, I am convinced that Mr. Benson will stay. Furthermore, I believe that even if he resigned, whoever succeeded him would have to carry out the same program, and I believe that the results would be the same. I take that position because we have observed that the President of the United States has manfully said to the reporters and to the critics that he could not understand what the complaints were about, and that he would not permit a man to leave while he was under fire; and then the President said pointedly that he had faith in Mr. Benson, that Mr. Benson was carrying out his program, and was his appointee, and that he could not understand why Members of Congress would request Mr. Bensons scalp, so to speak, when they, themselves, had supported Mr. Benson.

Mr. President, I believe that sooner or later the country should know that it will take an election to change things in the Department of Agriculture. Things in the Department of Agriculture will not be changed by the simple adjustment of personnel, by means of appointment. The change which needs to take place in the Department of Agriculture is similar to the change which needs to take place in the elections of 1958, which will bring into the Congress those who are friendly and sympathetic to the legitimate needs of farm families and the family-type farm; and it is the kind of change which will take place in 1960, when again the White House will be occupied by a member of the Democratic Party—by a man who will appoint a new Secretary of Agriculture, to be sure; but, more than that, by a man who will have a new policy. In this situation, Mr. President, what are really involved are, not personalities, but principles of agricultural economics and the agricultural policy.

Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled, "Benson, Brannan Cost Compared," written by Drew Pearson, which contains information I am sure at a later date others will wish to supplement by

giving a more detailed analysis of these costs. I understand, however, that earlier today the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] had the Pearson article printed in the RECORD. So I shall not ask that it be duplicated in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I addressed myself to the subject matter of the presidential press conference wherein President Eisenhower continued to extend his unqualified support to Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

I hold in my hand an article from the New York Times of February 27, entitled "Eisenhower Lauds Benson, Bars Party Bid To Oust Him."

That was the story to which I referred. Rather than have any misquotations or any paraphrasing which might in any way be misleading, I ask unanimous consent that at that point in my comments, where I was discussing the presidential press conference relating to the Secretary of Agriculture, this detailed news report, under the byline of Felix Belair, Jr., 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:

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1958]

EISENHOWER LAUDS BENSON, BARS PARTY BID TO OUST HIM

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—President Eisenhower turned a deaf ear today to Congressional farm bloc demands that Benson must go. In one of the strongest endorsements ever given a member of his Cabinet, the President described the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, as a man of the highest personal and intellectual honesty and courage whose services the Nation could not now afford to lose.

At the same time General Eisenhower went beyond the scope of the immediate clamor against Mr. Benson to remind the critics both in Congress and the Republican National Committee that the selection and tenure of Cabinet members was the responsibility of the President alone.

Once the constitutional mandate to obtain the advice and consent of the Senate to such appointments has been observed, Congress has nothing more to do with the matter, the President said.

CHALLENGES CRITICS

He added that "for any group of Congressmen, either informally or formally, to raise a question concerning my appointments to the Cabinet would not seem to be in order."

What had been a persistent but cautious clamor for Mr. Benson's retirement broke into the open in the House of Representatives last week.

The immediate reason was the near-defeat of a Republican candidate in Minnesota's special election to fill the House seat of the late August H. Andresen.

The First Congressional District, where the election was held, had not gone Democratic since 1890 and Republican majorities of 2 to 1 were considered normal, even through the New Deal era, when many Farm Belt districts returned Democratic candidates in one election after another.

When the Republican candidate, Albert Quie, squeaked by with a majority of 655 votes—a margin of less than 1 percent—over his Democratic opponent, Eugene P. Foley, many farm State Republicans thought they saw the political handwriting on the wall.

GOP GROUP FORMED

Mr. Benson had been the central issue in the election and some House members talked of the possible loss of 25 Republican seats in November, if the Secretary were retained.

Representative A. I. MILLER, Republican of Nebraska, organized a group of farm State Republicans in a direct appeal to the President to drop Mr. Benson for what they said was the good of the party's chances in November.

With Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican of Minnesota, the Nebraskan visited Mr. Benson to express what was termed a Republican consensus that the Secretary should resign for the good of the party.

The same day Mr. MILLER called Mr. Benson "the symbol of lower farm prices as Herbert Hoover was of the depression."

Although individual Senators have spoken out against Mr. Benson's continued tenure, it was presumably to the organized effort of the House group that the President directed his remarks today.

Indirectly at least, the President's news conference endorsement of the Agriculture Secretary included Mr. Benson's own reply to the farm bloc demand.

BENSON BARRED POLITICS

He told Mr. MILLER and Mr. JUDD last week that "concern for political fortunes of individuals cannot transcend the very function of government, which is to protect and help its citizens."

Having expressed himself on Mr. Benson's personal and intellectual honesty and integrity and his sense of dedication to the problems of farmers, General Eisenhower turned to what he called the substantive part of this matter.

The purpose of all farm programs from the beginning has been to bring about a parity of costs the farmer has to pay with the prices he receives for his products, the President asserted. Although many different ways of achieving this goal have been tried, none has been entirely successful, he said.

It is a proper function of government, the President added, to insure farmers against disasters beyond their control. But it will remain an objective of his administration, he said, to free farmers as much as possible from Federal regulation and to make farming subject to the same economic influences that apply to other segments of the economy.

General Eisenhower went to say that he personally was firmly convinced of the wisdom of what Mr. Benson was trying to do.

The President arranged today to confer with Representative MILLER tomorrow afternoon. Mr. MILLER said he would not ask the President to drop Mr. Benson but indicated he would leave a strong hint that Republican prospects in November would be brighter without the Agriculture Secretary.

INCREASE IN LENDING AUTHORITY OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3149, a bill to increase by $2 billion the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Senate bill 3149.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate enlarges the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion. It raises the lending authority from $5 billion to $7 billion.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. There was no opposition to it that I know of.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to say that, so far as I know, there is no opposition to the bill. It was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee. I strongly urge passage of the bill. I know the administration desires the passage of the bill. In fact, everybody is for it; I do not think anyone is against it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. It is a bill which the administration favors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF S. 3149, A BILL TO INCREASE BY $2 BILLION THE LENDING AUTHORITY OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

S. 3149 would increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington from the present $5 billion up to $7 billion. It would make a corresponding increase in the bank's authority to borrow from the United States Treasury.

The increase in authority proposed by S. 3149 was recommended by the President in his budget message and his economic report; the Export-Import Bank requested the enactment of the bill; and the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce have recommended its enactment. In addition, the committee received letters in favor of the bill from the National Foreign Trade Council and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Hearings were held on the bill before the committee on Monday, February 3, and a favorable report was made on February 4, Senate Report 1270.

The Export-Import Bank was originally incorporated in 1934 and it has been ex-

tended from time to time since then. The most recent extension was enacted last year, changing the expiration date from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1963. The bank has continued under substantially its present authority since the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

The bank has broad general powers to engage in banking in order to aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and foreign countries.

The Export-Import Bank is the principal instrument of the Federal Government which assists foreign trade on a business basis. Under Congressional mandate, the bank supplements and encourages private capital and does not compete with it; the bank's loans must offer reasonable assurance of repayment; and the bank makes no grants. The bank cooperates with private capital, sometimes through joint lending to individual ventures, sometimes through guaranties of part or all of private loans, sometimes through sales of loans from its portfolio.

The bank's activities take a number of forms. It makes development loans to private companies in foreign countries, including both American and foreign firms. It makes development loans to other governments or to official institutions, sometimes for the purpose of building needed basic public facilities, such as highways or port improvements, sometimes for the purpose of relending to private enterprise. These development loans have recently been approved at the rate of about $500 million a year. The bank also makes exporter credits to United States equipment manufacturers to assist in financing their exports. These exporter credits amounted to about $55 million in fiscal year 1957, and are expected to be about $130 million in fiscal year 1958. Another substantial line of credit handled by the bank is the financing of foreign sales of United States commodities, such as cotton, wheat, barley, soybeans, and tobacco. This medium term financing was about $70 million in fiscal year 1957, and is expected to be $194 million in fiscal year 1958. The bank also makes loans to foreign governments to meet emergency financing needs. The British credit of $500 million, granted in 1956 after the Suez crisis, of which $250 million has been drawn down, is an illustration of this kind of credit.

Virtually all of the bank's loans are spent for United States equipment, commodities, or technical services. And an Export-Import Bank loan may be only the beginning of a large volume of business with the United States. For instance, between 1947 and 1956 the bank lent $61.5 million to a Chilean steel company to buy United States equipment. The steel company has informed the bank that, over the same 10-year period, the steel company spent $64.9 million in the United States for equipment, $46.6 million in the United States for operating supplies, and $12.7 million to United States companies or individuals for technical services. In other words, for every dollar the bank had lent to the steel company, the steel company had spent $2 dollars in the United States. And the concern's purchases of operating supplies will probably continue indefinitely.

The Export-Import Bank has contributed to the strength and stability of the Free World. The major highway, port, irrigation, and power projects which it has helped to carry out, and the individual industrial plants which have been built or equipped through its aid, have helped to raise the standards of living in the countries involved, and have made it possible for those countries to proceed further with their own commercial and industrial development.

During the 24 years the bank has been in business, it has authorized loans totaling about $9 billion; and it has disbursed about $6 billion, about one-half of which has been repaid. During these 24 years the bank has had a gross income of $867 million. From this, administrative expenses of about $15 million have been paid; and the Treasury has received $202 million in interest on borrowings and $173 million in dividends on the capital stock. On December 31, 1957, the bank had reserves of $442.9 million, in addition to $32.6 million of undivided profits.

Last June when the life of the bank was extended for 5 years, no request was made for an increase in lending authority. However, the rate of loan authorizations over the past year and a half has been high—$1,067 million in fiscal year 1957 and $468 million during the last 6 months of 1957. This has reduced the uncommitted lending authority of the bank to $533.7 million on December 31, 1957. Other substantial loans are being considered, such as the proposed $150 million loan to India, which would further reduce these available funds.

The bank is not limited to lending its presently uncommitted funds. Each year it receives large installment repayments, and interest over and above the amounts it pays the Treasury and spends for expenses. However, funds becoming available from these sources are not expected to be more than $400 million to $500 million in fiscal year 1959, a sharp drop from the present rate of credit authorization, of $1 billion a year.

If the bank is to continue activity at or about its present scale and if the bank is to retain any sizable balance on hand for emergency loans, its lending authority and available funds must be increased. The administration has requested and the committee recommends an increase in the amount of $2 billion.

The previous experience of the bank indicates that this $2 billion increase will not involve an equal increase in the borrowings from the bank.

When the bank commits its lending authority in support of a substantial development project, a considerable period of time normally elapses before the bank is called upon to pay for specific equipment shipped from the United States to the project. There are also cancellations or sales of participations to private capital in all or part of a project. Over the past 4 years, only about 30 to 40 percent of the borrowing authority has been used, although the use of the lending authority has ranged from about 70 to 90 percent. For example, on December 31, 1957, the total of outstanding commitments was $4.4 billion. But the unrepaid disbursements at that date came to $2.9 billion, and the borrowings from the Treasury amounted to only $1 billion. Assuming this experience holds true for the future, it can be anticipated that the $2 billion increase in lending authority would not result in more than an additional $600 million to $800 million of actual borrowings, and even this total af actual borrowings would probably not be reached for several years. In the 1959 budget, the only estimated demand on this increased capital for fiscal 1959 is $200 million for emergency loans.

The committee was convinced that it was essential to continue this program in the interest of the United States producers and exporters involved, and in the interest of our national security and foreign policy. The committee, therefore, recommended that the Senate pass S. 3149. I urge its prompt approval.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some letters from the president of Mack Trucks, Inc., which are quite interesting as showing the beneficial effect of the proposed legislation.

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

MACK TRUCKS, INC.,
Plainfield, N. J., February 12, 1958.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We are very much interested in the proposed legislation to increase the lending limits of the Export-Import Bank of Washington by $2 million.

Through this institution, our company has been able to obtain some portion of the export business, and without its aid it would have been impossible to do so.

We thought you would be interested in two letters I have sent to the Honorable Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank, one dated October 26, 1955, and the other, February 3, 1958, copies of which are attached.

We feel your aid and support of this legislation would be beneficial to the extension of the trade-agreements legislation on which we understand President Eisenhower is asking for a 5-year renewal.

Sincerely yours,

P. O. PETERSON, *President.*

MACK TRUCKS, INC.,
Plainfield, N. J., October 26, 1955.

The Honorable SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAUGH: It gives me great pleasure to advise you that the Export-Import Bank has been of invaluable assistance to the Mack Co. in its sale of 100 Mack motorbusses to Iran.

The advance commitment for credit financing authorized by your bank on August 3 enabled Mack to obtain the Iranian order in the face of heavy competition from foreign manufacturers. After your commitment assured the sale, our distributor in Iran subsequently found it possible to complete the transaction on a cash basis. We, therefore, wish to advise you that we no longer require this financing.

However, without the willingness of the Export-Import Bank to assist in this sale, we would have been unable to obtain this order. Consequently, Mack, and more broadly, America, would have lost a $1 million sale to a market that has substantial requirements for additional busses and trucks.

Our experience thus far with the Export-Import Bank has been most gratifying. We feel it has been performing a vital service to American business and industry in the sale of American products abroad. If America is to continue to grow and prosper, industrial concerns such as Mack must find outlets abroad for their increasing production. The Export-Import Bank is playing an essential role in enabling America to obtain its fair share of foreign markets.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your appointment as president of this fine agency.

With deepest appreciation and best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

P. O. PETERSON, *President.*

MACK TRUCKS, INC.,
Plainfield, N. J., February 3, 1958.

Hon. SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAUGH: It is noted that President Eisenhower has recently recommended

to the Congress that the lending limits of the Export-Import Bank be increased by $2 billion.

For many reasons, we favor this proposal by the President. From a general point of view, we know your bank has, over the years, returned substantial profits to the Treasury Department. We know your relatively small number of employees are paid from earnings, as against appropriated funds. We, likewise, are fully aware of the fact that an exporter credit is not only for the benefit and assistance of the foreign purchaser. It has a decided favorable impact within the continental United States.

For example, we have plants in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, employing approximately 8,000 people. In addition, we have 57 Mack branches throughout the United States with more than 2,600 employees. All of these employees stand to benefit from orders made possible by Export-Import Bank financing. There are local taxes and substantial local purchases. Also, Mack has a wide range of suppliers—from various parts of the United States—for steel, other metals and materials, and the few components we do not manufacture. Likewise, each of our plants is continuing to procure equipment and tools from various parts of the country. Thus, the domestic dollar impact of an exporter credit is both far reaching and substantial.

From a Mack point of view, the exporter credits you have granted us over the past several years have permitted the consummation of substantial orders—running in the millions—that we could not have otherwise accepted. Your participation in such credits permits us to meet, on relatively equal terms, the continuing credit competition we face from foreign manufacturers of trucks and buses. Your participation in these exporter credits permits us to retain a reasonable share of these overseas markets where we have spent so much time and money in developing.

In appreciation of the consideration and constructive assistance provided by your bank, and with the hope that your lending limits may be increased and your facilities expanded, I am,

Sincerely yours,

P. O. PETERSON, *President.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3149) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$4,000,000,000." from section 6 and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,000,000,000.";

(2) by striking out "$5,000,000,000." from section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000,000,000.".

Mr. JENNER subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it passed Calendar No. 1294, Senate bill 3149, to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, inasmuch as no notice was given that action would be taken today on that bill.

I had an appointment downtown. When I returned, I found that, without a complete quorum call or any notice regarding the taking of action, the Senate took action on the bill, which involves liability amounting to approximately $2 billion to this country. I think that is no way to do business, and I believe the bill was too important to have been passed in that fashion.

Therefore, I submit the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course we have no objection to the motion of the Senator from Indiana that the vote on the bill be reconsidered. But in order that the record may be clear, let me state that announcement was made in the Senate, at noon, that the Senate would consider the bill. Several Senators were present at that time, and the bill was brought up at approximately 2 p. m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum, since there is no business pending before the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished minority leader if he will not withhold his suggestion. I have a few remarks to make, and I do not believe a call for a quorum is necessary at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withhold my request at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

JUVENILE COURT OPERATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on May 1 of last year the Senate was called upon to advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Orman W. Ketcham to serve as judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Prior to the Senate vote on that appointment, I spoke in opposition, not because of any personal feeling against Mr. Ketcham, but because I sincerely believed he did not possess the requisite judicial temperament or the personal attributes necessary to properly administer justice in the marital and social problems prevalant in the District of Columbia.

However, Judge Ketcham was confirmed, and has now served as judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia since May 1, 1957. But whether because of his inexperience or other reasons, we hear much criticism concerning his methods of operation, as well as the amount of time he gives to the court, the result of which is a failure to keep current the court calendar of pending cases.

Mr. President, although I am not willing to admit to possessing the power of clairvoyance, I deeply regret that my predictions seem to have been so clearly affirmed.

Obviously, unless the judges of our juvenile court are well grounded in experience and temperament and equipped with a practical working knowledge of psychiatry—mental disorders, psychology—actions of the mind, and other social sciences, they cannot cope with the volume and the complexity of cases involving these situations.

I do not wish to labor Senators with the submission of evidence in this regard, inasmuch as it is readily available to those who care to acquaint themselves with the manner of the court's operation. However, I have no doubt, many Senators can recall, as I do, when a few years back the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was far behind in its work, and did not have either community or public support.

In the past few years, in fact, up to May 1 of 1957, we have seen this court progress and become well-organized and function efficiently and administratively.

I believe the record will substantiate that as of May 1, 1957, the day Judge Ketcham was confirmed by the Senate, the court calendar was completely current; and, with a few exceptions, full social studies and final dispositions in connection with all cases were made within 30 days of the filing of complaints. Today, in spite of additional personnel being employed, a substantial backlog of cases awaiting court action exists. Many cases are being calendared for hearing 3 months hence, while others are being summarily disposed of at so-called detention hearings without the benefit of complete social studies as required by the Juvenile Court Act.

I am also informed that no one is now required to appear in court for setting aside commitments or dismissals from probation.

This elimination of an appearance before the juvenile judge in probation dismissals, in my opinion, while having its effect in lessening the workload of the court, at the same time denies a pat on the back through a word of encouragement to a boy or girl who has tried to become a better citizen.

Mr. President, being turned loose without receiving some encouragement from the one who placed them on probation would, it seems to me, appear to be a very cold approach to solving a juvenile problem.

Further rearranging his court schedule, Judge Ketcham is presently having juvenile cases set for hearing after April 15. Adult cases are being set for May 1 and later. This proposed schedule and its relation to the existing backlog of cases can be better understood when we also take into consideration the fact that Judge Ketcham has requested that no more than four new nonsupport cases and no more than 11 old nonsupport cases be scheduled for 1 day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of Judge Ketcham's court schedule.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

Monday	Tuesday—J and A	Wednesday—J	Thursday—A	Friday—J
9:30: Summons. 10: Court opens. Trials by jury (scheduled by courtroom clerk): 4 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel present.	9:30: Summons. 10: Court opens. Juvenile trials by court (scheduled by courtroom clerk): 2 cases scheduled. Probation officer on call. Assistant corporation counsel present. and Juvenile detention hearings: 10 hearings scheduled. Probation officer and assistant corporation counsel present.	10: Court opens. Dependency cases (scheduled by Department of Public Welfare with summons, etc., handled by clerk's office): 15 minutes per case. 10 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel and DPW caseworker present.	9:30: Summons. 10: Court opens. CBOW or nonsupport trials (scheduled by courtroom clerk): 2 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel present. Probation officer on call. 11: Summons. 11:30: Nonsupport arraignments (scheduled by clerk's office): 15 minutes per case. 4 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel and probation officer present.	9:30: Summons. 10: Court opens. Juvenile trials by court (scheduled by courtroom clerk): 2 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel present. Probation officer on call. Juvenile detention hearings: 10 hearings scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel and probation officer present.
12:30: Court recesses. 2: Court reconvenes. Third Monday of each month, traffic cases: 5 cases per hour commencing at 10 a. m. Summons for 9:30 a. m., 10:30 a. m., 11:30 a. m., 1:30 p. m., and 2:30 p. m. 25 cases scheduled.	12:30: Court recesses. 1:30: Summons. 2: Court reconvenes. CBOW arraignments (scheduled by clerk's office): 5 cases per hour. 10 cases scheduled. Assistant corporation counsel and probation officer present. 4: Bench warrants: Attachments, and other special matters.	12:30: Court recesses. 1:30: Summons. 2: Court reconvenes. New juvenile cases (scheduled by clerk's office): 4 cases per hour. 10 cases scheduled. Probation officer present. Assistant corporation counsel on call.	12:30: Court recesses. 1:30: Summons. 2: Court reconvenes. Entry of support orders and hearings on arrears (scheduled by clerk's office): 5 cases per hour. 10 cases scheduled. Probation officer present. 4: Bench warrants: Attachments, and other special matters.	12:30: Court recesses. 1:30: Summons. 2: Court reconvenes. New juvenile cases (scheduled by clerk's office): 4 cases per hour. 10 cases scheduled. Probation officer present. Assistant corporation counsel on call.
4:30: Court recesses.	4:30: Court recesses.	4:30: Court recesses.	4:30 Court recesses.	4:30: Court recesses.

Mr. FREAR. I may add, Mr. President, that, previous to Mr. Ketcham's appointment, the average number of new cases calendared and heard per day was 35; the number of old cases about 70 per day.

Though the number of cases for one court day has been limited, it frequently occurs that some are not heard and the persons involved are told to return at a later date. Most of these people are workers and can ill afford to lose time from work. I understand this happens almost every week.

Nonsupport cases are being dismissed with the direction that the man pay the support money directly to his wife. This directive is not an enforceable order and, if the man fails to pay, the woman must again return to the court, refile, and await another hearing.

I understand plans are under way to stop support payments made through the police precincts, as now provided by statute. This means that men under court orders to pay support to their wives and families must take time off from work to bring the payments to the court or send money orders or checks. Most of them do not have checking accounts and, in any case, checks have to be cleared before the money is available to be disbursed to the family.

Mr. President, to substantiate my observation in this respect, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1958, entitled, "Efficient, but for Whom?" This editorial asks a question concerning the collection of support moneys under the newly proposed system.

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

EFFICIENT, BUT FOR WHOM?

District Juvenile Court Judge Orman W. Ketcham is talking about a new way of collecting money from fathers who have to be forced to help support their children.

At present they pay through police precinct stations, which are scattered over the city and open night and day 7 days a week. This makes it possible for defaulting fathers to pay up close to home and without losing time from their jobs.

Judge Ketcham, on advice from a District government efficiency expert and after visiting juvenile courts in half a dozen other cities, is talking about reducing the number of operations required to handle these payments by having the men pay direct to juvenile court with certified check or money order through the mails, or cash in person.

The new plan would cut down filing, form writing, and so forth, from 22 operations to 8.

Juvenile court's collections office would be open possibly until 9 at night with staggered shifts for workers, so payments could be made after work.

But according to Mrs. Francine Temko, legal assistant to Judge Ketcham, there is no thought at this time of keeping the collections office open weekends, when most defaulters pay at precinct stations.

During the fiscal year which ended last July 1, $945,000 was collected through the court for support of children. Under Judge Ketcham no continuous monthly figures have been available on collection totals, but Mrs. Temko has said the amount paid in during December was $54,000.

We're no efficiency expert, but it seems to us that collections should be made in whatever way is most likely to bring in the most money, so children won't go hungry or be added to public assistance rolls.

Is that what the new plan will do, or will it merely make it easier for the bookkeepers, with maybe less money for the needy kids?

Judge Ketcham has authority under the District juvenile court law to require payments through precinct stations or otherwise.

No doubt he believes the new plan has merit.

But he should take into account the type father involved in most support cases. Judging by those we have seen in juvenile court, we believe the vast majority would have no bank connection, know little about certified checks, and would be more likely to hand out cash at a nearby precinct station than buy a money order and send it through the mail.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1958, entitled "Juvenile Court's Philosophy Has Changed."

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

A PRIVATE SHIRKER AND A PUBLIC BURDEN—JUVENILE COURT'S PHILOSOPHY HAS CHANGED

(By Martha Strayer)

Three more children—2, 3, and 4 years old—will soon be on public assistance here, adding to District taxpayers' burden. Their father has deserted them.

Theirs is typical of hundreds of nonsupport families whose cases come before District juvenile court.

A CHANGE

It also illustrates a changed philosophy and procedure in handling nonsupport cases since Judge Orman W. Ketcham succeeded former Judge Edith H. Cockrill in juvenile court last May 1.

Judge Cockrill brought fathers who would not support their children into court fast, and sent persistent defaulters to jail.

When a father failed to show up for a nonsupport hearing, she issued a warrant for his arrest. United States deputy marshals searched for him and in many cases found him.

DIFFERENT VIEW

Judge Ketcham has told the News he does not believe in jailing fathers.

"I have studied some of these cases," he said. "The pattern is this: A father gets behind in his payments. If he's sentenced to jail and borrows money to bail himself out, that sinks him deeper in the hole. He gets further and further behind."

No warrant was issued for the father of the three children after he failed to show up in juvenile court for a nonsupport hearing.

RELATIVE HELPS

The parents separated last August, and the wife and children moved in with a relative, who has been supporting them ever since. Public Welfare induced the man to sign a voluntary agreement to pay his family $20 a week. He didnt live up to it.

On November 18 his wife filed a nonsupport complaint in juvenile court. It took nearly 2 months to get the case before Judge Ketcham, and by that time the father had vanished.

His wife appealed to the News. "I can't see my relative burdened any longer with my troubles," she said.

GROWING BURDEN

The News took her appeal to Public Welfare Director Gerard Shea, who said she's

eligible for public assistance. "It will cost the taxpayers $142 a month," he said. "The burden of these nonsupport families is getting greater and greater."

Public Assistance Director Donald Gray added: "Unless you get after these defaulting fathers fast, you don't get them."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, collections under support orders are decreasing sharply. During the month of August 1957, some $17,000 less was collected than during the month of August 1956. This reflects itself in an added burden on the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia and ultimately on the taxpayer.

Furthermore, Judge Ketcham has expressed a dislike for the adult jurisdiction of the court and feels that it has no place in the operation of the juvenile court. Although he must have been aware of his responsibility under the Juvenile Court Act when he was nominated, his general apathy toward enforcement is quite costly to the District.

Mr. President, if the total needs of the District are to be accurately presented to the Congress, a comparison of the manner in which other District agencies are meeting their responsibilities should likewise be presented. For a number of years—four, at least—collections far exceeded, in fact, almost doubled, the amount of the court's budget.

I understand that dissatisfaction on the part of the bar and others having business with the court is rather widespread. It is said that Judge Ketcham's seeming lack of knowledge of law and procedure of the court, and some of his remarks from the bench, have been the subject of laughter and ridicule outside the courtroom.

Mr. President, the position of juvenile judge is one of the most important in any community, and certainly here in the District of Columbia the selection of a person for this post was worthy of our most serious consideration.

Here, as in any other juvenile court district, each case presents peculiar problems, and the handling of them on a day-to-day basis requires a broad knowledge and understanding of the social factors involved and a sound application of appropriate corrective measures. Each problem must of necessity be evaluated in terms of individual and community needs, as well as of available resources.

Mr. President, we are being asked to consider and enact into law H. R. 7785, presently pending on the Senate calendar, which would amend the present District Code to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

The enactment of such legislation would again place us in a position of giving advice and consent to the additional judge subsequently to be selected.

Mr. President, it is my deep conviction that we would not require an additional judge of this juvenile court had we not on May 1, 1957 considered and given advice and consent to a nomination in the sense of a political rather than a judicial appointment.

We should have put aside political partisanship where the lives and welfare of little children were involved, and taken into account the background, training, temperament, and experience of a candidate when we were called upon to advise and consent to his nomination.

Mr. President, the present incumbent judge was no doubt inexperienced, and in all probability, under existing provisions of H. R. 7785, if enacted, the new appointee will also be inexperienced.

Not only do I earnestly urge my colleagues of the Senate to give careful consideration to the present conditions confronting this juvenile court, but also the manner in which certain provisions of H. R. 7785 would further curtail rather than expedite the operation of the court, insofar as they relate to the experience and qualifications of the additional judge therein provided, as well as affecting other court personnel.

The situation would be further intensified should the two experienced civil-service employees be removed and their places filled by new persons selected by the judges and to serve at their pleasure.

Section 4 of the bill proposes to amend section 21 to remove from the present qualification requirements of section 11–922 and from civil-service protection the positions of clerk having over 20 years' experience and deputy clerk having 4 years' service.

Section 42 of the 1938 act, which established the present court, recognized this requisite, and provided that the experienced judges and other officers be retained in the new court.

Mr. President, section 4 should be omitted entirely from the bill. At the time H. R. 7785 was reported to the Senate, it was my understanding that two Members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, were sympathetic with this suggestion, and proposed to offer an amendment in this session of the Congress to correct the situation had the bill been enacted.

During the last session, great stress was placed upon the urgency of enacting this legislation, pointing with much alarm to the increased workload and the backlog of cases presently pending upon the court's calendar. There appears to be a variance between the actual records of the court's activity and the evidence presented in support of this legislation.

Witnesses appearing before the Senate and House District Committees in behalf of this bill, I understand, very often referred to the spiraling caseloads which make the appointment of an additional judge necessary.

To substantiate my view in this respect, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Paul Sampson, which appeared in the Washington Post, issue of July 1, 1957, entitled "Juvenile Crime Here Dips for the Third Year."

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

JUVENILE CRIME HERE DIPS FOR THIRD YEAR

(By Paul Sampson)

Juvenile crime in Washington declined for the third straight year during the fiscal year just ended, Inspector John E. Winters, in charge of the Metropolitan Youth Aid Division, said yesterday.

Winters said preliminary figures showed an 18 percent reduction in the number of cases sent to juvenile court.

The number of boys sent to court was reduced by 9 percent during the year. Figures for girls are incomplete, but Winters said there also was a substantial reduction in the number of girls referred.

The Washington reduction in juvenile delinquency comes at a time when other cities report an increase in juvenile crime.

Winters, who was interviewed on the WTOP–TV program, City Side, attributed the decrease in delinquency to cooperative action by public and private agencies.

Winters said the recent Supreme Court decision in the Mallory case will in no way affect the handling of juveniles in juvenile court. The Supreme Court ruled last week that a confession made by Andrew Roosevelt Mallory, after he had been held several hours by police without arraignment, could not be used against him.

Winters pointed out that a specific act of Congress covers handling of juveniles in the District, and that juvenile court is not a criminal court.

The question of juveniles who are waived into district court because of the serious nature of their crimes is more complicated.

The law requires the juvenile court judge to make a prior investigation before waiving the juvenile into the adult court. The juvenile may be held in the detention home for several weeks but he can't be arraigned until juvenile court waives him to the adult court.

Mr. FREAR. This article reports an interview statement of Inspector John E. Winters, Metropolitan Police youth aid division, over Washington TV Station WTOP. Mr. Winters is reported as saying that juvenile crime in the District of Columbia declined for the third straight year during the fiscal year just ended. Mr. Winters said preliminary figures show an 18 percent reduction in the number of cases sent to the juvenile court.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Washington Daily News, issue of Thursday, January 16, 1958, which reports the juvenile court backlog, yet at the same time asks a perplexing question concerning a reported 30 percent drop of juvenile commitments during Judge Ketcham's term in office.

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

JUVENILE COURT HAS BACKLOG—FEWER DELINQUENTS SENT TO CENTER

(By Martha Strayer)

A perplexing 30 percent drop in commitments of juvenile delinquents to the Children's Center at Laurel during Judge Orman W. Ketcham's first 6 months in District juvenile court was reported today by the Public Welfare Department.

The Children's Center, operated by Welfare, is a corrective institution for admitted or committed delinquents.

Assistant Welfare Director Donald Brewer reported that from July 1 to December 31, 1957, 115 juveniles were committed to the Center. In the same 1956 period under Judge Edith H. Cockrill, the number was 187.

BACKLOG

Mr. Brewer said a number of factors might be involved. He said he understands juvenile court has a heavy backlog of unheard cases.

Mrs. Francine Temko, Judge Ketcham's legal assistant, admitted a backlog—she said

February 19 now is the first open date for juvenile hearings.

Mrs. Hilda Reagle, court clerk, said there has been no substantial decline in youngsters against whom complaints have been filed with the court.

LESS CRIME

Capt. John Ryan of the Police Juvenile Bureau said "There has been a gradual decrease in delinquencies over the past 3 years, but it hasn't been anything like 30 percent."

Judge Ketcham has reorganized court procedures.

In order to move juveniles quickly out of the District Receiving Home, he conducts detention hearings within 5 days after their arrest.

He has told the News that about 50 percent of the cases are disposed of at the detention hearings, thereby greatly reducing the number of children at the home. Court social workers make brief investigations before the hearings.

COURT HEARINGS

Youngsters who deny charges are given court hearings. Apparently this is where the backlog exists.

The court's operation also has been complicated by a recent court of appeals ruling that juveniles must be told in open court of their right to have a lawyer. Hearings with defense attorneys usually take more time.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, it was further pointed out during the hearings that in 1938, the first year of the court's existence, the number of cases heard by this court was 2,500. In 1948, 10 years later, this number had increased to 3,000; an increase of only 500.

Senate Report No. 1074, printed to accompany H. R. 7785, in the last paragraph on page 2, states that in 1953, 15 years later, the number had increased to approximately 10,000 cases, an apparent increase of 7,000 cases. Should this figure be correct, Mr. President, I would also urge the immediate appointment of another judge.

However, the court record, I am advised, actually shows only 5,351 cases in 1953 and not the 10,000 cited; that figure actually representing hearings and not cases.

In fact, the peak caseload in the juvenile court occurred in 1954, when 5,514 juvenile cases were heard.

However, in 1956, only 4,551 cases were heard, a decrease of approximately 900 cases.

While this caseload, as reported, is decreasing, I must be fair and say that the number of cases or complaints mentioned does not accurately reflect the volume of judicial work, since a number of complaints may be filed against one child, or several children may be involved in a single complaint.

Neither can the number of hearings be compared to the number of cases heard in the court.

These numbers actually represent docket or calendar entries, and very often there are five or more entries involved in one single court hearing.

Also included in these figures are orders for bench warrants, attachments, setting aside commitments, and dismissals from probation.

Mr. President, not only should we be definitely concerned with the statutory requirement relating to the experience and qualifications of the nominee to be named under the provisions of the bill, but a continuation of the present statutory requirement of qualification for all positions, presently in effect, as well as those planned should this bill be enacted.

I understand there was requested to be included in the new budget, recently presented to Congress, 10 new positions, and it is said in the event an additional judge be approved, many additional positions may be required. To this I may ask: Are we establishing a juvenile court, or a political agency?

Mr. President, I ask this question in all sincerity, because recently the administrative officer of this court, Mrs. Alice Freer—who, I hasten to add, is no relation to me, and who spells her name F-r-e-e-r—was granted an outstanding-performance rating by the District of Columbia Awards Committee. I understand that Judge Ketcham did not feel morally obligated to approve an action initiated by his predecessor, even though recommended by a special committee, and withheld from Mrs. Freer the monetary award which normally accompanies such recognition. Refusal to approve the cash award for Mrs. Freer automatically denied it to Mr. Larkin, director of social work and employee of the court for many years, who also had been cited for outstanding performance.

Yet, in October 1957, the position of administrative officer was abolished by Judge Ketcham, thereby removing an experienced civil-service employee with career status and an outstanding performance rating. On November 7, 1957, a new job with no real difference in qualification or job requirements, was created and filled by a new and inexperienced person. The new job was made a schedule C appointment, to be held at the pleasure of the appointing officer, rather than a civil-service classified position.

At this point in my statement I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Star, issue of February 11, 1958, entitled "Mrs. Friedman Gets Court Post," which shows Judge Ketcham having to employ at least two persons to perform the duties of Mrs. Freer.

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

MRS. FRIEDMAN GETS COURT POST

Juvenile Court Judge Orman W. Ketcham today appointed Mrs. Leah L. Friedman, wife of a Justice Department attorney, to a newly created post of management assistant at the court.

Mrs. Friedman, who will begin her new duties Monday, has been associated since 1950 with the Public Housing Administration, where she is a management analyst.

Judge Ketcham said she would take over some of the duties of Mrs. Alice B. Freer, former administrative assistant at the court, whose job was abolished by Judge Ketcham last October. She will serve as chief assistant to the judge.

Most of her duties, however, will be to continue a review and reorganization of court operations, it was said. She also will direct the putting into effect of administrative improvement programs as approved by the judge, it was added.

The new post is a civil service job classified as GS-12, which carries a starting pay of $7,570. Addition of this post and another of legal assistant was announced last October by Judge Ketcham. Mrs. Francine Temko was appointed to the legal post in November.

Mrs. Friedman, the wife of Daniel M. Friedman, lives at 1611 45th Street NW. She attended Randolph-Macon Woman's College at Lynchburg, Va., and received a bachelor of arts degree at Fairmont College, Fairmont, W. Va., in 1935. She is a native of Fairmont.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, as previously mentioned, there has been a widespread expression of concern regarding the operation of this court under the incumbent judge.

Not only have I received numerous letters, telegrams, and telephone calls regarding this matter, but I also understand that a management expert from the District of Columbia personnel office has been studying the court's operation since May 1, 1957, spending his entire time there. Also, I am told, the Civil Service is presently inspecting the court's personnel files, apparently not at the request of Judge Ketcham.

The reason for manifestation of interest in the operations of the court, I have not as yet attempted to ascertain.

Mr. President, to correct some of the inequities I believed to exist in the bill on the calendar, I did, perhaps a little late, present to the Senate District Committee several amendments.

Some of these inequities I desire to point out at this time. For instance, on page 1, line 11, H. R. 7785, we find a provision which seems to direct service when it should only prescribe the length of the term. A change in this provision could also spell out any existing confusion over the status of the 1951 Juvenile Court Act as to whether Judge Ketcham succeeded under provisions of that act to a position which had only 4 years left of a 6-year term, or to an entirely new position under the 1938 act.

Also, in general practice, the chief judge of the municipal court actually designates the municipal judge who is temporarily assigned to sit for an absent juvenile court judge. But the act further provides that his selection shall be confirmed by the chief judge of another court entirely; namely, the district court. A change in this provision would save the time of all three courts in the matter of such designations.

Another matter of equal importance is that the juvenile court should be required to make reports showing its business and operations. The previous judge made an annual report despite the lack of any legislative directive. The municipal court is required to make reports, and the juvenile court should be required to follow the same pattern, especially when it may become more than a one-judge court.

Mr. President, there are many other matters pertaining to this court about which I am concerned. However, my principal interest is the present requirement of law governing qualifications of persons nominated for juvenile court judgeships.

In this respect, I feel strongly that a majority of the members of the Senate District Committee feel as I do concerning the qualifications necessary to be possessed by one expected to conduct properly a court of this nature. This concern is so stated in Senate Report No.

1074 which accompanies H. R. 7785, page 3, where we find these words:

The committee in favorably reporting this bill feels very strongly that the appointing authority, in selecting a juvenile court judge, should be governed by a strict interpretation of the qualification standards set forth in the bill, to the end that the nominee shall fully meet all of the requirements.

The committee makes this statement because of its deep concern for the welfare of the children coming within the jurisdiction of this court, and feels that comprehensive knowledge of the social problems of the area, as well as a thorough understanding of child and adolescent psychology are most important attributes in this position.

Mr. President, in view of the present situation confronting the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, I trust we will recognize the concern of the community and not again make the mistake of enacting legislation merely to provide this court with another judge. This, in my humble opinion, would only be adding insult to injury to a community already suffering from the ineptitude of one presently serving in that capacity.

Mr. President, confronted as we are with an acute situation, which from day to day is rapidly becoming worse, no doubt the best solution would be to have the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems investigate the juvenile court and its operation, with the view of recommending proper legislation necessary to provide an efficient juvenile court in the District of Columbia, even recognizing the need for an additional judge.

In order to take a step in that direction, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit three amendments to H. R. 7785, presently pending on the Senate Calendar, and further ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate may be informed, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative analysis of my proposed amendments.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE BILL 7785 AND SENATOR FREAR'S BILL RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

There are three basic differences between Senator FREAR'S bill and House bill 7785.

The first basic difference relates to the qualifications which a person must have to be eligible for appointment as judge of the juvenile court. Under the terms of House bill 7785 a person has to have been a resident of the District of Columbia or of the metropolitan area of the District for a period of at least 5 years immediately preceding his appointment. To be eligible for such appointment under Senator FREAR'S bill a person must have been a resident of the District of Columbia for a period of at least 5 years immediately preceding his appointment, and must have had actual experience in working with local social problems and youth problems of the District of Columbia. Senator FREAR'S bill adds the additional requirement that any such person to be eligible for appointment as a judge of the juvenile court must have had 5 years of trial experience before the courts immediately preceding his appointment, or have had previous judicial experience.

The second basic difference between the two bills is the addition by Senator FREAR'S bill of a new section to the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. Such section would require the chief judge or the acting chief judge of the juvenile court to submit to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia a detailed quarterly report of the work of the court within 30 days of the end of the quarter. Such report would include the number of juvenile and adult cases heard, the number of juvenile and adult cases calendared, the number of juvenile and adult complaints filed, the number of juvenile cases closed without court hearing, moneys collected for fines and support of legitimate and illegitimate family members, and such other information as may reflect the court's operation and volume of work. A copy of such report would be kept in the office of the clerk of the court and would be open to public inspection during the regular hours that the court is open for business.

A third difference between the two bills is that House bill 7785 provides that the court shall have the power to appoint a clerk and a deputy clerk to hold office at the pleasure of the court. Senator FREAR'S bill which makes no reference to such positions would in effect leave such positions under civil service as they are under existing law.

In addition to the aforementioned differences between Senator FREAR'S bill and House bill 7785, there are several other minor differences not of a substantive nature.

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

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to assure the Senator from Delaware that the matter to which he has addressed himself will receive the very early and careful consideration of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I am sure I can also speak for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary.

I am well aware of the Senator's keen interest in this question. I am sure that it will be proceeded with without delay. I did not have the opportunity of hearing all the Senator's well-prepared address, but I wish to assure him that we will study the matter very carefully, with the thought in mind that we will consider the proposed legislation without undue delay.

Mr. FREAR. I have always been conscious of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has been very sympathetic toward the problems of the metropolitan area, and I know that he and the other members of the committee will give due consideration to the proposals offered by one of the junior members of the committee. I thank the chairman very much for his remarks.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1301, S. 1538.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1538) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) with respect to federally owned or operated land areas in the several States, the Congress finds that the retention by, or relinquishment to, the States of legislative jurisdiction of the kind involved in article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States, (1) enables States and local communities to obtain tax revenues from persons, private property, and business transactions within such areas, if not otherwise exempt, (2) relieves the Federal Government in many respects from the performance of functions normally exercised by the States and local communities, and (3) provides a basis for assuring to the residents of such areas many rights, privileges, and services which they would normally enjoy when the Federal Government does not have exclusive jurisdiction over such areas.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that—

(1) the Federal Government shall receive or retain only such measure of legislative jurisdiction over federally owned or operated land areas within the States as may in particular cases be necessary for the proper performance of such of its functions as are performed upon such areas; and

(2) to the extent consistent with the purposes for which the land is held by the United States the Federal Government shall avoid receiving or retaining concurrent legislative jurisdiction or any measure of exclusive legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the obtaining or retaining of exclusive jurisdiction or any other measure of legislative jurisdiction by the United States over lands or interests therein which have been or shall hereafter be acquired by it shall not be required. The head or other authorized officer of any department or independent establishment or agency of the Government may, consistent with the policy set forth in this act, acquire from, or relinquish to, the State in which any lands or interests therein under his immediate jurisdiction, custody, or control are situated, such measure of legislative jurisdiction over any such lands or interests as he may deem desirable. Such acquisition or relinquishment of jurisdiction on the part of the United States shall be indicated by filing a notice thereof in such manner as may be prescribed for this purpose by the laws of the State where such lands are situated, and unless and until a notice is filed in accordance with such State laws, or with the Governor, if the laws of such State do not prescribe another manner, it shall be conclusively presumed that no transfer of jurisdiction pursuant to this act has taken place, nor shall any transfer of legislative jurisdiction pursuant to this act take place unless and until the State in which the land is located has accepted or relinquished jurisdiction in such manner as its laws may provide. Upon a relinquishment by the United States of all of its legislative jurisdiction over an area to the State in which such area is situated, the State thereafter shall, with respect to

such area, exercise the same jurisdiction which it would have had if legislative jurisdiction over such area had never been in the United States. Like jurisdiction may be exercised by a State over any area over which the United States receives or retains only concurrent legislative jurisdiction, without prejudice, however, to the right of the United States to assert and exercise the legislative jurisdiction had by it over such area.

SEC. 3. (a) The first section of the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking all the language appearing therein after the words "unlawful assemblies," and substituting therefor the following language: "and to enforce any rules and regulations made and promulgated pursuant to this act."

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The head of any department or agency of the United States or such other officers duly authorized by him are authorized to issue all needful rules and regulations for the Government of the public buildings and other areas under their charge and control, and to annex to such rules and regulations such reasonable penalties, within the limits prescribed in section 4 of this act, as will insure their enforcement: *Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall be posted and kept posted in a conspicuous place on such public buildings and other areas. This authority shall not impair or affect any other authority existing in the head of any department or agency. The term 'public buildings and other areas' as used in this act includes property leased to the United States."

(c) Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The head of any department or agency of the United States and such officers duly authorized by him, whenever it is deemed economical and in the public interest, are authorized to utilize the facilities and services of existing Federal law-enforcement agencies, and, with the consent of any State or local agency, the facilities and services of such State or local law-enforcement agencies, to enforce any regulations promulgated under the authority of section 2 of this act.

"(b) Upon the application of the head of any department or agency of the United States the Administrator of General Services and officials of the General Services Administration duly authorized by him are authorized to detail such special policemen as are necessary for the protection of the Federal property under the charge or control of such department or agency."

(d) Section 4 of such act is amended by the insertion of the word "than" between "more" and "$50."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 3401 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any United States commissioner specially designated for that purpose by the court by which he was appointed has jurisdiction to try and sentence persons committing petty offenses in any place over which the Congress has exclusive power to legislate or over which the United States has concurrent or partial jurisdiction, or which is under the charge and control of the United States, and within the judicial district for which such commissioner was appointed."

SEC. 5. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 103 of title 4, United States Code.

(b) Sections 4661 and 4662 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

(c) The final paragraph of section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended.

SEC. 6. Any civil or criminal process, lawfully issued by competent authority of any State or political subdivision thereof, may be served and executed within any area under the exclusive, partial, or concurrent jurisdiction of the United States to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area were not subject to the legislative jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to affect the rights of authorized officers of the Federal Government or of any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof, to issue rules and regulations at any time for the purpose of preventing interference with the carrying out of Federal functions.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed to conflict with or detract from any statute consenting to or permitting State or local taxation.

FARMERS HAVE BEEN MISLED BY SECRETARY BENSON'S ASSURANCES OF BETTER PRICES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. Secretary, the Secretary of Agriculture has given his assurances to the committees of Congress, to the farmers, and to the public, that the severe cut in prices of dairy commodities that is scheduled to go into effect on April 1 will be "good for farmers."

The record shows, Mr. President, that Mr. Benson's assurances simply cannot be depended on. I do not say that Mr. Benson has deliberately misled and deceived the farmers of this country. I am willing to give Mr. Benson the benefit of every doubt, and to conclude that he has been sincerely mistaken. But regardless of what Mr. Benson's motivations have been, the result has certainly been to mislead and to deceive anyone who has placed confidence in his assurances that the farm situation is improving.

Mr. President, farm prices averaged 100 percent of parity in the year before Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture.

On November 18, 1953, after farm prices had slumped to 92 percent of parity, Mr. Benson gave this assurance to the National Grange meeting in Burlington, Vt.:

> The retreat of farm prices and incomes * * * seems to have been stopped a few short months after we took office.

A month later, he renewed this optimistic assurance before the National Farm Bureau convention on December 16, 1953, stating:

> Let me assure you * * * considerable progress has been made along the road to recovery. I believe that 1953 has marked the turning point—in the right direction.

One year later, when farm prices had dropped lower than ever, Mr. Benson went before the Farm Bureau convention again, and proclaimed optimistically that: "We are headed in the right direction at last." Farm prices then averaged 89 percent of parity.

As farm income continued to slide, on February 4, 1955, Mr. Benson went before the National Editorial Association and testified solemnly as follows:

> Farm income has been stabilized for some months * * * of one thing you can be certain. The better farmers will make money * * * because there is real opportunity in agriculture today.

Mr. Benson, of course, was wrong. All evidence made it clear that he was wrong. But he continued nevertheless to make misleading claims for the results of his policies. On January 16, 1956, he told the National Council of Farm Cooperatives the following:

> A new buoyancy in the market place—a new hope—a new vigor and zest—can be anticipated * * * surely it should be reflected promptly in prices and incomes.

Mr. President, by this time anyone who had followed the facts was perfectly aware that Mr. Benson's remedies were not delivering the cure which he promised for them. But Mr. Benson continued to advertise his wares to the unsuspecting public. As farm prices and incomes continued to slump and slide, Mr. Benson continued to tell the American people what was not true—that the farmers' situation was improving. On September 11, 1956, he said to the National Feed and Grain Dealers:

> We are on the right track. The downward slide in prices * * * has been checked. Yes, we are on the right track, and we are going to stay on it.

Again, the results proved that the Secretary of Agriculture had been mistaken. Again, anyone who had placed confidence in what the Secretary of Agriculture had said, was betrayed by the actual events, for farm prices and farmers' incomes did not improve. Farmers' purchasing power continued to bump along at levels close to 20 percent below those of 1952.

Last fall, Mr. Benson again told American farmers that their problems had reached the low point at last, and that his policies were proving successful. Speaking at the National Mechanical Corn Picking Contest in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on October 10, 1957, Mr. Benson said:

> Here is evidence of improvement in which both you as farmers and we who are working in your interest can take some measure of encouragement: First, net farm income will be higher this year than last.

Mr. President, unhappily Mr. Benson was not predicting accurately. Again, anyone who had placed confidence in his assurances would be misled. For just a few weeks ago, when the final figures came out, the Department of Agriculture reported that net farm income was not up—as Mr. Benson had promised it would be. No; it was down—down by a shocking, crushing $500 million, down from $12 billion to only $11½ billion.

This record of consistent errors in estimating the consequences of his actions, Mr. President, should serve as a warning to all who have a responsibility for farm policy: The assurances of Ezra Taft Benson that what he proposes will be "good for farmers" simply cannot be depended on.

Mr. President, I wish now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

HUNGRY CHILDREN IN A COUNTRY OF SURPLUSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article was published in the Milwaukee

Journal a few days ago which was positively shocking to me, and I am sure it was to the hundreds of thousands of people who read it.

This article tells of a reporter's visit to a flat in Milwaukee occupied by a family recently migrated from Puerto Rico. The father of this family has been unable to find a job because of the deepening recession and rising unemployment in the industrial areas of Wisconsin. This places him in the same dire straits as several thousand other people of my State.

That is the shocking revelation of this article, Mr. President, is the effect of his situation on his 2-month-old baby daughter. I quote from the article:

All this week the baby has had nothing to eat but sugar and water. That is all they have. There is no milk * * *

Thursday morning Mrs. Torres was asked if the baby was well again.

"Si," she said.

"How much does she weigh?"

"Six pounds nine ounces when she came home from the hospital. Now I do not know."

"And what of Nilda's future? Will she be hungry again, in a State where the cows produce 8½ billion quarts of milk a year?"

Mr. President, the article ends with this very cogent question. American agriculture—the most efficient and most productive the world has ever seen—is producing record surpluses despite deliberate efforts of the Federal Government to curb this abundance. In my own State of Wisconsin, our fine dairy farms are producing their share of the farm surplus.

Certainly every one of the distinguished Members of this body will agree that a 2-month-old baby should not have to live on sugar and water in the midst of this abundance. Certainly, every one will agree that our National, State and local governments should give real aid to any baby born into such unfortunate conditions as Nilda Torres.

Mr. President, I have proposed to the Senate a plan which would be helping Nilda Torres and her family if it were now law. In a comprehensive full-parity farm income and protection program which I have introduced—S. 2952—I have included a food-stamp plan by which families with low incomes could get enough food for a healthful nutritious diet for as little as one-fourth of the retail cost.

According to a Department of Agriculture report 2 years ago, 1 out of 10 families in the United States does not receive adequate nutrition to maintain good health. At present, with 5 million breadwinners out of work, the number of families who do not get enough to eat is undoubtedly much larger.

The food stamp plans which other Senators and I are proposing would allow qualified families to buy food coupons for one-fourth of the retail purchasing power of the coupons, or for 40 percent of their family income, whichever is greater. They would redeem these coupons for food in free-enterprise grocery stores. This plan thereby assures healthful, nutritious diets to families in unfortunate economic straits, it broadens the farmer's market for his great production, and it keeps the food business in the retail grocery stores, giving a boost to private business which would be especially important in this time of business recession.

Mr. President, I believe this case in Milwaukee illustrates graphically the urgent need for Congress to consider and provide effective ways of helping such people as the Torres family. I would urge that my food-stamp plan and other ideas with like objectives which are now pending before this Senate be given the quickest possible consideration.

But, Mr. President, there is still another aspect of this case which I believe also demands urgent consideration by this Congress. Most of us are surprised to hear of cases like the Torres family of Milwaukee because we believe our relief laws will take care of them. But there is a law—I believe a legally unsound one as well as a morally unjust law—which prevents them from receiving any public relief help. This is a new Wisconsin law, similar to ones in most other States, which requires a 1-year residency in the State as a condition for several forms of public-assistance aid. Since the Torres family has been in Milwaukee for less than a year, they cannot receive any public assistance to buy milk for their baby.

This residency requirement was a very substantial factor in the pneumonia death of a 1-year-old baby girl in Milwaukee early this winter.

Mr. President, I have introduced in this Senate a bill to abolish residency requirements as a condition of extending federally supported public assistance to persons who have newly taken up residence in any State. I believe the case of the Torres family in Milwaukee—and there are many parallel ones throughout the country—clearly illustrates the need for this type of legislation. I believe that it should receive the earliest possible consideration.

Mr. President, because this article in the Milwaukee Journal so well illustrates the urgency and necessity for legislation in these two fields, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 27, 1958]

(By Robert W. Wells)

Nilda Torres is 2 months old. Wednesday evening she had her first milk since Sunday. On Monday and Tuesday she drank sugar and water instead. It was all that her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carmelo Torres, 1136 North Jackson Street, had to give her.

You reach Nilda's second-floor, 2-room apartment—an apartment she may soon have to leave—by climbing dark stairs through a fetid hallway. There is the smell of cooking oil and of people packed too closely together. There are Spanish words scrawled on the walls.

The Torres are among the 4,000 or so Puerto Ricans who have migrated to Milwaukee in the last 7 years. The Torres family is worse off than most of this group. But nearly all the migrant families have been hard hit by the suddenly desperate competition for jobs—a competition that finds them handicapped by a lack of seniority, of training and of English.

A BARE BULB FOR LIGHT

When you open the door that leads to the Torres apartment you walk first through a windowless bathroom. There are clothes soaking in the tub. Open a second door, and you are in the combined bedroom and living room.

There is a bare bulb for light. The linoleum on the floor is worn brown from scrubbing. There are two cribs. There is a double bed on which there is an old mattress and blanket, but not sheets.

Behind the living room is a kitchen. Often, in recent weeks, it has been a kitchen where the larder was bare. This week, there was only the sugar and water mixture to feed the baby, instead of milk. And, because the rent is long overdue, the family faces eviction.

RELIGIOUS PICTURES ON WALL

On the wall of the front room are religious pictures. Beside them a gay poster proclaims the merits of Coca-Cola. It has been tacked up to fight back the drabness.

The reporter visited the Torreses with Mrs. Judith Clack, a caseworker for the International Institute of Milwaukee County. When it came time for Nilda to go home from the county general hospital, where she was born prematurely, alarm was felt over the child's welfare. The parents had no job, no money, sometimes no food. Mrs. Clack, who speaks Spanish, was called on for help.

The institute is not equipped to give direct relief. But in talking with Torres she found one small ray of hope. He had come back to Milwaukee—he had lived here before—about 7 months ago after being laid off from his job in Chicago as a trucker's helper. He might be entitled to unemployment compensation from Illinois.

SUCH THINGS TAKE TIME

Torres had not realized this until Mrs. Clack told him. Then he applied, but so far nothing has happened. Such things take time, it seems, and meanwhile there is no money for rent, little for food. He is now 5 weeks behind on his $12 a week rent for the 2 rooms. The landlord—of his 12 tenants, he told Mrs. Clack, 6 are not paying—cannot carry him forever. Torres has been told he must leave.

Torres speaks some English and understands it fairly well. But he feels more at home in Spanish. He had thought things would be better in Milwaukee, he said. But they were not.

"I've been looking for a job ever since I got here," he said. "I've been looking for any kind of a job—at the hotels, anywhere. There is nothing."

When he applied for county aid, he was told he was not qualified because of the nonresidence law passed by the legislature last year. Go back to Illinois, he was told.

THE MOTHER IS 22

"But there is nothing for me there," Torres said.

What about Puerto Rico, the island he left in 1955?

"In Puerto Rico," Torres said, "I worked in the sugar cane fields. There was 4 months work a year at $3 a day." He made a gesture with his hand across his throat. "That's all. How can we stay? We can't live. If we had opportunities there, we wouldn't have come."

Mrs. Torres, a tiny woman wearing tennis shoes, looking almost like a child although she is 22, stood by quietly, listening. In a Puerto Rican family, in contrast with most other American groups, it is the man who talks.

"Everywhere they tell me, no job," Torres said. "Everywhere it's layoff, layoff. In Chicago, I never missed a day's work. I want to work. But there is no work."

A brother in Chicago has taken in the Torres' oldest child, Carmelo, 5. The other son, Idraid, 2, and the baby share their parents' apartment here.

"We don't want to live like this," Torre said. "But what can we do?"

St. Vincent de Paul society has helped with food. Last week, it gave Torres $5 to buy milk for the baby. It was all the money the family had. Idraid was hungry, too. By Monday, the money was gone. A neighbor gave Torres some corn meal and vegetables. But Nilda could not eat this.

THERE IS NO MILK

The reporter's first visit was last week. Wednesday he called Mrs. Clack to inquire about Torres. By coincidence, the Puerto Rican was in her office when the call came.

"He is desperate," she said. "He doesn't know what to do. He is to be evicted because he can't pay his rent. All this week, the baby has had nothing to eat but sugar and water. That is all they have. There is no milk."

A little later, Mrs. Clack called St. Vincent de Paul. Wednesday evening a representative of the society gave Torres another $5 for milk for Nilda. If the society had known of the emergency sooner, Mrs. Clack was told, it would have seen to it the baby did not go hungry. But there are many Puerto Ricans and others who need help.

For those who do not qualify for relief under the new law, the society is almost the only resort. There is a limit to what it can do.

Thursday morning Mrs. Torres was asked if the baby was well again.

"SI" IS HER ANSWER

"Si," she said.

"How much does she weigh?"

"Six pounds nine ounces when she came home from the hospital. Now, I do not know."

And what of Nilda's future? Will she be hungry again, in a State where the cows produce 8½ billion quarts of milk a year, enough to give every man, woman and child six quarts a day?

Walking back down the dark stairs in the fetid hallway, it was hard to think of an optimistic answer.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1538) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill under consideration, Calendar No. 1301, S. 1538, is to provide for the adjustment of legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and other Senators were interested in some of the implications of the bill, particularly, I believe, as it affects water rights. Am I correct?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. I shall make a short observation, and then, if it is agreeable, ask a question or two.

The Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision in the so-called Pelton Dam case a couple of years ago. The case arose in Oregon and concerned a Federal power license on the Deschutes River, in Oregon. At the dam site, where the powerplant was to be constructed, water withdrawal intake was located on one side of the river, and an Indian reservation on the other side of the river. The Supreme Court decided that the laws which had been in force for 90 years in the Western States, giving those States the control over the waters within their confines, so far as the public lands were concerned, did not apply in that case because they were reserve lands of the United States.

Is there anything in the proposed legislation, I ask the Senator from Minnesota, which will give the Federal Power Commission or any other agency of the Government any authority over the public lands of the West, so far as the control, disposition, and appropriation of water in those States is concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill does not in any way change any existing Federal law relating to water rights or land rights which are presently operative. The proposed legislation is permissive. It permits the States to undertake certain responsibilities if they so desire, but it does not affect the rights which exist at present.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I have examined the bill and the report of the committee. I am satisfied that that was the intention of the committee in reporting the bill to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill authorizes the Federal Government to restore to the States jurisdiction over particular areas, if the States request it.

Mr. BARRETT. For purely legislative purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, since the bill is of vital concern and has been studied so carefully, I ask unanimous consent that pages 1 through 5 and through the first paragraph on page 6 of the report be printed in the RECORD as a part of the legislative record, simply because that part of the report gives the background and the development of the bill.

The bill received considerable study by the committee appointed by the Council of State Governments, by the Department of the Interior, and by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the portion of the report beginning on page 9 and extending to the middle of page 12. The bill was reported under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to permit Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States, which may better be administered by State authorities, and to acquire only such jurisdiction as may be necessary in connection with future land procurement. Once legislative jurisdiction has been vested in the United States, it cannot be revested in the States other than by operation of a limitation imposed by the State at the time the State ceded jurisdiction, or by an act of Congress.

The bill specifically declares it to be the policy of the Congress that (1) the Federal Government shall receive or retain only such measure of legislative jurisdiction over federally owned or operated land areas within the States as may be necessary for the proper performance of Federal functions; and (2) to the extent consistent with the purposes for which the land is held by the United States, the Federal Government shall avoid receiving or retaining concurrent jurisdiction or any measure of exclusive legislative jurisdiction. An overall objective of the bill is to provide that, in any case, the Federal Government should not receive or retain any of the States' legislative jurisdiction with respect to qualifications for voting, education, public health and safety, taxation, marriage, divorce, descent and distribution of property, and a variety of other matters, which are ordinarily the subject of State control.

S. 1538, as proposed to be amended, would authorize the head or other authorized officer of any department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government to relinquish to the State in which any Federal lands or interests therein under his custody or control are situated, such measure of legislative jurisdiction over such lands or interests therein as he may deem desirable. The bill provides that with respect to future acquisitions of property, no more jurisdiction than is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the acquiring agency should be obtained. Any relinquishment of jurisdiction by the Federal Government would be subject to acceptance by the State in such manner as the law of such State might provide.

Other provisions of the bill would authorize Federal department and agency heads to issue necessary rules and regulations for the governing of public buildings and other areas under their charge and control, and to provide such reasonable penalties, within prescribed limits, as will insure their enforcement; permit such heads to utilize the facilities of existing law-enforcement agencies for the enforcement of any such regulations; authorize the General Services Administration to detail special policemen for the protection of Federal property under the charge of other departments and agencies; extend the authority of United States commissioners to try and sentence persons committing petty offenses in any place under the charge and control of the United States; extend the right of States and their political subdivisions to serve and execute process in areas under the legislative jurisdiction of the United States, while making it clear that such process may not be served contrary to rules and regulations issued by authorized Federal personnel for the purpose of preventing interference in carrying out Federal functions; and amend or repeal obsolete or inconsistent Federal statutes.

COMMITTEE ACTION

S. 1538 was originally drafted by the staff of the Committee with the cooperation of the Department of Justice, in order to implement recommendations contained in a report by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, a Committee appointed by the President for the purpose of finding means of solving the problems arising out of the uncertain jurisdictional status of Federal lands situated within the several States. The Committee was composed of representatives of eight executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Bureau of the Budget, which had a principal interest in the problems involved. Twenty-five other agencies of the Federal Government furnished information concerning their properties and problems relating to legislative jurisdiction to the Committee. In addition, the Interdepartmental Committee had the assistance and cooperation of the National Association of Attorneys General in its conduct of the study.

Following the introduction of the bill in its original form in the 84th Congress (S. 4196),

the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations forwarded copies to the governors and attorneys general of the several States and to all interested Federal agencies for comments and recommendations. Reports were received from 36 States—31 State governors and 29 State attorneys general—all of whom endorsed the objectives of the bill and recommended favorable committee consideration. Certain of the governors and attorneys general of the States requested that the committee withhold action on S. 4196, however, until a study of its provisions could be completed by the State Committee on Legislative Jurisdiction of the Council of State Governments. That committee was appointed by the president of the council pursuant to a resolution adopted by the States for the purpose of considering this legislation proposed by S. 4196. The committee appointed for this purpose was directed to give consideration to certain suggested amendments to the original bill, and to determine whether or not it would be feasible to extend its provisions beyond its original intent by incorporating certain suggestions made by various State officials.

Upon completion of the study made by the Committee on Legislative Jurisdiction, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations arranged conferences between the representatives of the Council of State Governments and of the Department of Justice for the purpose of perfecting the bill by incorporating appropriate amendments. Following a number of such conferences, during which consideration was given to the various recommendations of the governors, attorneys general, and the Council of State Governments, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was drafted, with the unanimous approval of representatives of the States and the executive branch of the Federal Government. Consideration was given to all recommendations submitted to the committee by the governors of the States, and by the National Association of Attorneys General, the National Association of Tax Administrators, and Federal agencies interested in the bill, which were consistent with the objectives of the proposed legislation.

Some of the suggestions submitted to the Committee on Government Operations by certain of the State officials and by the National Association of Tax Administrators, dealt with tax matters which were considered to be outside of the scope of the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States. Such suggestions were largely concerned with tax problems, such as payments by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes, etc., which the committee felt should be considered in separate legislation dealing exclusively with those problems. Specific proposals pertaining to those problems are presently pending in the Congress.

S. 1538 is not concerned with tax matters, except to the extent that a transfer of legislative jurisdiction may involve transfer of a power to tax (other than the Government or its property), and also to the extent that there are preserved certain Federal consents to State and local taxation, as embodied in such statutes as the Buck Act and the Lea Act.

BACKGROUND

Article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, provides that the Federal Government shall have exclusive legislative jurisdiction over such area not exceeding 10 miles square as may become the seat of government of the United States, and like authority over places acquired by the Government, with the consent of the State involved, for various public purposes. Under the first portion of such clause the United States acquired legislative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, and exercises in the District all authority, whether executive, judicial, or legislative, of the type usually exercised by States. Under the second portion of the clause the United States has similarly acquired, but has exercised only to a minor extent, like jurisdiction over several thousand areas acquired for various Federal purposes within the 48 States. However, the amount of authority vested in the Federal Government over individual areas has varied, leading to uncertainty and confusion. While the Federal Government has provided laws for the District of Columbia, and governmental machinery to administer such laws, it has legislated very little with respect to these other areas. Such areas in many respects are Federal islands, or enclaves, surrounded by State territory. State authority does not extend to these enclaves, or to persons or transactions within them, except in several minor respects. Except as to sales taxes, use taxes and income taxes, which the Federal Government has given the States permission to apply, the States are deprived, by Federal possession of legislative jurisdiction, of tax revenues which they would normally receive from private sources within Federal areas. For many purposes the residents of such enclaves, who aggregate many thousands, are not considered residents of the State or local community in which the enclave is situated, so that frequently they may not vote, have their wills probated, adopt children, or avail themselves of the facilities and services which are dependent upon residence in the State. Many of these services and facilities are not furnished by the Federal Government. On the other hand, the Federal Government must furnish to many such areas services and facilities which could be furnished by the States and local communities with much greater ease.

On December 15, 1954, pursuant to recommendation of the Attorney General approved by the President and the Cabinet, there was formed the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, for the purpose of finding means for solving the problems arising out of the jurisdictional status of Federal lands. That Committee, of which Mr. Perry W. Morton, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, was Chairman, had representation, through their chief law officers, from the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Services Administration, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Veterans' Administration.

The Morton Committee, with the benefit of information and recommendations furnished by State attorneys general, representatives from all Federal agencies interested in problems arising out of the legislative jurisdictional status of Federal lands (33 agencies), and numerous other sources, State and Federal, pursued its study for some 2½ years, submitting a report in 2 parts. Part I, which was issued in April 1956 (Government Printing Office), is entitled "The Facts and Committee Recommendations." Part II, which is dated June 1957 (Government Printing Office), is entitled "A Text of the Law of Legislative Jurisdiction."

The reports growing out of the Morton Committee study, and the further study of this subject made by the Committee on Government Operations, indicate that, while Federal exercise of legislative jurisdiction over Federal areas within the several States is authorized by the Constitution, and while it has been extended by Federal-State arrangements, neither at the time of the formulation and ratification of the Constitution, nor at any subsequent time, until the present studies, has any serious or extended consideration been given to the question of legislative jurisdiction over such areas.

Currently completed research has involved a general survey of the jurisdictional status of all federally owned or leased real property in the 48 States, but such survey did not cover United States Territories or possessions, the District of Columbia, or Indian lands, to which different facts and law may appertain. A detailed survey was also made of the status of such properties in the States of Virginia, Kansas, and California, these States having been selected for the purpose as representative. Information has been procured concerning the practices and problems related to legislative jurisdiction of all the Federal agencies controlling real property, and of the advantages and disadvantages of the several legislative jurisdictional statuses for the various purposes for which real property is used by the Federal Government. Information also has been procured concerning the policies, practices, and problems of the 48 States relative to legislative jurisdiction. All this information, which includes Federal and State constitutional provisions, statutes, and judicial and administrative decisions relating to the subject of legislative jurisdiction, has been coordinated and analyzed.

POLICIES DETERMINED

On the basis of this research the Morton Committee concluded, and the Senate Committee on Government Operations concurs, that in general the Federal Government should not receive or retain any legislative jurisdiction within federally owned or operated areas which might be exercised by the States; that in some special cases where general law enforcement by Federal authorities is indicated the Federal Government should receive or retain legislative jurisdiction only concurrently with the States; and that, in any case, the Federal Government should not receive or retain any legislative jurisdiction with respect to qualifications for voting, education, public health and safety, taxation, marriage, divorce, annulment, adoption, commitment of the mentally incompetent, and descent and distribution of property, normally exercised by the States.

In certain instances, however, which are not entirely foreseeable, it may be necessary or highly desirable for the Federal Government to have some greater measure of legislative jurisdiction over individual properties, and discretion in this matter should be lodged, as it has long been, in the heads of Federal agencies. It is also the view of the committee that in every case States should have authority to enter any Federal area for the purpose of serving process, provided that service is accomplished at a time and in a manner which will not interfere with the carrying out of Federal functions, and that residents of Federal areas should not be deprived, solely by reason of such residence, of civil or political rights to which other citizens of the respective States in which such Federal areas are located are entitled.

EXECUTION OF POLICIES

The committee is advised that, to the extent possible the foregoing policies are currently being carried out by the executive branch of the Federal Government. By way of example, legislative jurisdiction has not been assumed by the Federal Government over the site of the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo. However, these policies cannot fully be put into effect without new legislation, Federal and State. The bill S. 1538, as amended, would furnish the necessary Federal legislation.

STATEMENT OF COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS' COMMITTEE ON JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL LANDS WITHIN THE STATES WITH RESPECT TO S. 1538 (JULY 25, 1957)

The Council of State Governments' committee supports the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 1538. We do so, not because the bill is anything like a complete solution to the problem of legislative jurisdiction over Federal lands

within the States, but rather because it is a reasonable first step toward such a solution and because it seems to be the best that is attainable at the present time.

It is probably fruitless to speculate concerning what Federal-State relationships with respect to Federal-land areas would now be if the United States Government had pursued different policies in the past. However, it is a fact that between 1840 and 1941 the Federal statute required the cession of State legislative jurisdiction over Federal lands as a prerequisite to the development of those lands. Consequently, the States customarily ceded such jurisdiction. An objective analysis of the resulting situations may lead to the conclusion that the Federal requirement was not wise. It deprived the States of many types of control in these areas which they should have continued to exercise in the interest of fair and orderly governmental administration. It also deprived the States of tax revenues from private persons and property for which such persons and property should have continued to be liable. On the other hand it placed an obligation to render many services and to undertake many control measures on these areas which the Federal Government is ill equipped to perform and which, in many instances, the Federal Government has not performed.

Despite these highly unfortunate features of the situation which now so largely prevail, there is one type of equity which must be preserved in any improvement of the general situation which may now be attempted. If the exercise of legislative jurisdiction by the Federal Government has deprived the States of the power and the wherewithal to service these lands and the people resident upon them, it has also relieved the States of the responsibility for such control and service. To the extent that States and localities have nevertheless provided services to the Federal areas—and they have done so quite extensively—such action has been voluntary. The States and their subdivisions are perfectly willing to assume responsibility as a matter of law, but they can fairly be asked to do so only if the legal status and practical administration of the Federal areas is such as to give to the States and their subdivisions a degree of control over and revenue potential from these areas commensurate with the responsibility. This means that the Federal areas and the people on them must be placed, as nearly as may be, in the same position as any other areas and persons within the State.

The solution of the jurisdictional aspects of the Federal area problem has two vital aspects: (1) The ascertainment of the jurisdictional status of many Federal areas for which the status is now unknown or uncertain and (2) provision of a uniform, equitable, and orderly procedure for the transfer of jurisdiction from a State to the Federal Government, or vice versa, to whatever extent may best accord with the needs of particular cases.

We in the States had hoped that the present legislation might contain a full solution for both of these problems. However, the Federal agencies feel that they cannot go this far at the present time. Consequently, we support the present bill as a desirable first step and as a reasonable compromise.

The bill does nothing to precipitate the definitive ascertainment of jurisdictional status for those areas whose status is now unknown or uncertain. We have received some assurances from the Department of Justice and the Federal Interdepartmental Committee of their willingness to work out a system whereby the results of the present inventories of Federal lands may be made available in such form as will clarify the matter. Whether the States will eventually find it necessary to ask Congress for additional legislation in aid of such clarification depends on what can be worked out administratively.

Provision of a uniform and equitable procedure for transfers of jurisdiction is made possible but not insured by the bill. With its passage, Federal administrative authorities would have the power to obtain from and relinquish to the State legislative jurisdiction according to a relatively simple and orderly pattern. This is all to the good and is one of the principal reasons why we support the legislation. However, it should be pointed out that unless individual Federal administrators can be induced to pursue consistent and equitable jurisdictional policies the benefits of the bill could be largely illusory. We would have preferred a more definitive approach but are satisfied that section 2 of the present bill is all that is likely to be achieved at the present time.

Before concluding this statement, we would also like to comment on the importance of sections 1, 6, and 7 of the bill.

As already noted, it is essential that responsibility of States and their subdivisions for Federal areas must be accompanied by the availability to them of taxable wealth on as nearly the same basis as may be in other areas of the State. An extremely important part of this problem is bound up with the question of payments in lieu of taxes. We understand that this problem is receiving consideration elsewhere and that the present bill is not a proper vehicle for determining the appropriate Federal contribution on behalf of properties which it owns and uses directly for the conduct of its Federal functions. However, the clear statement in section 1 of the bill with respect to the connection between legislative jurisdiction and taxation of private persons and property is quite necessary and appropriate in the present legislation. Similarly, section 7 provides valuable clarification of the Congressional intent to leave other tax arrangements already contained in Federal law, or which may be enacted in the future, undisturbed.

The provision for the service of criminal and civil process contained in section 6 is essential to the administration of State and local justice. However, if this section is to work properly, the proviso contained in its concluding words must be narrowly construed so as to limit such service only in such manner as is absolutely essential to permit reasonably efficient performance of the Federal functions.

We wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to make our views known. The status of Federal lands within the States is of great and obvious importance to the States and a proper solution of problems connected with such areas can be found only if the Federal Government and the States work very closely together from the very inception of any projects in this field and cooperate, not only in the assembly of information but also in the evolution of the law and policy.

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS,
Chicago, Ill., January 31, 1958.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The committee on legislative jurisdiction over Federal lands within the States of the Council of State Governments and the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States have completed a series of conferences held for the purpose of proposing appropriate amendments to S. 1538, relating to the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States and for Federal purposes.

There is before your committee now the tangible result of that series of meetings, an amendment in the nature of a substitute which meets with the unanimous concurrence of all participants in the meetings. The substitute proposal, if enacted, will not solve all jurisdictional problems but it will provide an orderly means whereby Federal jurisdiction may be relinquished, in whole or in part, thereby decreasing the number of areas in which jurisdictional conflicts may occur. It is our earnest hope that the committee will be able to consider the substitute bill at an early date. We are expressing a similar view to Senator MUNDT.

On behalf of our committee we wish to thank you for your courtesy, patience, and understanding in a matter of great interest to each of the States. We remain ready to continue to cooperate in any way you desire.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very sincerely,

FRANK BANE,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT OF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL PERRY W. MORTON, CHAIRMAN, INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN THE STATES, WITH RESPECT TO S. 1538 (JULY 8, 1957)

I am pleased to report that the meetings between State and Federal representatives sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Operations have resulted in the development of a bill, identified as the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 1538, which is in accord with all the recommendations for basic Federal legislation made by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, and which meets with the unanimous concurrence of all participants in the meetings.

The committee amendment may be said to result from compromise. The compromise, however, is based on Federal and State recognition of the existence of various immutable facts, and on mutual confidence. There has been no requirement for compromise of principle on the part of either State of Federal representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it believes enactment of legislation of this nature would contribute greatly to the improvement of management of Federal operations in the various States as well as to the improvement of Federal-State relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1538) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes."

PROPOSED SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1300, Senate bill 2752.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2752) to amend section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to modify and improve the procedure for submission to

the Attorney General of certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether such disposals would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement regarding the bill: It is designed to clarify, modify, and improve certain phases of existing law and procedures relative to the disposal of surplus property by executive agencies. It seeks to accomplish this by modifying the requirement in section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 that executive agencies, at the beginning of negotiations, seek the advice of the Attorney General as to whether a proposed surplus property disposal would tend to create and maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. It would require, instead, that such notification to the Attorney General be made whenever such disposal is contemplated by any executive agency, thus leaving it to the agency to determine the appropriate time for submission.

The bill would also require that when such notice is transmitted to the Attorney General by any executive agency other than the General Services Administration, a copy of the notification must be transmitted simultaneously to the Administrator of General Services. In addition, S. 2752 would exempt from the requirements of section 207 proposed disposals of scrap and salvage, and any property (other than a patent, process, technique, or invention) if the aggregate amount of the original acquisition cost to the Government, and all capital expenditures made by the Government with respect thereto, is less than $3 million, instead of $1 million as now provided.

S. 2752 is based upon a draft bill submitted by the Administrator of General Services, and redrafted by the committee, prior to introduction, in order to clarify its provisions. In its present form, it has the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of General Services, and the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2752) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"APPLICABILITY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

"SEC. 207. (a) Except as provided by subsection (c), no executive agency shall dispose of any plant, plants, or other property to any private interest until such agency has received the advice of the Attorney General on the question whether such disposal would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Whenever any such disposal is contemplated by any executive agency, such agency shall transmit promptly to the Attorney General notice of such proposed disposal and the probable terms or conditions thereof. If such notice is given by any executive agency other than the General Services Administration, a copy of such notice shall be transmitted simultaneously to the Administrator. Within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed 60 days, after receipt of such notification, the Attorney General shall advise the Administrator and any other interested executive agency whether, so far as he can determine, the proposed disposition would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

"(b) Upon request made by the Attorney General, the Administrator or any other executive agency shall furnish or cause to be furnished to the Attorney General such information as the Administrator or such other executive agency may possess which the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice required by this section, or to determine whether any other disposition or proposed disposition of surplus property violates or would violate any of the antitrust laws.

"(c) This section shall not apply to the disposal of—

"(1) any property (other than a patent, process, technique, or invention) if the aggregate amount of the original acquisition cost of such property to the Government and all capital expenditures made by the Government with respect thereto is less than $3 million; or

"(2) any personal property, without regard to cost, which is determined by the executive agency concerned to have value only as scrap or salvage.

"(d) Nothing contained in this act shall impair, amend, or modify any of the antitrust laws or limit or prevent the application of any such law to any person who acquires in any manner any property under the provisions of this act.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'antitrust laws' includes the act of July 2, 1890 (ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209), as amended; the act of October 15, 1914 (ch. 323, 38 Stat. 730), as amended; the Federal Trade Commission Act (38 Stat. 717), as amended; and sections 73 and 74 of the act of August 27, 1894 (28 Stat. 570), as amended;

"(2) the term 'scrap' means any material that has no value except for its basic material content; and

"(3) the term 'salvage' means any personal property that has some value in excess of its basic material content, but which is in such condition that there is no reasonable prospect of its use by the Government for any purpose as a unit and its repair or rehabilitation for use by the Government as a unit is clearly impracticable."

OPERATION OF THE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1304, House bill 8795.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8795) to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill would permit the Administrator of General Services to maintain and operate the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library under the terms of the General Presidential Libraries Act—44 United States Code 397. It would also enable the Administrator to accomplish the following:

First. Abolish the Board of Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

Second. Establish the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library fund as a separate account within the National Archives trust fund.

Third. Eliminate the present limitations on the purposes for which the Franklin D. Roosevelt trust funds may be used.

Fourth. Eliminate the 25-cent ceiling on admission fees.

Fifth. Give statutory recognition to the validity of restrictions placed by donors on the use of papers accepted for deposit.

The committee is informed that all members of the Board of Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library have advised the Administrator of General Services that they are in accord with the objectives of this legislation, and recommend its enactment.

I thought the Senate would like to know the proposal has had the approval of the trustees and also the careful scrutiny of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1306, S. 2224.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2224) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposal of surplus property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

"(6) An explanatory statement of the circumstances shall be preserved in the file of each case where disposal occurs under paragraphs (3), (4), or (5) of this subsection.

And insert:

"(6) Except as otherwise provided by this paragraph, an explanatory statement of the circumstances of each disposal by negotiation of any real or personal property having a fair market value in excess of $1,000 shall be prepared. Each such statement shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days (or such shorter period as may be concurred in by such committees in advance of such disposal, and a copy thereof shall be preserved in the files of the executive agency making such disposal. No such statement need be transmitted to any such committee with respect to any disposal—

"(A) of any perishable food or other property which may become useless by deterioration within 30 days;

"(B) required to be made immediately for the preservation of human life or the alleviation of human suffering;

"(C) required in the public interest to be made within 30 days during a period of national emergency declared by the President or the Congress;

"(D) of real property made through a contract realty broker pursuant to paragraph (4);

"(E) of personal property made under paragraph (5) at a fixed price; or

"(F) authorized by section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or any other provision of law to be made without advertising."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That section 203 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) All disposals or contracts for disposal of surplus property (other than by abandonment, destruction, donation, or through contract brokers) made or authorized by the Administrator shall be made after publicly advertising for bids, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (5) of this subsection.

"(2) Whenever public advertising for bids is required under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(A) the advertisement for bids shall be made at such time previous to the disposal or contract, through such methods, and on such terms and conditions as shall permit that full and free competition which is consistent with the value and nature of the property involved;

"(B) all bids shall be publicly disclosed at the time and place stated in the advertisement;

"(C) award shall be made with reasonable promptness by notice to the responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That all bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest to do so.

"(3) Disposals and contracts for disposal may be negotiated, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, without regard to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection but subject to obtaining such competition as is feasible under the circumstances, if—

"(A) necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, with respect to a particular lot or lots of property or, for a period not exceeding 3 months, with respect to a specifically described category or categories of property as determined by the Administrator;

"(B) the public health, safety, or national security will thereby be promoted;

"(C) public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

"(D) the property involved is of a nature and quantity which, if disposed of under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, would cause such an impact on an industry or industries as adversely to affect the national economy, and the estimated fair-market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal can be obtained by negotiation;

"(E) the estimated fair-market value of the property involved does not exceed $1,000;

"(F) bid prices after advertising therefor are not reasonable (either as to all or some part of the property) or have not been independently arrived at in open competition;

"(G) with respect to real property only, the character or condition of the property or unusual circumstances make it impractical to advertise publicly for competitive bids and the fair-market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal can be obtained by negotiation;

"(H) the disposal will be to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions thereof, or tax-supported agencies therein, and the estimated fair-market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal are obtained by negotiation; or

"(I) otherwise authorized by this Act or other law.

"(4) Disposals and contracts for disposal of surplus real and related personal property through contract realty brokers employed by the Administrator shall be made in the manner followed in similar commercial transactions under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That such regulations shall require that wide public notice of availability of the property for disposal be given by the brokers.

"(5) Negotiated sales of personal property at fixed prices may be made by the Administrator either directly or through the use of disposal contractors without regard to the limitations set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection: *Provided*, That such sales shall be publicized to the extent consistent with the value and nature of the property involved, that the prices established shall reflect the estimated fair-market value thereof, and that such sales shall be limited to those categories of personal property as to which the Administrator determines that such method of disposal will best serve the interests of the Government.

"(6) Except as otherwise provided by this paragraph, an explanatory statement of the circumstances of each disposal by negotiation of any real or personal property having a fair-market value in excess of $1,000 shall be prepared. Each such statement shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days (or such shorter period as may be concurred in by such committees in advance of such disposal, and a copy thereof shall be preserved in the files of the executive agency making such disposal. No such statement need be transmitted to any such committee with respect to any disposal—

"(A) of any perishable food or other property which may become useless by deterioration within 30 days;

"(B) required to be made immediately for the preservation of human life or the alleviation of human suffering;

"(C) required in the public interest to be made within 30 days during a period of national emergency declared by the President or the Congress;

"(D) of real property made through a contract realty broker pursuant to paragraph (4);

"(E) of personal property made under paragraph (5) at a fixed price; or

"(F) authorized by section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or any other provision of law to be made without advertising."

"(7) Section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to disposals or contracts for disposal made under this subsection."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill is designed to prescribe the situations in which the disposal of surplus Federal property, real and personal, must be accomplished by public advertising, and those in which disposals of such property may be accomplished by negotiation. The bill prescribes also the advertising procedure to be observed, including such matters as the period of advertisement, opening of bids, and making the award. It would provide a charter in the field of surplus property disposal comparable to the one contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 applicable to the procurement of property and services. The intent of S. 2224 is to require that the sale of surplus property shall be by advertising for competitive bids, with negotiated disposals limited to certain defined situations where sales by negotiation are necessary in the public interest.

The amendment, adopted by the committee on recommendation of the Subcommittee on Reorganization which held hearings on this bill, is designed to continue on a permanent basis the policy approved by the Senate in previous temporary extensions of the negotiating authority, requiring that, with exceptions specifically provided therein, the disposal agency shall submit written explanatory statements to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days prior to consummation of the proposed disposal.

Mr. President, the report on the bill is elaborate in terms of the details and the exemptions to which I have referred. I assume the report will be made a part of the record, by reference if not by printing.

I ask that the bill be given favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1307, S. 2283.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2283) to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is another one of the bills which would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. It would add a new section 110, which would authorize the establishment of an administrative operations fund on a permanent basis.

This bill would amend title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by adding a new section 110 which would authorize the establishment of an administrative operations fund on a permanent basis.

The bill would permit the Administrator to transfer up to 5 percent of the amount included in each annual appropriation, but not more than the amount included in the respective program appropriations, to an administrative operations fund, from which the cost of legal, financial, administrative, compliance, information, and business services would be charged. This procedure for funding the cost of services rendered by certain administrative officials against the benefiting programs will make possible some savings to the Government and will simplify the General Services Administration's internal budget and accounting systems.

The bill further provides that the accounting for obligations and expenditures chargeable to the fund shall be maintained and accounted for in accordance with the system of accounting approved by the General Accounting Office.

The passage of the bill has been recommended by the appropriate agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration.

I also note for the RECORD that the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, wrote to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. MCCLELLAN], relating to this bill and advocating its passage. The Senator from Arizona pointed out, in his letter of June 24, 1957, that:

The committee is informed that the advantages of allocating such costs according to the work performed, particularly as to personnel, have been well proved and will result in some savings in administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Senator from Arizona, as well as the letter of the Comptroller General of the United States containing recommendations, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JUNE 24, 1957.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of June 17 requests my views on the proposal in S. 2283 to add a new section to title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which would establish an administrative operations fund on a permanent basis, as requested by the Administrator of General Services.

This fund was created on a temporary basis in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1957, and amounts for administrative operations as included in each program appropriation for General Services Administration were deposited into the fund, from which all legal, financial, administrative, compliance, information and business service center services are financed. The fund has been extended in a similar manner for fiscal year 1958 in H. R. 6070.

The committee is informed that the advantages of allocating such costs according to the work performed, particularly as to personnel, have been well proven and will result in some savings in administration.

The proposal to continue the administrative operations fund on a permanent basis is therefore approved.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1957.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of June 17, 1957, acknowledged June 18, requests our views on S. 2283.

S. 2283 would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide basic legislation for the administrative operations fund of the General Services Administration. This fund was established for the fiscal year 1957 in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, Public Law 623, approved June 27, 1956 (70 Stat. 345), to permit all sums available to the General Services Administration for administrative operations to be expended and accounted for through a single fund. It also is included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1958 (H. R. 6070), as passed by both Houses of the Congress.

The existing law as well as S. 2283 provides that the costs and obligations financed under the fund shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office. On September 17, 1956, we approved the accounting system prescribed by the General Services Administration for the administrative operations fund established by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957.

The primary difference in the provisions of law establishing the 1957 fund and of S. 2283 relates to the amount which may be paid into the fund from the program appropriations. In the 1957 and 1958 appropriation acts, the amounts deposited into the fund for administrative operations for each program cannot exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes. S. 2283 provides:

"The amount paid into said fund from any appropriation made to General Services Administration in each annual appropriation act shall not exceed by more than 5 percent the amount included therein for administrative operations, nor shall the total payments from the respective program appropriations exceed the sum of the amounts included for the purpose in all such appropriations. * * *"

The above provision would authorize the General Services Administration to increase the deposits to the fund from individual program appropriations by an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated therein for administrative operations but the total of such deposits to the fund shall not exceed the total of the amounts included for administrative operations in all such program appropriations. We feel that this provision gives the General Services Administration a reasonable degree of flexibility necessary to correct any substantial variances between the amounts deposited by the individual program appropriations and the actual costs developed at a later date.

Since the administrative operation funds for the fiscal year 1957 and as proposed for the fiscal year 1958 were established in annual appropriation acts, they clearly were annual accounts. The enactment of S. 2283, however, would establish in basic law a permanent fund, but we understand that the General Services Administration does not intend to extend the period of availability of any funds transferred to the fund. We do not construe the provisions of S. 2283 as extending the period of availability of any funds made available for administrative expenses for any fiscal year.

We believe that the purposes of the fund are good and favor the enactment of S. 2283.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting, immediately after section 109 thereof, the following new section:

"ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

"SEC. 110. Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund, which is hereby authorized. The amount paid into said fund from any appropriation made to General Services Administration in each annual appropriation act shall not exceed by more than 5 percent the amount included therein for administrative operations, nor shall the total payments from the respective program appropriations exceed the sum of the amounts included for the purpose in all such appropriations. The costs and obligations financed under the fund shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 203 (C) OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT PERMITTING EXERCISE OF CERTAIN OPTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1308, S. 2231.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2231) to amend section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the exercise of options contained in certain leases of Government property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment in line 5, after the numerals "484", to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 385, 40 U. S. C. 484 (c) is hereby amended by inserting after the word "lease" the parenthetical clause "(which may include one or more options to purchase or to renew or extend the lease)."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is another one of the bills relating to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, over which the Committee on Government Operations exercises legislative jurisdiction.

The bill provides for amending section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by inserting a parenthetical clause after the word "lease" which will authorize the inclusion of one or more options to purchase or to renew or extend a lease executed by the Administrator of General Services, or by the head of any Federal agency authorized to dispose of surplus property.

The statute presently permits the Administrator or duly authorized departmental head to dispose of surplus property by sale, exchange, lease, permit or transfer for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems proper, and to execute such documents for transfer of title or other interest in property and

take such other action as is deemed necessary or proper to dispose of surplus property.

When this language was drafted it was the legislative intent that the Administrator should be authorized to sell, lease, or exchange property in the same manner as property is disposed of by private concerns and pursuant to the practice commonly followed by private business. The precise terms as to how property should be disposed of, or under what conditions such authority should be exercised, were not set forth in the act, the Administrator being given authority to prescribe such terms and conditions as he deemed proper. As a result, some leases of surplus property included options permitting the lessees to renew or extend the leases, or to purchase the leased property after a period of years, according to the terms of the contract, without any question as to the authority for the inclusion thereof. The Attorney General of the United States, however, expressed doubt as to whether the authority granted by the act to dispose of surplus property by sale, exchange, lease, permit, or transfer confers authority for use of options to purchase in leases executed thereunder.

This bill would clarify the statute and remove any doubt as to the inclusion therein of authority for the use of options to purchase, renew, or extend leases.

Mr. President, I note for the RECORD that the bill has been approved by the General Services Administration. The bill was also recommended by the Comptroller General of the United States and by the then Deputy Attorney General, the present Attorney General, William P. Rogers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2231) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. 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. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF ADMINISTRATION PRACTICES AND PROPOSALS IN THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION FIELD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Association, recently reported to the 16th annual meeting the members in Dallas, Tex. In a speech entitled "Stand Your Ground," delivered on February 3, 1958, Mr. Ellis analyzed the disastrous effects of administration practices and proposals in the rural electrification field. In clear, forthright language, Mr. Ellis challenges the President to reverse his position on many matters of vital interest. A good many in Congress, Mr. President, join in that appeal.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Ellis' report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STAND YOUR GROUND

(By Clyde T. Ellis, NRECA general manager)

Better borrow all this Texas oil money you can while you are here. It might be easier than getting Wall Street loans.

As you know, the theme selected for this meeting by your program committee, "Stand Your Ground" was taken from Capt. John Parker's famous command to the minutemen volunteers assembled at Lexington, April 19, 1775. That full command was: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon; but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

The President of the United States has within the last weeks asked Congress to enact legislation at this session which would in effect destroy REA as we have known it and which, in my opinion, would destroy the rural electrification program as well.

Nothing I say at this meeting will be remembered, but what you do here will not be forgotten. For you are here, among other things, to take a stand in the greatest crisis by far that has ever faced the rural electrification program.

YOU, THE ELECTED STATESMEN

I am only a small voice crying in the wilderness. But you are the elected statesmen of the program—over 5,000 of you from 43 States and Alaska. Nearly 1,000 voting delegates among you have been charged with, and have accepted, a responsibility to do, within the limits of the charter and bylaws, of course, what you believe should be done for the program at this meeting. You are the national association. You could save or lose the rural electrification program of the United States by the decisions you make—or fail to make—right here in Dallas during the next 4 days. That is my opinion.

I call you statesmen because I truly believe you are. It is said that one difference between a statesman and a politician is that a statesman dares to place himself in jeopardy, if necessary, for the good of everybody; whereas the politician dares to sacrifice anybody, if necessary, for his own good. I don't believe it necessary for anyone to place himself in jeopardy here. But I do think we must now face up to what is by far the gravest peril ever to confront the rural electrification program. To solve this problem is going to take the kind of courage that I know you have.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OUR PERIL

I know that, as my employer, you expect me to give you here the salient facts about the peril we face and my opinions and conclusions based upon them.

In view of the fact that apparently all segments of the administration touching the rural electrification program—except REA itself—have now joined the profit power companies in total war against the program, I am going to come right to the point. In doing so, I shall violate the rules of good speech and give you my conclusions first. Then I shall try to justify them.

Here are my conclusions:

First, the rural electrification program is in real trouble. As I have already indicated, I am convinced this is the program's most critical hour. I shall state the details of this conclusion in a few moments.

Second, the rural electrification systems themselves, and their organizations, are in part to blame for the serious jeopardy we now face. I have reached this conclusion because I believe that up to now the program as a whole has offered too little resistance to attacks and proposals designed to destroy us. For one thing, we have refused to believe all the signs.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT OUR PREDICAMENT?

Third, I am convinced we can yet do something about our predicament. To use a famous Lincoln quote, "We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility."[1]

Fourth—and please keep an open mind on this until you have heard the full story—it is my earnest conviction that you can well afford to double your dues to your national association, or treble them if necessary, in order to achieve maximum efficiency in those of your national services which are dues supported—principally legislative, public relations, organization activities and consumer-member information, including power use. This conclusion is based upon the certainty that if you don't take this action, or some other action equally effective, the alternative will cost you far more.

Fifth, it is my conviction that you can well afford to vastly increase your statewide services and activities, lest the alternative of not doing so cost you much more.

Finally, it is my conviction that most of your systems can well afford to step up your local member and public relations activities because the alternative of not doing so will cost you much more.

These are my general conclusions and now I would like to discuss with you:

The facts of the situation, and

What we can do about them.

At the start let's take a look at what Captain Parker really meant by "Stand your ground." He meant, among other things, that the hard-pressed colonists, whose markets had been gobbled up by the King's favorite monopolists, could retreat no further without losing every freedom and the dearest possessions for which they had worked so hard. He meant they must resolve to fight, if necessary, in order to be able to preserve any degree of freedom, independence and equality.

We are the spiritual great-great-grandsons of those minutemen. We too are pioneers—pioneers who, like the colonists, have come a long way, doing what couldn't be done. Let us likewise survey the situation and determine whether or not we want to stand our ground—truly the same ground on which they stood.

THE DOUBLE-CROSS ON REA—STAND AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION'S ANTI-REA BILL—THE INSURED LOANS AMENDMENT

I am going to document for you what I choose to call the REA double-cross.

In 1949 the first Hoover Commission called for a sweeping reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. The name of REA would be changed to Rural Electrification Service. The Truman administration asked Congress for authority to put the reorganization into effect. Congress declined.

In 1953 the Eisenhower administration asked Congress to pass an even more sweeping Department of Agriculture reorganization bill. Congress did, but only after Secretary Benson had solemnly promised Congress he would not reorganize REA in any way without first consulting Congress.

In 1955 the second Hoover Commission recommended to Congress that REA be abolished, and that a Rural Electrification Corporation be established instead; that Congress provide no more loan or administrative funds for either the rural electrification or the telephone program; that the Rural Electrification Corporation raise its funds

---

[1] Abraham Lincoln, second annual message to Congress.

in the private money markets and pay whatever rates of interest were necessary to get the funds, plus enough to pay all administrative costs of the new corporation.

It is significant also to remember that the Hoover Commission recommendation to Congress was much milder than what the Hoover Commission's power company-stacked Task Force on Lending Agencies had recommended to the Commission. The task force had recommended, among other things, that REA be placed under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; that the co-ops be authorized and encouraged to pool their borrowing and obtain their funds from the money market without Government guaranty, that is, without insured loans.

Remember that the second Hoover Commission recommended that we be required to obtain our loans without Government guaranty.

That was only the beginning.

SOFTENING US UP, AND BREAKING PROMISES

From 1955 to date our program—including our interest rates, our handling of reserves, and our power supply—has been subjected to a constant organized propaganda barrage through advertisements; through many front organizations such as the National Tax Equality Association, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, and the United States Chamber of Commerce; through the public press, radio and television, and through spokesmen in public office.

This has been a continuous softening-up process.

On or about June 1, 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, without consulting Congress and in violation of his solemn promise to Congress, reorganized REA by placing into effect a major recommendation of the second Hoover Commission. He placed REA under the Director of Agricultural Credit Services. While technically he didn't place REA and the other lending agencies all under a Farm Credit agency, as the Commission had recommended, he went still further and placed REA and Farm Credit under his own office; that is, under the Director of Agricultural Credit Services.

On the same date, and also in violation of his promise, Secretary Benson further reorganized REA by removing from the REA Administrator and transferring to the Director of Agricultural Credit Services the final authority to approve all loans in excess of $500,000 and the final authority to approve all loans to new borrowers, both electric and telephone.

In early 1957, the President's Bureau of the Budget sent to committees of the Congress a proposed REA reorganization bill generally in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. It would fix the interest on REA loans at the current market yield on equally long-term Government securities plus the total cost of REA administration, plus an amount sufficient to cover any probable losses. This bill was immediately introduced by Senator CAPEHART in the Senate and by Congressman HIESTAND in the House. Senate hearings were scheduled last summer to begin this month. In retrospect, this bill, too, appears to have been a part of the softening-up process.

THE AX FALLS—ON OUR NECK

On January 13, 1958, President Eisenhower said to Congress in his annual budget message (p. 47):

"Expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources have amounted to over 30 percent of the Federal expenditures for civil benefits in the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 and are estimated to take almost as large a proportion in 1958. This compares with a little over 20 percent in 1953 and 1954. In this budget, I am recommending important revisions in our price support, conservation, and rural credit programs to place them on a sounder long-term basis with less reliance on the Federal Treasury. These revisions will result in only moderate reductions in budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1959, but should result in more significant reductions in 1960 and later years."

The President also submitted to Congress a table (p. 351 of the budget) listing the loan funds to be available to the rural electrification program in fiscal 1959. I quote from that part of the table applicable to the rural electrification program: "New loan authorizations * * * $150 million.

Two things are awfully wrong with these statements of the President. In the first place it is awfully wrong and unfair, I think, to say that loans for rural electrification and rural telephones are expenditures, as he called them. He doesn't even deduct the amounts we repaid on principal in 1957 and that we will repay in 1958 and 1959. No loans should be listed as expenditures. Does a bank list its loans as expenditures?

In the second place, the President requests only $150 million for new electric REA loans for the next fiscal year. This request is far short of what will be actually needed, and this fact is well known to the Administration.

The official REA annual construction loan survey conservatively estimates that new electric loan needs will amount to $210 million for fiscal 1959. This figure is too low for two reasons: (1) It is based on a survey more than a half year old and therefore out of date, since the subsequent NRECA survey shows greater need, and (2) it assumes there will be no requests from new power-type borrowers.

NRECA's own annual survey is not complete yet, but we already know from your own system-by-system statements of your needs that they will be substantially greater than the Administration's estimates. NRECA's estimates of the need, compiled from data submitted by you a half year later than the REA survey, have nearly always exceeded the budget estimates. Yet ours have always been proved to be conservative, without exception.

In any case, the President's request for inadequate electric loan funds—we think now, only about half enough to meet our needs through next fiscal year—is designed, it seems, to do two things:

(1) provide us just enough loan funds to run us past the November election; and

(2) put pressure on us to accept the President's proposals—including a new proposal which I shall mention shortly.

The President is honorbound to administer the existing law, the REA Act—and to support it as long as it is the law—as he took the oath to do. It is awfully wrong for him, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other official to sabotage the law, as I believe is being done here. I would be just as quick to commend the President or the Secretary or any other official, for aggressively supporting the law, as indeed I did commend the President and Secretary Benson and Administrator Hamil about a year ago now for initiating a $200 million supplemental REA loan request to the Congress—in line with your earlier statement of the need.

Now let me quote you further from the President's budget message to Congress last month (p. 50):

"Approximately one-half of REA electric power now goes to rural industrial and nonfarm residential consumers, and in the future these nonfarm users will account for a larger share of the increasing demands. This situation, together with the present state of development of rural electric cooperatives, clearly indicates that it would be in the public interest to broaden the sources of capital from which the REA system may obtain the financing necessary for continued growth and adequate service to consumers. Therefore, legislation will be proposed (1) to assist both electric and telephone borrowers to obtain financing from private sources where the security is adequate and the loans can be repaid within a reasonable time, and (2) as previously mentioned in this message, to adjust interest rates on future loans for all loan programs to meet the Government's costs."

Notice how the power-company-inspired Hoover Commission flower gradually unfolds and the pattern develops. Now the President, like the second Hoover Commission, would send us out in search of private sources of capital.

I can quite see how that cutting us off from Government loans and throwing us to the same money barons who control and manipulate the Power Trust would broaden our sources of capital.

RETURN TO DARKNESS

Let me say that if rural America is cut off from REA loans, then the farmers and other rural Americans will be right back where they were before REA—with sources of capital so broad they will again be more than a little difficult to find.

Let me say a word, too, about the President's reference to the fact that approximately one-half of REA electric power now goes to rural industrial and nonfarm residential consumers and that in the future these nonfarm users will account for a larger share of the increasing demands. On this the President is correct. He could have said, too, that our consumer members' demands for power are doubling about every 5 years.

But he could also have said that REA was launched as a social and economic project, to replace darkness and despair with light and hope for all unserved rural Americans, be they farm or village, or county store or potato drier, alfalfa mill or cotton gin, or filling station or shoe factory. The record is clear on that. Area coverage was demanded of us by REA—something the power companies have never accepted in the rural areas they serve. We accepted it in good faith and consider it as sacred a covenant with our Government as we consider our Government's promises sacred to us.

Therefore, our people in the more feasible areas, the better-off areas, extended their lines on out to serve their brethren in the less feasible areas, too, as a matter of principle, as a practice of the Golden Rule. We have reached 4 million homes and rural establishments, but over a million rural Americans have not been reached yet. They wait and pray and hope—and read about Ike and Ezra and Wall Street trying to abolish REA loans. We still serve only three to the mile, average. Yet area coverage—blessing to millions—the Golden Rule concept—is to be destroyed, they say. They would even force the co-ops to cut off and stop serving those already served who are not self-supporting. The next step would be that whole co-ops, no longer self-supporting, would have to be sold to the profit companies which would then follow their ancient practice of serving only those who would return the kind of profits they require. Rural America would be headed into darkness again, just as rural America, once more than half served by rural telephones, started downhill in phone service after the early twenties—and for the same principal reasons: lack of financing and monopoly practices. God forbid.

THE PRESIDENT'S INSURED LOANS AMENDMENT

We have had the greatest difficulty finding out what the President's newest proposals really mean. We have been denied the right to know anything about them prior to their announcement. We have known that top-level and top-secret conferences were going on in Washington about them. We know these conferences have been apparently as hush-hush as Kremlin planning sessions. When we have tried to get information about them, we have been told that people attending the conferences had been placed under the strictest of secrecy orders.

Strangely enough, our best information has come from Wall Street money market experts who have been consulted by the administration.

The President's Director of the Budget wrote the Senate Banking and Currency Committee a few weeks ago that he would shortly send to Congress new proposed amendments to the Rural Electrification Act. And the President revealed to Congress in his recent budget message that, in line with the stacked Hoover Commission committee recommendation, he is ready to go one significant step further than the administration's Capehart-Hiestand bills of last year would go: he would now eliminate all future REA loans after about December 31 and turn us away from REA and into the open money market.

We know that the administration has made two decisions, designed, I believe, to hoodwink us temporarily. It has decided not to abolish REA outright—just amend the law, add a new title III and abolish the REA principle. REA would have no more funds to lend. Then the administration, with tongue in cheek, could deny that it had abolished REA.

Secondly, the Secretary of Agriculture—not the REA Administrator—would be authorized to help you broaden your loans market by approving, if and when he should see fit, insurance endorsements on notes you might make for funds you might find in the open market. But there would be a limit of $150 million on the insurance endorsements the Secretary could approve on money market loans through next fiscal year.

In other words, your loans for the first half of next fiscal year would come from REA as usual. For the last half you would have to go find them yourselves in the open market—if you could. Thereafter, all your loans would come from the open market. There would be no more REA loans. There would be no REA Administrator for lending purposes. The word "REA" Administrator is not mentioned in Ike's insured loans amendment—only the Secretary of Agriculture. The REA Administrator in effect would be abolished, and the Secretary substituted—but the Secretary would not do anything except stamp the insurance endorsements on your notes to private lenders if he should see fit. It would be the end of Hamil and the beginning of Benson.

Is this what you want?

And what is the Secretary directed to do under the insured loans amendment? Nothing. The answer is that he is only authorized, he is not directed to insure a single loan. And, if he does insure a loan which you obtain in the open market, he is required to add to your open market interest rates an additional 1 percent to pay such insurance charges as the Secretary deems proper, taking into account administrative expenses and other costs and a reserve for probable losses; provided that the amount, until such time as the Secretary determines that the fund is adequate, etc., shall be an annual charge at a rate equal to at least 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation of the loan.

Now the Secretary also would be authorized (a) to subordinate the prior liens of the United States under loans made pursuant to this act, upon his determination that (1) additional financing may be obtained from credit sources other than the Federal Government at reasonable rates and terms, (2) the security for such loans and additional financing will be reasonably adequate, and (3) the loans will be repaid within a reasonable time. This amendment would become effective July 1, 1958.

It reminds me of the typical adult western in which the local baron cuts off the water supply for the homesteaders and tells them that he has broadened their water supply, that they can now find it elsewhere, wherever they can, and that if they do find any, he will guarantee that it will be good.

Is it necessary that we consider what would happen when Government loans would be thus closed to you and your loans market would be thus broadened?

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE INSURANCE GUARANTY

The insurance guaranty does not guarantee that we can find the money.

Experience in the housing field has shown many homeowners what the insurance guaranty amounts to. They still have to find the money and their interest rates are high. (Bear in mind, too, that the larger amounts of money which the rural electrics will need cannot be found locally.)

Millions of veterans can tell you what this insurance guaranty method has cost them in money and anguish even where the amounts are small enough for local sources to handle. Veterans have seen the United States Treasury manipulate interest rates so that the "Government guaranty" has often become but a snare and a delusion.

Federal Housing insurance-guaranteed loans are now running 5½ percent plus discount charges.

This so-called insurance endorsement that the Secretary could attach to your open market mortgages if he should elect to do so is an old trick designed to give us a false sense of security.

Experience in the Farmers Home Administration also proves that the insurance guaranty does not insure nor guarantee that borrowers can find private capital for the Government to insure or guarantee. While Farmers Home has some money to lend, it encourages borrowers to use the open market instead. The would-be borrowers are encouraged to go out and find prospective lenders. If they cannot, then Farmers Home Administration may help them find lenders. Would-be Farmers Home borrowers have had great difficulty finding lenders. Often they have failed.

The Farmers Home interest rate is fixed at 4½ percent, including 1 percent for handling, plus discounts. This handling charge includes the insured loans endorsement. The procedure is that the lender holds the note with the "insured loans" endorsement stamp on it. When the private loan is made, the lender pays the money direct to the borrower but the lender then looks to Farmers Home for his payments. Notes are negotiable after 5 years.

COLD FACTS ABOUT PRIVATE FINANCING

How much would our rural electrification loans cost us under these "broadened" anti-REA proposals? No one knows, but we of your staff have been studying them since they were first announced by the Hoover Commission several years ago. And we have talked with every known type of authority, including bankers, brokers, commission houses, Government specialists—even Wall Street sources, including known financiers of the power companies.

These sources tell us that without the Government insurance we can't get the money at all in the open market. To start with, we are "co-ops"—a bad name among monopolists.

Next, we are regarded in the money market as enemies of its principal pet, the cost-plus Power Trust.

Next, we require a disproportionately large amount of capital investment.

Next, we require 100 percent construction loans; i. e., we are 100 percent debt-financed.

Next, we operate in marginal territory.

Next, our territory being in jeopardy by the power company piracy and sellout campaigns, our distribution co-ops have no assured market.

Next, our distribution co-ops have no assured source of supply.

Next, our generation and transmission co-ops have no assured market.

Next, most of our distribution co-op mortgage notes would be too small for favorable market acceptance. Top brokers tell us they lose money on issues of less than $2 million.

Next, the Government never set us up to be able to walk alone at this stage. It required us to pay off our capital loans, something the power companies never do.

And finally, 66 percent of the rural electric systems have less than 20-percent equity, and 91 percent have less than 40-percent equity. Over the Nation as a whole, the average equity per system runs only about 13.5 percent. By comparison, power companies on the average have an equity of several times that amount, plus a public-service monopoly status.

If you will forgive the language, one of the experts we consulted told us, "We think that without the kind of REA loans you are getting now, you would be in a hell of a fix."

I think so, too.

In their more polite words, they don't regard us as good risks; this they say despite our fine repayment record maintained under a thus-far-friendly REA.

And the experts tell us, too, that so-called Government insurance is usually limited or conditional, or otherwise less than ironclad. Suppose the loans should go bad and Congress should not fully back them up with appropriations? Many things could happen, they point out. If you had money to lend, at what rate of interest would you be willing to tie it up in a rural electric co-op for 35 years?

In view of all this, I would say that I believe any unbiased person who studies the matter thoroughly will agree that we probably could not get loan funds under the administration's new proposals at less than 5 percent plus the 1-percent service charge, in the long run, under present conditions.

Let us assume the new rate to be 6 percent—i. e., 5 percent plus at least 1 percent for Mr. Benson for insurance and servicing. What would this mean to you? It would mean that your new loans would cost you $40,000 a year more per $1 million of loan than at the present rate. It would mean that your present requirements of about $300 million of new loans per year—and your needs are increasing—would cost you $12 million more per year in interest on each new year of loans—and these yearly increases would be cumulative. It would mean that, countrywide, the 1956 net margins of all the rural electric systems in the aggregate would have been reduced, assuming 1956 levels of operating revenue and expenses, from $69 million to $18 million less than zero. In other words, the rural electric systems of the United States in the aggregate would have operated $18 million in the red in 1956 under the Eisenhower-Benson anti-REA loans bill. These figures are based on several assumptions of course. They are not meant to be exact, but are used only to indicate the approximate magnitude of the administration's proposed new catastrophe.

THE BROADER ECONOMIC ASPECTS

I think the administration ought to give a little thought to what the rural electrification program would cost the Government if it forces us to default on our loans. And what would it cost the billion-dollar appliance and equipment market we have created? How much income tax and other taxes would be lost from them? What would it cost the American worker who produces all this? How much more income tax and other taxes would be lost from these laborers?

And why is it clearly in the public interest to thus further impoverish the farmers and slow down the development of rural America? And how much more taxes and other taxes would be lost from these farmers and other rural people? And who would

make up these taxes and the extra taxes required for more unemployment and more old-age pensions?

There are many reasons to question the sincerity of the arguments being used against us. They say our interest rates are subsidized.

Rural electrification, like many other American enterprises, was launched as a program in the public interest. Industry generally, for instance, was given tariff subsidies—and still has them. Railroads were given land and capital. Banks have their free Federal deposits. The profit power companies have received their $5 billion in interest-free loan benefits under the accelerated depreciation program since the beginning of the Korean war—and it will get many more billions yet. Current Federal grants to municipalities to improve their sewer facilities is another example. Almost no segment of the economy is without subsidy today.

And then there are the 2-percent loans to foreign governments, such as the recently renegotiated $3.8 billion 50-year loan to Great Britain and the gifts to foreign governments for rural development and even for rural electrification, at no interest and at no principal return.

Remember that old gift to Egypt—a 1953 gift released to Mr. Nasser a few weeks ago? Well, I just happened to get hold of this little green pamphlet put out by Mr. Nasser, and I want to read you one paragraph from it—what he said in 1955 they would use this United States money for:

"The importance of electricity in raising the standard of living in rural communities has not been overlooked. Village streets and public buildings will be lighted with electricity. Such service can be extended to the settlers' homes if they wish it, and they may use the cooperative societies to help them obtain it."[2]

That is fine. It is good that we can thus help the rural people of Egypt to get electricity, even at no return of principal or interest to the United States of America. But it makes us wonder what is wrong with continuing the REA program for our own farm people, thousands of whom are going broke every month now, losing their homes, often losing all they have. Has our Government come to the point of helping to unelectrify rural America while helping to electrify rural Egypt and the rural areas of other countries? Will we now have Government support of rural electrification for export only?

And then what about that $48 million surplus which the Government has accrued on its loans to us as reported to Congress last month by REA Administrator Hamil? As you know, the interest rate charged us for many years was more than the cost of money to the Government.

Furthermore, are we to assume that those responsible for trying to push the high interest rates upon us believe that the present jacked-up high-interest-rate tight-money market is going to continue at the present level? I don't believe it will, and I don't believe they believe it will. The Government has recently taken three major steps to loosen it up—and it is loosening some.

And let us not forget that the Hoover Commission recommended that the loan funds we might get from the money market not be guaranteed or insured. When we are further softened by the current blow, the next step would be to withdraw the insurance guaranty.

The average cost of money to the Government could conceivably return to 2 percent or below. It is now under 3 percent. If it does return to 2 percent or below, it might pull our money-market interest costs under the administration proposal down from around 6 percent to around 5 percent.

An interesting development in connection with the administration's last proposal is a move to create another commission to study the REA program. Bills to provide for it have been introduced within the last few days. The creation of such a commission might or might not delay the administration's open-market drive while the pot boils.

CAMPAIGN PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Where is the Dwight D. Eisenhower who during the campaigns of 1952, 1954, and 1956 so vigorously assured the American people of his full support of the existing rural electrification program? We need him very badly right now.

Here are typical examples of what Ike promised us as a candidate:

On October 4, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower told the voters at Brookings, S. Dak., "I have made clear the Republican support of the rural electrification programs * * *" and on the 28th of that same month he told the voters of the whole country over radio and television networks, "We will support * * * REA programs, and all that sort of thing."

During the Congressional campaigns of 1954, on September 28, President Eisenhower released to the press a letter which he had written REA Administrator Ancher Nelsen in which he said:

"I understand that some people are busily circulating statements to the effect that this administration is opposed to rural electrification programs and that these programs are to be drastically curtailed in the coming fiscal year. I am sure you recognize as I do that this is part of a general fear psychology now being adroitly generated in many fields by people who evidently have ends to serve that they consider more important than the truth. I am convinced that our rural population will not be misled by such reckless and irresponsible statements * * *.

"It is our determination that these programs shall fully accomplish their purposes. We shall continue to give them our wholehearted support."

But the "fear psychology" persisted, particularly with reference to the Hoover Commission recommendations. REA made an exhaustive study of their effect if adopted and on May 20, 1955, REA Administrator Nelsen wrote a letter to a Congressman which was given nationwide publicity in which he said:

"We believe that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations were to be adopted REA would be unable to accomplish the objectives in rural electrification and rural telephony which have been established by the Congress. The Commission's recommendations would result in termination of the rural telephone loans program, with less than half of the Nation's farms having telephones and slight prospect for alleviating the situation. Further progress in rural electrification through REA loans—connection of unserved farms and system improvements to serve expanding loads—would be drastically curtailed under the Commission's recommendations. Borrowers in both programs would be unable to meet the loan requirements. Details of our analysis of the Commission's recommendations and statements of our viewpoint on each of them are enclosed in this letter."[3]

The REA Administrator also announced that he had cleared his statement at the White House and that it represented the administration's policy as against that of the Hoover Commission.

In the presidential campaign of 1956, Candidate Eisenhower again accepted and ran on his party's platform. I quote from that platform:

"The Republican Party is pledged * * * to expand rural electrification through REA loans for generation and transmission, and to expand rural communication facilities."

And, in the 1956 campaign he said in a speech at Peoria, Ill. (September 25): "We will continue to strengthen such long-established indispensable programs as rural electrification and rural telephone service."

Notice, too, that he always talked about the "programs." If he was pledging himself to support the "programs," he was pledging himself to support them substantially as they were then and as they are still.

And then as late as our national meeting in Chicago last March 4–7, President Eisenhower sent us this fine message by telegram:

"With the support of dedicated men and women, your cooperatives have grown into dynamic institutions for the advancement of the social and economic life of our rural communities. In order to maintain progress, I now urge you to hold fast to the principles of local ownership, local membership control, and independent thinking. In this way, I am confident your program will continue as an excellent example of people and government working together for the common good.

"This administration gives wholehearted support to the rural electric and telephone programs. They are essential to the Nation's well-being and to our expanding economy. Best wishes to you all. Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Note that again the President talked of our rural electrification and telephone programs as they were then and are now. It just seems inconceivable, unbelievable, that this same Mr. Eisenhower, twice elected on promises to support the rural electrification and telephone programs, and committed again as late as a year ago in his telegram to us, could now be asking Congress to stop all REA loans. It is a mystery beyond my comprehension. I don't mean to be personal, for I respect the office of President, but facts are facts and I submit that on the record they constitute a clear double-cross of the American farmers and of rural America.

What can be so suddenly wrong with REA? What is wrong with this noble REA principle—the principle of democratic government helping people to help themselves? Has it worked too well? The President doesn't even tell us what the defendant, so good a year ago, is charged with—only that the REA loans must now stop.

I hope no one thinks I am being unfair to the President in these statements. Short of giving you the whole truth I cannot do my duty as I see it, and this a vital part of the truth.

The program committee invited President Eisenhower to come and speak to you here. The committee thought it might help a lot if he would come here and see you and get a better idea of what you are doing, and see the exhibits and get a better idea of what the program means to the whole economy.

I wrote every Republican Member of both Houses of the Congress and asked them to urge him to come. Many of them have told me they did. Others have said they hesitated to on account of his health. Anyway, he declined. But I see in the papers that he flew to Chicago week before last, attended a political rally, and made a fund-raising speech to help his party get votes. The program committee and I were simply trying to help persuade him to do something that might cause him to do something else that might have meant a lot more votes than that.

Which reminds me that several members of his party in the Congress have told me privately and several have stated publicly that they are not going along with the President on his move against REA.

[2] Land Reclamation and Resettlement—the Egyptian-American Rural Improvement Service, March 1955.

[3] Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, in a letter of May 20, 1955, to Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS, Member of Congress.

CONSEQUENCES OF ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

Passage of the administration's anti-REA loans bill would be an open invitation to Wall Street to turn loose their cost-plus power monopolies against us—to accelerate their pirating campaigns and to openly invade us as they did Stevens County and Shoshone and Tombigbee rural electrics in the last few years. It would be more of an invitation, I'm afraid, for Wall Street to start raiding than to start lending us. Indeed, over 100 of the power companies based their unsuccessful court attack on our "Willie Wiredhand" symbol in part upon the fact that they regard our territory as open range.[4]

Money-market experts are telling us that if we are forced into the market our financing will be much less difficult as public power districts rather than as co-ops. Then, they point out, we would be units of Government; we would have better protection from invasion; we would have the right of eminent domain, the right of condemnation even over power company properties; we could pledge not only revenues but taxes as well, if necessary, as security. Furthermore, the investors' income from our bonds would then be tax exempt.

Generally, we want the co-ops to remain as they are, I believe, but there has been some trend toward public power districts already—notably in Nebraska and the Northwest. Power district bills have been introduced in the legislatures of other States. Some of our members are public power and public utility districts.

Interest on the latest public power district open market financing is running around 5 percent—even without a 1 percent charge by the Secretary of Agriculture. Usually the power districts borrow from REA—for rural electrification—but Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, Wash., was borrowing $250 million to build a giant dam on the Columbia River. It sold its bonds at 5 percent.

I would say that if the Wall Street monopolists and the administration really want public power in America they seem to be on the right track with this Hoover Commission proposal to kill REA loans and throw us to the mercy of the same money market barons who control the profit power companies.

The American people have never liked total monopoly, Congress and the State legislatures have oft declared it un-American, and we never will tolerate it as long as we are a free people, for it is inimical to democracy. There will always be a way around it. We know.

THE TIME IS AT HAND—STAND FOR ADEQUATE LOAN FUNDS UNDER THE EXISTING ACT

The administration's request to Congress for only the first half of our next fiscal year's requirements to come from REA loans under the existing law and for all our loans thereafter to come from Wall Street, must be answered by you at this meeting in the strongest possible language, in my opinion, or the REA Act in effect will be dead. It is no secret that some of our best friends in the Congress are saying that if Ike's bill ever gets to the floors of the two Houses, with all the power of the financial world, and of all the monopolies it controls behind it, the bill will pass.

The best answer would be your decision here not only to fight for the full amount you will need through next fiscal year, based on the need your own survey shows, but also to stand your ground and fight for it all as loans under the present REA Act, as you have done so successfully in the past.

We compiled statistics (table I, below) from official records showing that since 1949, in every year but one, Congress has authorized more loan funds than the administration requested, and that in that year it authorized the same amount.

Note that Congress usually authorized more nearly what NRECA requested than what the administration requested.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of requests for rural electric loan funds by NRECA and the administration's, and amounts authorized by Congress, fiscal 1949 to 1959*

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	NRECA request	Administration budget request	Total authorized by Congress
1949	430.0	300.0	400
1950	450.0	350.0	500
1951	400.0	400.0	[1] 500
1952	220.0	100.0	175
1953	100.0	100.0	100
1954	294.0	155.0	180
1955	211.0	90.0	170
1956	[2] 169.5	195.0	260
1957	214.0	170.3	414
1958	[3] 179.0	179.0	179
1959	(?)	[4] 150.0	(?)

[1] Does not reflect sec. 1214 reduction of $85.5 million.
[2] NRECA requested $169.5 million plus $250 million to $300 million contingency if the State allocation formula in the REA Act were not repealed. It was.
[3] NRECA requested $179 million provided Congress authorized an additional $200 million for current fiscal 1957. This supplemental was granted.
[4] Does not include insurance endorsements on money market loans.

Source: Compiled from official Congressional hearings and public laws.

This shows the fine attitude of Congress toward the REA loans program, whether Republican controlled or Democratic controlled.

Congressional committee members have often complimented your NRECA's officers, legislative committee and staff for their honest, able, and conservative presentations before them. I am sure they will hear us with the same confidence again and again, as long as the REA Act remains as it is.

Incidentally, if the committees of Congress think well enough of your national association to hear us out on matters affecting the program, would you not think the administration too would hear us—would want our counsel and advice—before proposing anything so drastic against us? But it has not done so. It refused to even tell us what it was about to do to us.

The administration placed Mr. Adolph Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., right in the Bureau of the Budget to help put over the Dixon-Yates deal on TVA—the famous conflict of interest case—for his company was to help finance the deal. But the administration tries the rural electrification program in secret, convicts it in absentia, and then ambushes it.

Standing our ground on this issue calls for action—and better preparedness for action than we have yet mustered.

TRUTH WILL—MUST—TRIUMPH—STAND AGAINST THE BIG LIE PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

Let me turn now to a more encouraging development. A recent Federal court judgment has held that certain railroads and an advertising firm had conspired to use what the court specifically called the "technique of the big lie" designed to destroy the good will of the trucking industry, force truck transportation costs up to the public and thus destroy the long-haul trucking business.[5]

The facts in the Truckers case and those of the power company campaigns against us closely parallel each other. NRECA has been requested to consider joining with the American Public Power Association in a damage suit against the profit power companies, charging them with conspiracy under the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws—conspiracy to use the "technique of the big lie" to destroy the good will of, so as to kill off, the consumer-owned electric cooperatives, power districts and municipal electric systems.

The National Milk Producers Federation (an association of the farmers' milk co-ops), prompted by the Truckers case decision, has already filed a similar action against the National Tax Equality Association.[6]

And, since the profit power companies have been among the largest contributors to NTEA, the milk producers have asked NRECA to join them in that suit.

It is my opinion that we cannot continue to stand our ground in a worsening climate of opinion, bought and paid for with millions of dollars extracted by the cost-plus power companies from the ratepayers—including us—unless sooner or later we take some sort of bold action designed to end the vicious propaganda attacks upon us.

However, it is doubtful whether or not—on top of all else we must do—we could join in such a suit at this time to protect our rights. It does seem a shame that we evidently don't have the resources to protect ourselves under the law.

In some other areas of government, too, I am happy to note that, as a result of your efforts, both directly and through NRECA, some public officials are taking a little note of how these propaganda campaigns are being financed. Even the propower company Federal Power Commission, under prodding from a Congressional committee, and the Internal Revenue Service, and some State commissions, have been obliged to register some objection to the power company methods of handling their expenditures for the slick magazine propaganda ads and their political activities.

The Federal Power Commission has directed that two political-propaganda type publications put out by two power companies not be charged as expense to the ratepayers. The Internal Revenue Service has prohibited a power company from deducting a number of ads from its income as a legitimate public service company business expense. The Wisconsin State Commission held flatly a few weeks ago that power company expenditures for these purposes cannot be charged to the ratepayers.

Bills were introduced in the Congress last month designed to force the Federal Power Commission and the Internal Revenue Service to do their duty and enforce already existing laws prohibiting all such practices at the ratepayers' expense.

The Congressmen are correct. Token objection to such practices is not enough. Either there must be stronger laws and better enforcement of them or the electric energy monopoly—the privately owned cost-plus Power Trust—will soon control the Government itself—more than it does already.

STAND FOR THE FEDERAL WHOLESALE POWER PROJECTS

Over 400 of our approximately 900 operating rural electric systems depend on the Federal multipurpose river projects for all or part of their wholesale power supply. But many of them are having to purchase an increasingly high percentage of their

[4] *Reddy Kilowatt, Inc.* v. *National Rural Electric Cooperative Assn., et al;* District Court 142, Federal Supplement, 851–June 15, 1956; Court of Appeals, 4th Circuit, 240, Federal Supplement, 282–January 7, 1957.

[5] Opinion, *Noer Motor Freight, Inc. et al.,* v. *Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, et al.,* U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

[6] *National Milk Producers Federation, et al.* v. *National Tax Equality Association, et al.,* U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

supply from other sources. This is due to the simple fact that construction of Federal wholesale power projects has been practically stopped except for completion of those begun in prior years.

We have prepared figures (table II) showing that annual investments in these Federal projects have fallen from about $681 million in fiscal 1952 to about $341 million in fiscal 1958.

TABLE II.—*Federal investment for power and related development,[1] fiscal 1952–59*

[In millions]

Type	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 estimate	1959 estimate
Multipurpose dams and reservoirs with hydroelectric power facilities:								
TVA	$32.2	$22.8	$8.1	$6.0	$2.0			
Bureau of Reclamation	75.4	70.5	54.1	33.1	24.5	$36.8	$59.8	$84.8
Corps of Engineers	287.0	332.9	271.1	241.1	177.1	170.0	133.5	145.8
International Boundary and Water Commission	8.0	13.8	5.9	1.4	.8	.1	1.3	
Total, multipurpose facilities	402.6	440.0	339.2	281.6	204.4	206.9	194.6	230.6
Steam-electric powerplants, TVA	147.7	152.2	238.4	181.6	44.3	49.2	90.3	115.8
Power transmission facilities:								
TVA	42.1	33.5	47.5	27.9	14.5	24.8	24.0	32.8
Bureau of Reclamation	34.4	28.0	25.0	16.1	14.7	6.9	7.8	10.3
Bonneville Power Administration	50.8	53.4	41.7	33.3	27.7	27.2	24.3	22.0
Southeastern Power Administration	.1	.4	[2]		[2]			
Southwestern Power Administration	3.2	2.9	2.8	.6	.2	.4	.9	.6
Total, power-transmission facilities	130.6	118.2	117.0	77.9	57.1	59.3	57.0	65.7
Total	680.9	710.4	694.6	541.1	305.8	315.4	341.9	412.1

[1] Nonconstruction costs excluded.
[2] Less than $50,000.

Source: The Budget of the U. S. Government for Fiscal Years 1954–59.

We have also prepared a chart showing the extent of this stoppage (chart I, not printed). It shows that the amount being invested annually in these programs is now down to about 50 percent of what it was in 1952.

Now the President asks for total stoppage of new projects—no new projects in 1959, he says in his budget message. It's the old story: Monopoly, operating through Government, uses every emergency—even this sputnik emergency—to kill off or slow down whatever it doesn't like.

There is a completely new campaign on now to convince the people that there is no relation whatever between the Federal wholesale power projects and rural electrification. This campaign is being pushed even in the very States where many of the co-ops and power districts have no other source of supply, as in South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, and Arizona. How stupid do they think the people are anyway?

CURIOUS CONTRASTS

Yes, the administration proposes that the rural electric co-ops do their own financing, but in the same breath they oppose workable legislation to enable TVA to do its own financing. We have taken an opposite view on both issues. The differences are that the administration knows TVA could do its own financing, and we cannot.

The administration is now in the process of changing the cost allocations in the dams and charging the bulk of the cost to power in order to raise the wholesale rates to us, while at the same time opposing legislation to establish an equitable formula and including a charge for recreation benefits.

The administration tells the rural electrics to go out and get our own financing, including that needed to generate our own power where necessary, and in the same breath it raises its Southwestern Power Administration wholesale rates to us 27 percent—and doesn't raise them any to an aluminum company and to the power companies of the SPA area.

(You know, I sometimes wish we had the money and could make campaign contributions, ourselves.)

And the administration tells us to go to Wall Street money market for help, while it gives away to the Wall Street controlled Power Trust the best remaining sources of low-cost power in America—including Hells Canyon.

The President vetoes the omnibus flood-control bill containing many self-supporting, wealth-creating multipurpose projects, which our people worked for very hard, while at the same time he encourages FPC to give the best remaining low-cost hydroelectric sites to our enemies.

Our country's conservation program through Federal multipurpose development is on the way out—unless it just happens that those responsible for stopping it are on the way out.

The administration also brings White House pressure to keep Congress from passing a decent atomic energy development bill, while it helps turn the atomic program over to giant power company combines and while it delays years on end letting our three co-ops in Alaska, Michigan, and Minnesota get started with their atomic reactors. The administration stagnates the program generally while the Russians and the British and probably others surge ahead of the United States in this area, we believe.

ACTIVE DUTY FOR MINUTEMEN

Up to this point, I have talked mainly of our problems in terms of the drive being put on by our enemies to crush us in a pincer's movement between lack of finances and lack of power supply. But the issue is far broader, involving a pincer's movement against the entire American people—a pincer's movement designed to catch their vital power supply in a vice of a gigantic private-power monopoly.

As that great humanitarian, conservationist, and friend of the people, Gov. Gifford Pinchot, prophetically pointed out in 1925:

"It is almost impossible to imagine the force and intimacy with which such a monopoly (the private-power monopoly) will touch and affect for good or evil, the life of every citizen * * *. Nothing like this gigantic monopoly has ever appeared in the history of the world. Nothing has ever been imagined before that even remotely approaches it in the thoroughgoing intimate, unceasing control it may exercise over the daily life of every human being within the web of its wires. It is immeasurably the greatest industrial fact of our times. If not controlled, it will be a plague without previous example. If effectively controlled in the public interest it can be made incomparably the greatest material blessing in human history."[7]

You, the regular militia of our program, and the Rural Electric Minutemen of America, have a duty to perform—a duty which naturally includes but also transcends the preservation of your own rural electric cooperatives and power districts as we know them. For it is you—and you alone—who stand in the front ranks of the battle—and it is you alone who will determine whether or not the electric power industry can be effectively controlled in the public interest and made to provide for us the greatest material blessing in human history.

TELL YOU WHAT I THINK

Well now, I'm going to tell you what I think can yet be done—this year. I think the American people are beginning to wake up—a little—particularly in the areas most affected by these retrogressions. I think that if we will double our own efforts—and I think we must in order to hold our own—then, this year—

1. Congress will authorize adequate loan funds for us under the present REA Act;

2. Congress will keep REA as is and will not force us into the money market for funds we can't get or at rates we can't afford to pay—not this year;

3. Congress will begin consideration of legislation designed to end the big-lie technique conspiracies of public-service-for-profit monopolies.

4. Congress will pass a workable TVA financing bill;

5. Congress will pass an equitable cost-allocation bill for the multiple-purpose projects;

6. Congress will pass the Federal Hells Canyon bill—if we double our efforts, I say;

7. Congress will pass the omnibus multipurpose projects bill; and

8. Congress might even decide it's about time to force through a real atomic energy program. It might even prevail upon AEC to let our three co-ops go ahead with their long-planned reactors—that is, if AEC Chairman Strauss can be persuaded that Congress is about as big as he is.

THE FIGHT IS ON

Whether we like it or not—and we don't—the fight is on. The battlelines are drawn. The first shot has been fired. Pearl Harbor, yea, even our mainland has been attacked. What are we going to do about it?

The enemy has legions of forces; they have reams and reams of propaganda rolling off the presses in the slick magazines. They have an army of lobbyists calling on your Congressmen right now. They have their war chests filled to overflowing. They can call on the power monopolists for new recruits to fill the battle ranks and any amount of money to supply them with rockets and missiles to back up their attack upon us. How can we meet such an attack? All of us agree, I am sure, that the way to meet an attack is with an attack of our own.

Some may say the odds are too great, that our chances are hopeless against these rich and greedy cost-plus octopuses aided and abetted by the administration in Washington. But what chances did the minutemen, the embattled farmers of yesteryear, have? How could our pioneer forefathers, without unified leadership, without arms, without supplies, hope to be victorious against a mother country known for her military prowess?

[7] Report of the Giant Power Survey Board to the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, p. xi.

Yes, their prospect of victory was only a hope. But their cause was just—they had determination, and they had God and right on their side—and this proved to be an unbeatable combination.

You stand, today, embattled farmers like our forefathers. Again our cause is right. God is on our side—the people's side. What, then, must we do to win? The answer is, Do what our forefathers did—throw ourselves and our resources into this fight. Nothing short of this will win.

The national, the regional, the State associations, the minutemen, the individual cooperatives, and their consumer members will have to mobilize immediately for all-out war. This will take personal sacrifices and a lot of time and money.

By your policies you have directed us in your national office to assume leadership in this fight, but to do it effectively we must have your full support. Not only will we need you to come to Washington to join ranks with us in our battle on Capitol Hill, but we will need more funds to wage this all-out battle. Our enemies are doubling their efforts—we must more than double ours. You can afford to do this because you can't afford not to do it.

To accomplish what we must, I believe you will agree, your dues to the national must be increased. In terms of what your dues will buy, you have barely increased your dues support in recent years. There was some increase when the dues formula was adjusted at Atlantic City. There was some loss when it was adjusted at St. Louis. Old Man Inflation has just about eaten up the small net increase from these dues adjustments, so we are back where we were several years ago. We can't go forward and wage the fight you demand of us without more help from you.

Many times you have heard me say we run a good shop in your national office. We do—considering the nature and amount of work we do and the funds we have to do it with—but 1957 was not our best year. There is a point below which any service will begin to break down if inadequately financed. We operated below that point throughout 1957.

By the skin of our teeth we operated within our very tight and inadequate budget during calendar 1957. Still we operated in the red—for the first time in our history—for the 1957 budget included $34,000 of surplus from 1956. We operated at about $10,000 under the budget ceiling, but we had an operating deficit—i. e., income less expenditures—of about $24,000. Meanwhile, the pressures mount every month.

And right here, I want to pay the highest tribute of which my vocabulary is capable to the NRECA board of directors, its executive committee, its regular and special office study committees, its other board committees, and its officers for their able, conscientious and devoted service in your behalf. I believe they truly represent you—that they are statesmen second to none in our great country. I only wish you could know, as I know, how much time, effort and concern they have devoted to trying to solve your budget problems. They have been a great help to us of the staff on this and all other problems we face. They have demanded, and I believe they have obtained, many dollars worth of services for every dollar of cost. But even they cannot perform miracles.

Your national's services are in great need of some of the best talent that you can develop—and some of that talent would like to come into your Washington office right now—but we can't get them at the salaries NRECA can pay out of its present income. Several of your top people to whom we have offered jobs have turned us down. I do not mean to imply that we do not have able and dedicated people on the staff. We do, but we need more if we are to help you succeed in standing the redcoats off.

NRECA HAS ONLY SECONDARY INCOME

NRECA, for general purposes, has no primary income. It has only secondary income—dues income.

The exception to this is the services which are wholly or partially self-supporting. Much of our income is from charges for such services. But this income cannot help the general situation because any surplus they have left must go into a reserve for the specific service or be returned to the systems. For instance, we returned over $57,000 in safety funds to the statewide associations last year, based on their participation in the Employers Mutuals insurance programs. But our retirement and insurance services, our management institutes, and the other self-supporting services cannot be required to help our woefully restricted legislative and public relations services.

Nearly half of your association's income now is from self-supporting services. About one-third of the employees are supported by payments for specific services. The board and staff have done the best we could to put just as much as possible of our services on a fee basis. But, although our legislative work may be many times self-supporting—I think it is—still there is no way to measure it or to charge for it. The same is true of our public relations, of meetings and of other services.

WE STRETCH YOUR DUES DIMES

Let me summarize some of the lengths we go to in your national office to stretch your dues dimes just as far as possible.

We pay smaller salaries than we should to attract and hold the talent we need.

We do without equipment we need.

We do without personnel we need—administrative personnel, public relations personnel, legislative personnel, research personnel, clerical and other.

Some of us work constantly under pressure and far longer hours than can be good for the program, or for us personally.

We constantly decline invitations to speak before your State and local meetings—and before other organizations where we could tell the rural electrification story.

We have to refrain from complying with requests for other national services which we know would help you and maybe save you money—just because we know we don't have the time or budget to help you with them.

Members of Congress and Congressional committees constantly call on us for services we cannot render.

We have been able to spend very little time telling our story to other groups and to the general public.

All of this is not good.

Let me ask you something as man to man. Do you think the program in the aggregate could afford to invest as much dues annually in its national's services as it does to send its delegates to this national meeting? You figure it up. There are more than 5,000 of you here.

I am just not as good a salesman as the boy in the grocery store. His dad said to him one Saturday, "Son, I'm afraid I have bought too many dressed chickens. (This was before the day of the store freezers.) If you will sell every chicken in that barrel by closing time I'll give you a nice bonus." The boy really dug in and long before closing time he had sold all but one—a little undersized one. No one wanted it. Finally it occurred to the boy he could cut the price, make up the difference himself and still be ahead. Just before closing time a little old lady came in and asked for a chicken. He proudly held it up. She asked, "How much?"

"Only 50 cents," he replied.

"No," she said, "it's too small."

But the boy was not about to lose that bonus. He quickly put the chicken back in the barrel, stirred it around a few times and came up with it again. "How about this one?" he asked.

"How much is it?"

"Ninety cents."

"O. K.," she said, "I'll take 'em both."

When Emerson wrote that, "Here once the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world," he wasn't writing just of them. He was writing of all those other pioneers who dared to fight and stick it out; of Travis and his men at the Alamo; of the widowed mother on the western plains before statehood; of the little old man—I can see him yet—I mentioned him at Miami—he's gone now—carrying the petition afoot, down the muddy road getting signers for electric lights; of you who will do your duty here as you see it, as you have done it a hundred times before and will do it again; of our new Minutemen, who, under your leadership, will help recapture some of the spirit of Lexington—for they, too, and you and I will do what we must to stand our ground. Of that I am confident, for we have been fired upon.

OBSERVANCE OF FINNISH KALEWALA DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to mark today an anniversary dear to the people of Finland. We in America like to think the Finns who left their home country to come to the United States found here their Kalewala, a land of happiness and abundance.

In observing Kalewala day, we can reflect with pride on the contributions our great Nation has received from the sturdy, independent people of Finland. I am pleased that so many Finns were attracted to the State of Minnesota. We must encourage more to come to the United States by enlarging the immigration quota for Finland. The quota is now much too small.

All over the world there was mourning last year at the death of the great Finnish composer, Jan Sibelius. His music speaks an international language.

I think all Americans, no matter what their background, can join with us today in celebrating this traditional holiday of the people of Finland.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

PREPARATIONS FOR SUMMIT CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times, commenting on the significance of the latest Soviet note on preparations for a summit conference. This note indicates that the Soviet Union has at least partially reversed its previous rigid position. The new Soviet attitude goes far toward fulfilling a prediction I made here in the Senate just a month ago. At that time I said:

Make no mistake about it, Mr. President, the Soviet Union will come back to the conference table for disarmament discussions.

I also added that—

We must be prepared for that day and that hour.

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

CONCESSION FROM MOSCOW

As Moscow undoubtedly expected and hoped, the latest Soviet note with regard to preparations for a possible summit conference has been well received in much of the Western World. Though this note has not yet been made public, what is known of its contents appears to suggest that it departs somewhat from the rather rigid attitude shown in Premier Bulganin's last letter to President Eisenhower and in Mr. Khrushchev's Minsk pronouncement on foreign policy. In particular, Moscow seems partially to have reversed itself and agreed to a meeting of foreign ministers. This meeting would be limited, however, to procedural problems, such as the questions of the attendance and agenda at a summit meeting.

First reactions from Washington, Paris, and London suggested that many officials in the Western World believe the new Soviet attitude with regard to the foreign ministers' conference is a step forward toward a summit meeting. It is one of the advantages of normal Soviet rigidity that any move which seems to represent a Moscow concession tends to be given a value greater than it properly deserves, especially by officials who have wearied themselves previously by pitting their efforts against an unyielding Soviet line. This is not to say that the Soviet move now is not to be welcomed, at least cautiously, but rather that the degree of welcome given it should be judged on the basis of the real rather than apparent importance of the Soviet concession. The United States, it may be recalled, had earlier sought to meet Soviet wishes by dropping its insistence upon a foriegn ministers' meeting as a prerequisite for a summit conference.

With this in mind, it must be noted that the Soviet agreement to a foreign minister's meeting, so far as is now known, goes only a small part of the way toward meeting the basic United States conception of the preparatory work required before a summit meeting. Our conception has been that a summit meeting is justified only if there is good reason to suppose beforehand that it is likely to result in agreements which will reduce world tension. Such expectation of summit agreements, we have believed, can come only from preliminary diplomatic negotiation on substantive questions, negotiations which could be carried out through normal ambassadorial channels or at a foreign ministers' meeting. It is this agreement for discussion on substantive, rather than procedural, issues at a foreign ministers' meeting that is missing in what is known so far about the extent of Moscow's latest concession.

In the present situation it may be useful to note why the United States insists upon preliminary negotiations which can reveal whether there is hope for agreement at a summit conference. A determining reason is that at a summit conference the Western negotiators suffer from somewhat the same disadvantage vis-a-vis the Soviet representatives as would poker players who have to place their cards face up while their opponents kept their cards hidden. Western negotiators at a summit meeting would have to operate under the pressure of informed public opinion, much of which—particularly in Western Europe—would regard the very fact of such a meeting as virtually assuring progress toward peace and would be greatly disappointed if no agreements were reached. Soviet negotiators, on the other hand, control their public opinion through the Communist Party's monopoly over all that is printed or broadcast in their country.

The Soviet rulers realize the West's disadvantage in this respect. That realization is why they have been trying to get the West's leaders to sit down with them, without any preliminary commitments on substantive issues. But that same realization is what makes us, or should make us, so cautious about knowing beforehand what attitudes we are likely to encounter if President Eisenhower sits down with Mr. Khrushchev.

That we are interested in holding a summit meeting that will produce important agreements aiding the cause of world peace has always been clear and should even be clearer now. But we are not interested in summit meetings that would merely be forums for Communist propaganda. The experience of Geneva in 1955 taught us much about the disappointments that can come from unduly high hopes and inadequate preparation before a summit meeting. The Soviet Union, if it really wishes to contribute to world peace, should make plain more clearly than it has yet done that it is willing to reach substantive agreements on the key issues of our time. For this more than a procedural conference of the foreign ministers is required.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my feeling that the Soviet is taking well-measured, carefully predetermined steps, with a sensitivity as to the propaganda value of those steps, to return to the conference table on the subject of disarmament negotiations. I am only hopeful that our country will realize that these developments have worldwide repercussions. The world is watching to see how we react. I am hopeful that today, as the President of the United States receives the Soviet Ambassador, the President will make it unequivocally clear that the United States of America has always been an advocate of a just and enduring peace; and that the United States of America has always sought the opportunity to negotiate the many difficult political and military problems between the East and the West.

I hope the President of the United States will remind the Soviet Ambassador of the many political problems which still remain unsettled as a result of commitments made by the Soviet Union in the period during World War II and the period immediately thereafter.

Furthermore, I hope the President and his Secretary of State will make it quite clear that we are prepared to discuss disarmament matters piece by piece, item by item, and that what we seek is not some form of universal acceptance of a grandiose, comprehensive package, knowing full well that that may well nigh be impossible.

But what we really seek are beginnings—the beginnings of an effective international inspection system that will make sure that both the United States of America and the Soviet Union can proceed in disarmament negotiations, with the full assurance that whatever is agreed upon can be inspected, as to the fulfillment of the arrangements which may be finally decided upon as being the controlling mechanism in a disarmament proposal.

The most important thing that can be settled on the part of leaders of nations in the field of disarmament is a determination to make a start on some substantial proposal which leads toward inspection under the auspices, direction, and supervision of the United Nations.

The world looks to a resumption of negotiations between the western nations and the Soviet Union because it feels so acutely the necessity of making some opening breach in the problem of disarmament. This is indeed urgent. The problem of disarmament must be approached, however, within the framework of other grave political questions that trouble relations between the Communist bloc and the Free World. In any meeting with the Soviet Union serious consideration should be given to include on the agenda not only disarmament, but also the two central problems disturbing European peace today, namely, the reunification of Germany and the future of the East European captive countries, as well as the question of restoring amicable relations in the Middle East.

Political problems are always a part of any type of international conference. Although the conference will undoubtedly concentrate its attention primarily on disarmament, it must at all times take into consideration the fact that the underlying problem in the world is a political one, of which the armaments race is but symbolic.

In addition, it is necessary to clear away the cloud of misunderstanding between Moscow and the West and to create conditions of trust and mutual confidence as a basis for sound relations in the future.

I suggest that one of the reasons for much of the trouble and much of the apprehension today is the continuous use of invective and language which is belligerent in tone and aggressive in implication. If the language between the nations and between the spokesmen of the nations could but be made more reasonable, it seems to me that even that could have some bearings upon building an environment which would be more conducive to fruitful negotiations and eventual understanding.

I also believe that negotiations with the Kremlin should include the question of widening the exchange of personnel, between the United States and the Soviet Union, which have already been formally agreed upon. I think that in order to obtain maximum results these exchanges should range high up the ladder of political and other leaders in both countries.

Finally, I hope that in the discussions which take place between ourselves and our allies, and between the United States and the Soviet Union itself, we in America will always exude a spirit of confidence, without arrogance; that we will always exude a spirit of faith, without pride.

We have great strength. We have a good and substantial case before the world of public opinion. There is no reason why the United States should be fearful of negotiations, particularly if we know what we seek, and if we send to those negotiations the finest talent our society is capable of producing.

I, for one, am unwilling to accept the proposition that in all the conferences,

whether they be at the intermediate level or at the summit level, the United States and our allies must come out second best. If we do, it is our own fault. We need not. We have the strongest case. We are the most powerful Nation on the face of the earth. We have the strongest allies. I remind the Senate that the Soviet Union has no allies; it has satellites, and most of those satellites are living for the day when they can strike a blow for their freedom and literally stick a dagger into the political back of the Soviet Union.

We have allies—allies who on occasion disagree with us, but allies who at all times are willing to work with us in building strength for freedom and in negotiating for peace.

We have a decided advantage. What we need to do is to coordinate the policies of the United States and its allies; we need to coordinate our activities and our statements, and, finally, arrive at a set of objectives which we will pursue in negotiations. We must be wary lest the Soviet Union talk to one country at a time separately from the group of nations, or separately from the NATO alliance.

Of all things that are needed today, the first is that the NATO alliance have political solidarity, and leadership from the United States. I believe that leadership can be assured if we will but take the lead. It will not come about if we permit the Soviet Union to fire one literary missile after another at us. We need to move with a sense of direction and a sense of purpose, and we must recognize that in this great contest called the cold war there are those intangible assets of world public opinion and world understanding and world good will which may well be the deciding factors in the ultimate outcome of the struggle.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for the moment, and yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withhold it. Of course, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I am aware of the consistent interest of the Senator from Minnesota in the question of disarmament, and also of his hopes of fruitful negotiation with the Soviet Union.

I am sure the Senator does not intend to leave any impression that the President and the Secretary of State have not sought earnestly for a settlement of the questions which divide the Soviet Union and this country and its allies. The Soviet Union has made it manifestly clear, again only recently, that it intends to maintain the status quo of such issues, as Germany; that it does not intend to change its position upon the questions which we tried to negotiate at the last summit conference.

I am sure the Senator did not mean to leave the impression that there has been some fault on the part of the United States because it has not been able to reach a solution of any of those questions.

So far as disarmament is concerned, all of us recall that the Soviet Union walked out of the last disarmament negotiations; that they never offered anything more than an agreement between this country and the Soviet Union on the cessation of atomic tests, without inspection; and the negotiation of a so-called treaty of friendship. So far, there has not been any change in their position; while we have from time to time advanced new proposals.

I remember that a short time ago the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, with good spirit and hopefulness, said he believed the Soviet Union would come back with a new proposal. I call attention to the fact that the Soviet Union has returned halfway toward the proposal Mr. Dulles and the President had made that the foreign ministers and Mr. Dulles should meet and discuss and reach some agreement, that would give promise of negotiation, rather than entering a propaganda meeting. I know that all of us are anxious that progress be made toward actual disarmament and just settlement of political issues, but I believe it is harmful to give the impression that we have not continuously taken steps and made efforts toward negotiation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I should like to clarify my statement to the effect that if there is any doubt——

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator's position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to clarify and make manifestly clear one point at least. I said yesterday on a television-radio show that the foreign ministers conference was our idea, not that of the Soviet Union. What I want our Government to do is to say so, and let the world know that we have always been ready to meet and negotiate, and that it was we who suggested an orderly procedure. I thoroughly favor an orderly procedure, and I believe an agenda should be prepared containing certain items, as has been suggested by the President and the Secretary of State.

My other point was simply this: As I said at the beginning of my remarks, we are a nation that seeks peace. We have always sought peace. We want the world to know that we want peace—not a peace of appeasement, but a just peace. All I am saying is that the United States should make its case manifestly clear, so that the world will know what our position is. We know the difficulty of dealing with the Soviet Union. It is hardly necessary for me to reiterate it at this time. We know its record of intransigence, its record of opposition, its record of duplicity. Nevertheless we must seek to find reasonable alternatives and reasonable suggestions which we can offer without in any way jeopardizing our security.

One of them, I thought, as has been indicated here, might be the banning of tests, with inspection. But I repeat my emphasis upon the inspection item, because I think, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOEPR] has expressed himself so ably and conscientiously on other occasions, inspection is the heart and core of any valid and effective disarmament proposal. Even then, we know it involves some risk.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky, whom I consider to be a very able and devoted servant to the cause of international relations which are constructive and dedicated to peace and to the welfare of mankind.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the comments which the Senator from Minnesota has made. Two or three weeks ago I had occasion to speak at a meeting in which I tried to discuss, as I had read them, some of the comments of American scientists concerning the difficulties involved in fashioning a sound inspection plan.

One of the great American physicists today is Dr. Edward Teller. In Foreign Affairs Quarterly for January, he said that, in his judgment, it was almost impossible to have a foolproof inspection system under the original open-skies proposal which had been submitted.

It seems to me as a layman, and as a member of the legislative branch of the Government, that the problem of fashioning a foolproof inspection system must encompass extremely difficult considerations, which is all the more reason why time to prepare such a system must be an essential.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the problem of an effective inspection system is always a very serious one and that it must be carefully considered. In fact, when we have had our hearings on the whole subject matter of disarmament, this question has been emphasized. I do not suppose that there is any such thing as a foolproof system. I believe there are always some risks entailed. I have tried to minimize the risks.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is what I intended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am certain the Senator intended that. I wanted to clarify the issue.

The testimony we have had from Admiral Strauss, the testimony of Jules Moch, the great French weapons expert, and the recent testimony of the former adviser on disarmament, Mr. Harold Stassen, who has had much experience in this field, indicates that we are now at the point where, at least so far as the banning of nuclear tests is concerned, a test inspection system could be perfected which would afford us sufficient security to justify whatever risk was involved. I am certain that in all the proposals some risk is involved. I am positively certain of it. But I think the risk is less than the political liability in doing nothing, with, consequently, the allout risk of an arms race which seems to have no letup and no place to go except oblivion.

I thank the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who has again and again demonstrated his keen and constructive interest in problems relating to the national security, foreign policy, and, in particular, disarmament. It is no secret that he has spoken to me many times, has studied the committee reports, and has been a constructive observer and

participant in these discussions. I thank him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend from Minnesota.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF JULIUS H. MINER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Chicago Daily News of February 26, 1958, concerning the confirmation of the nomination of the Honorable Julius H. Miner to be a judge of the United States district court.

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

NEW UNITED STATES JUDGE

The Senate yesterday confirmed the appointment of Julius H. Miner as a judge of the United States district court.

Judge Miner is an able and experienced trial judge, with long service on the Circuit Court of Cook County. We predict for him a distinguished career on the Federal bench.

Judge Miner's popularity among lawyers was demonstrated when he ran unsuccessfully against Walter Schaefer for a place on the Illinois Supreme Court. A majority in a bar poll preferred Miner.

A scholar in the law, Judge Miner has worked with indefatigable energy and great resourcefulness for a variety of reforms in judicial procedure. His most notable success in this field came when he persuaded the legislature to provide a cooling-off period in divorce actions before final filing, except in cases where the court finds an emergency.

Judge Miner's elevation to the Federal bench may endanger the future of this reform. A good many of his colleagues on the bench are disposed to find an emergency in almost every case. With the law's original sponsor removed from the jurisdiction, this statute may fall further into disuse.

Senator DIRKSEN'S nomination of Judge Miner is testimony that wise politicians do not cherish grudges forever. When DIRKSEN first ran for the Senate in 1950, Judge Miner tried unsuccessfully to persuade Franklin Bliss Snyder to be a candidate for the express purpose of blocking DIRKSEN'S ambition.

If he ever felt any resentment over this, Senator DIRKSEN forgot it by 1957.

Judge Miner's service on the bench has won him much praise and has incurred little criticism. Off the bench, he has sometimes been more active in political management than is strictly desirable in a judge. This kind of activity would be even less seemly on the part of a Federal judge than in a circuit judge of Cook County, and we hope that Judge Miner will now forego it entirely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that tomorrow is the anniversary of the inauguration as President of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have notified interested Senators; and I expect that on tomorrow there will be a series of addresses regarding the outstanding public service of those two great men. I should like to have the RECORD show that we anticipate that a portion of the time during the session tomorrow will be used in that way.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whether he is prepared to have the Senate proceed today to the consideration of Calendar No. 1343, Senate bill 3039, amending the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the bill was reported, there was an agreement that it would not be taken up by the Senate until the committee had a chance to study further the amendments submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The committee will meet on Wednesday, at which time it may or may not make recommendations regarding the amendments of the Senator from Minnesota. Thereafter, the committee will be ready to have the Senate consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

EXTENSION OF ARMED FORCES DAIRY PRODUCTS PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is very much interested in Calendar No. 1338 and Calendar No. 1339, being, respectively, Senate bill 3341, to extend the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years; and Senate bill 3342, to continue the special milk program for children.

Let me ask whether he is prepared to have the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of those bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I am.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1338, Senate bill 3341.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3341) to extend the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will state the purpose of the bill, thereafter I should like to comment on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill simply extends the present law; it will make dairy products available for the Armed Forces for a period of 3 years, that is to say, until December 31, 1961. Also, it will extend the benefits of the program to the Coast Guard and to the Merchant Marine Academy in the manner provided by Senate bill 1696, which passed the Senate on August 5, 1957, and is now before the House of Representatives.

The Senate may recall that when the law was originally prepared and passed, its provisions did not apply to the Coast Guard or to the Merchant Marine Academy. Some time ago the Senate passed a bill to include those two services, but that bill is still before the House of Representatives.

Therefore, the committee voted to include in the extension bill, which is now before the Senate, provision for the Merchant Marine Academy and the Coast Guard.

The authority for the program is contained in section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to make dairy products acquired through price-support operations available to, first, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to supplement the ration in VA hospitals; and, second, the Secretary of the Army to supplement the ration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the ration of Defense Department hospitals. As it would be amended by the bill, it would similarly provide for supplementing the ration of the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy. Section 202 expires December 31, 1958. The bill would extend it to December 31, 1961.

I may point out, Mr. President, that although the program started only a few years ago it is making it possible for us to dispose of much of our surplus milk. When the program reaches its maximum operating level, say next year, it is expected that the amount of payments made under it for supplemental fluid milk will be running about $25 million a year. I wish to emphasize the program is designed only to supplement the rations now received by the armed services and the Coast Guard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from the Department of Agriculture and from the Treasury Department dated July 2, 1957. Both Departments have recommended extending the benefits of the program to additional services. The Secretary of Agriculture recommended extension of the program for an additional 2 years on January 17 of this year.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1957.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This replies to your request of March 26 for a report on S. 1696, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for furnishing the Coast Guard Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Academy with surplus dairy products. The bill would amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to make cadets and midshipmen at, and other personnel assigned to, the Coast Guard Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Academy eligible to receive dairy products that are made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Army for increased use by the military agencies.

The Department recommends enactment of the bill.

The quantities of dairy products acquired by CCC under the dairy support program have exceeded the quantities that could be sold by CCC in available market outlets. It has been possible to reduce the CCC inventory only by donating substantial quantities for increased use by military personnel and veterans hospital patients and for domestic and foreign school lunch and welfare uses.

By increasing the number of persons eligible to receive and to increase their consumption of milk and its products pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the proposed bill will aid in increasing total consumption and in keeping down CCC's inventory of dairy products acquired under the milk and butterfat price support program.

Your attention is invited to a technical inaccuracy in the bill. The "and (3) * * *" phrase should be inserted before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (b) rather than at the end of the subsection. This may be accomplished by inserting in line 7 after the word "end" the phrase "of the first sentence."

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1957.

Hon. ALLEN J ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to S. 1696, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for furnishing the Coast Guard Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Academy with surplus dairy products, which has been referred to your committee.

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1446a), so as to authorize cadets and midshipmen at, and other personnel assigned to the Coast Guard Academy and United States Merchant Marine Academy to receive additional dairy products as a part of their ration. This program is now in effect with respect to military members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to hospitals under the Veterans' Administration.

The interest of the Treasury Department in the bill is limited to the effect of its enactment on the Coast Guard.

Since all military members of the other Armed Forces are included in section 202, it is recommended that the bill be amended so as to extend the benefits of the section to all military members of the Coast Guard.

The Treasury Department would have no objection to the enactment of S. 1696 with the recommended amendment.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana recalls, does he not, that previous to 1954 Senators received hundreds of complaints from boys in the service that they could not get milk with their meals? They could use milk on their cereals and go without milk to drink, or they could drink the milk and have their cereals dry.

We tried for some time to get the armed services interested in giving boys in the services more milk. We did not get too far with that effort until we finally reached a decision whereby the Commodity Credit Corporation would stand for half the cost of the extra amount of milk for boys in the services to use. That half amounted to about $16 million last year. Actually, that cost should be charged to the armed services, because the milk was primarily furnished to the armed services so they could supplement Army meals with milk rations. Many, many young men in the armed services were so desirous of getting milk with their meals that they constantly wrote Members of Congress requesting that some action be taken. I think the solution reached was a good one. I do not like the idea of charging $16 million to farm-price supports, but I would rather have it charged to that than not have the armed services obtain the milk. For many years it has been popular to charge certain costs to the farm program, because it seemed the easiest way to do it.

I think we acted wisely in this case, but certainly the program should be continued for the next 3 years. So far as I know, there is no opposition on the part of anyone.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may point out that, in addition to the large amount of fluid milk which was consumed by the Armed Forces, 23 million pounds of butter and 2 million pounds of cheese were disposed of in calendar year 1957.

Mr. AIKEN. I think those items could more properly be charged to the farm-support program. However, the cost of the fluid milk should not be; but it is, and it looks like it is going to be so charged for a while.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Referring to the bill now before the Senate, I may point out that I was one of the Members of this body who introduced similar bills in past years, for reasons stated by my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and also my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER].

Coming from a large dairy State such as Minnesota, it did not seem proper that men in the service should find it necessary to complain that they did not have all the dairy products they desired. During the years which have been mentioned, much of my mail consisted of messages from men in the armed services in Korea, Japan, the Aleutian Islands, Greenland, and Iceland, which stated that they were hungry for dairy products. As has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, if they used milk for their cereals, they had no milk to drink.

It was on that basis that I urged enactment of such legislation. I introduced a bill in this session, which has been embodied in the committee bill which has been reported and is now on the calendar. I believe that a man in the service should not be denied a glass of milk when we are blessed, as we are in this country, with an abundance of fluid milk. While a small percentage will be going into surplus, we should make every effort to see that a man in the service gets all the milk he wants, within reason, so that he may drink fluid milk or be able to use milk on his cereal or have the advantage of milk in food products prepared for him.

I am happy to see the bill being favorably considered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Enactment of the bill is bound to result in a splendid outlet for raw milk. The record shows that in fiscal 1957 a little more than $16 million was expended for milk, resulting in an increase of about 400 million pounds in the consumption of milk by military personnel. In addition, 20.7 million pounds of butter, 1.7 million pounds of cheese, and 72,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk were disposed of. That amount may not sound very large to dairy producers from States like Wisconsin and Minnesota. Yet it is a fair outlet. With an extension of the act to the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academy, along with the continued growth of the program, it is felt the payments for supplemental milk will probably level off at about $25 million, and the value of the manufactured products transferred will level off at about $13 million, which is quite a bit more than we provided last year.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for providing in the bill for the inclusion of the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy. I concur wholeheartedly in the remarks made by my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Minnesota, particularly as one who was in the Armed Forces for five years during the Second World War. I recall how often many of us wanted milk when we could not get it, and wanted butter when we could not get it. It certainly is to the great interest of the country and of the men in our Armed Forces that they have dairy food, which is the best available food.

I conclude by saying I deeply resent that the cost has been charged as a loss against the dairy farmers, when obviously, if it should be charged as a loss at all, it should be charged as a cost to the armed services and the national defense effort, in which we all also firmly and deeply believe.

I am delighted to have had the opportunity to call up the bill, and I am also proud to have had a chance to concur with my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Minnesota in honoring the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for having reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1958," wherever it appears and substituting therefor "December 31, 1961."

SEC. 2. Section 202 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out "of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, and as a part of the ration" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard, (2)" and by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such subsection the following: ", and (3) of cadets and midshipmen at, and other personnel assigned to, the United States Merchant Marine Academy."

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1339, S. 3342.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3342) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill simply provides for the extension of the special school milk program to June 30, 1961. There are no other changes proposed in the program under the bill.

The present authority for the special school milk program which is contained in section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, will expire June 30, 1958. In order to recognize the primary purpose of the program, which is to improve the nutrition for school children, the bill provides for the extension of the program by separate legislation, not amendatory of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and specifies that amounts expended under either the original or the extended program shall not be considered as amounts expended for price support purposes. That is one of the new provisions of the bill.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that this program has also been of great help in disposing of fluid milk. During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half-pints of milk, a 29 percent increase over 1956. Expenditures in that regard totaled $61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school lunch program. So as a result of the two programs, children consumed 3.6 billion half pints of milk last year. It is anticipated that the annual cost of the program will approximate $75 million.

Mr. President, we are now considering a fine outlet for the use of fluid milk. I wish to say that the committee was unanimous in its approval of the extension of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, recommending extension of the program, and a statement submitted by the Department of Agriculture with respect to the program.

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

We are recommending a 2-year extension in the special milk program to increase fluid milk consumption by children in schools, summer camps, and child-care institutions. This will extend the present annual authorization of $75 million through June 30, 1960. This program is making an outstanding contribution to the expansion of markets for fluid milk. Equally important, it is providing more children with more milk—a very real improvement as far as their dietary needs are concerned.

During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half pints of milk, a 29-percent increase over 1956, and expenditures totaled $61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school-lunch program. So, as a result of the two programs, children consumed 3.6 billion half pints of milk last year.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The special milk program was initially authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 and provided for the use of $50 million of CCC funds for a milk program in schools for each of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. In April 1956, legislation was enacted to extend the program through 1958 and to increase the authorization to $60 million for 1956 and $75 million for 1957 and 1958. The program was also extended to include all nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children. Subsequent legislation, in July 1956, removed the reference to underprivileged children. The primary objective of the program is to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children of school age and, thereby, help to reduce the movement of manufactured dairy products into CCC inventories.

Assistance is provided to eligible schools and child-care institutions in the form of reimbursement payments, for milk consumed by the children. Methods of encouraging increased milk consumption are determined by those who know most about the opportunities—the local school official, or the director of the child-care institution. These local people decide when and how the milk is to be offered to children, and—if the milk is sold as a separate item—what price is to be charged the children. Then, the school or child-care institution applies for participation in the program.

The Department of Agriculture has established the maximum amounts that may be paid to any participating school or institution. Schools serving type A or B meals under the national school-lunch program may receive up to 4 cents reimbursement for each half pint served in excess of the first half pint in a type A or B lunch. All other schools and all child-care institutions may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk served to children.

If the school or child-care institution offers milk to children as a separately priced item, maximum use of the reimbursement payments must be made to reduce the price of milk to children. Within the maximum rates established by the Department of Agriculture, the amount of reimbursement provided will depend upon the cost of milk to the school or child-care institution, the proposed selling price to children, and the cost of handling milk within the school or institution. In general, it is expected that such handling cost will not exceed 1 cent per half pint.

Boarding or institutional schools, summer camps, and many child-care institutions usually do not offer milk as a separately priced item to children. When such schools and institutions apply for participation, they outline the planned methods and practices by which they intend to increase milk consumption by children. The schools and institutions are then reimbursed for the cost of the additional milk served to children.

During the first year of operation a total of approximately 450 million half pints of milk were consumed by children in 41,000 schools at a Federal expenditure of $17.1 million. The second year of operation there were 62,266 schools participating in which $45.8 million of Federal funds were expended reimbursing the consumption of 1.4 billion half pints of milk. This past year (fiscal year 1957) children in 71,239 schools and child-care institutions consumed about 1.75 billion half pints at a Federal expenditure of $60.5 million.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if he does not feel that it would be in the national interest to extend this program even longer than is provided in the pending bill, in view of the fact that a substantial majority of children, as I understand, do not have an opportunity to participate in the school-milk program?

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be well to do that, but as I recall the Department recommended a 2-year extension. Our committee provided a 3-year extension, which I believe is sufficient for the time being. I would prefer to have the program on such a basis.

I do not know what is going to happen to the present milk program. As the Senator knows, we are trying to expand markets so that the program will not be costly to the Government. That is one of the things which prompted us to provide for a program extending not more than 3 years, rather than making it permanent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I feel very strongly, as I am sure nu-

tritionists all over America must feel, that this program is greatly in the national interest. Schoolchildren are at a habit-formation age. In very many homes, unfortunately, the children do not get milk or do not get enough milk. Under the school milk program the children do get this nutritious food. The children then develop a habit of eating properly in childhood, and it affects their health throughout lifetime with tremendously beneficial results.

I think the program is of great interest to this country, and it should be carried forward. I feel that the program should be expanded in the future. As many of our children as possible should be included in the program. I think it is a tragedy that unfortunately the majority of our children do not have a chance to participate in this program.

I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for reporting to the Senate the bill presently under consideration, which calls for a substantial improvement in the special milk program for children.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee was unanimous in its recommendation. This represents not only the recommendation of the chairman, but also of the other committee members, such as my good friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who was very active in the consideration of the bill, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and all the other committee members. We were all interested in finding some good outlet and use for the tremendous volume of milk which is being produced.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may point out an important feature of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The first school-milk program bill was passed as an amendment to the price support act. Consequently, the costs of the program up to this time have been charged to the price-support operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It now appears that the school-milk program has become so popular that it is likely to be continued for some time, depending upon the milk supply. It is also believed that a sufficient number of schools will qualify this year to use the entire amount provided, which is $75 million. Last year I believe the program involved only $56 million or $57 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. Sixty-one million dollars.

Mr. AIKEN. Sixty-one million dollars. I will take the chairman's word for that, since he undoubtedly knows.

The principal feature of the bill under consideration, to which there is no objection at all, so far as I know, is that from now on the program cost will not be charged to price-support operations.

While I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that the program may well become permanent, depending upon the supply of milk, I am not quite so sure as some others seem to be that we are going to be deluged with milk in the future. I believe that after a period of 3 years we will have had sufficient experience with the program so that we can then determine whether it is advisable perhaps to incorporate this plan into the school-lunch program. I am not sure as to how the details should be worked out.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, what we might do in the future, if the supply of milk lessens, is to continue the program by increasing the appropriations for the school-lunch program, permitting more of the money for that program to be used to buy milk.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one reason why we did not extend the program indefinitely, as some have proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not so sanguine as some persons that we will always have such a large supply of milk as we now have. We are extremely fortunate to have as much milk as we have at the present time, but the consumption of milk is catching up rapidly. The consumption in this country is increasing about twice as fast as is the production of milk. That is true today, was true last year, and I believe was true the year before that.

I would prefer to give the program another 3-year trial, with the hope that at the end of that time it might become a part of the school-lunch program.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I first introduced the bill to provide for the increased use of milk in the schools. I felt strongly, Mr. President, that our schoolchildren should have an adequate supply of milk in their diets. So long as we were blessed with a surplus in this land, I felt we should make the funds available to increase the amount of milk going into the school-milk program.

On January 27 of this calendar year I introduced a bill which proposed the extension now embodied in the bill which the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported. That bill is on the calendar, and we are considering it today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there were other bills on the subject.

Mr. THYE. There were other bills, but mine was the first bill introduced in the calendar year 1958.

Mr. President, coming from a dairy State such as Minnesota, and knowing of the nutritive value to children of dairy products, especially milk, I have always advocated that children should have milk available for their school lunches. Only $61 million worth of milk went into the school-milk program during the past year. However, I believe that more and more of the school authorities are becoming acquainted with the program, and that the school boards, as well as the legislatures within the respective States, have been able to adjust themselves to an increase in the program in the respective school districts.

While the dairy-cow population has decreased in the past 2 years, we have proved our ability to increase the per cow production annually, and I am confident that if there is a known need, the producers will provide all the milk that will be necessary for our school-milk program.

Therefore it is with great appreciation this afternoon that I note that this bill is now being considered. All school districts will be advised that we are to continue the present school-milk program at its high level, so that all children may have the benefit of this very nutritious food.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and his colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY] both worked on this program very effectively. The senior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are the authors of the original school lunch bill.

Mr. THYE. That was in 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I was referring to the $75 million school milk program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought that while bouquets were being tossed about, I would put in that reminder.

Mr. THYE. I did not want to lose the identity of this particular legislative program. The $75 million for the school milk program, I respectfully state, came about because of the introduction of proposed legislation in the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself in June of 1957, and in the House by the late Representative Andresen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3342) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for each of the 3 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1961, not to exceed $75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. Amounts expended hereunder and under the authority contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program.

EXTENSION OF BRUCELLOSIS CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 3343.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3343) to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program under section 204

(e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the title indicates, it simply extends the accelerated brucellosis eradication program for 2 years, until June 30, 1960. This program is provided for by section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which authorizes the transfer of $20 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds annually to the appropriation available for brucellosis eradication, the purpose being to accelerate the program through first, increasing indemnities—to not to exceed $50 per head—second, increasing the number of indemnities; and third, defraying additional administrative expenses. Section 204 (e) expires with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958.

The Department of Agriculture objected to the bill because of the manner in which the operation is being financed. It will be recalled that 4 years ago it was provided that the $20 million to operate this program was to be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund. The program has been operating in that manner for 4 years. The Department of Agriculture took the position that it had sufficient authority to continue the program, and that the money should be obtained through the regular appropriation.

The committee as a whole thought otherwise. We felt that it was just as well to continue the program as it is now being pursued, that is, to have the funds transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Department. The program has worked very well under that method, and it is our belief that if the program is continued at its present rate, within from 2 to 4 years we ought to be able to eradicate brucellosis entirely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is an extremely important bill. Not only is it important to farmers who have cows, but it is a very important public-health measure. The result of the contagion which is spread by brucellosis is undulant fever in human beings, an illness which is very debilitating, and often results in death.

I feel very strongly that the funds for this bill could very well be charged against the public-health program, rather than against the farmer. On the other hand, I think it is extremely important to advance as rapidly as possible the effort to eradicate this disease, because it is something that can be eliminated.

Wisconsin is one of nine States in which brucellosis has been eliminated. As everyone knows, or should know, Wisconsin is the largest dairy State in the Union, and has a tremendous herd of dairy cattle. I think it is most important that the Senate proceed to the enactment of the bill as rapidly as possible, and continue, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has recommended, the program to eliminate this disease, which causes debilitation and death.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Vermont is one of the nine States in which brucellosis has been virtually eradicated. As everyone knows, or should know, Vermont, while not the largest dairy State in the Union, is the most intensive dairy State in the Union.

What the Senator from Wisconsin says about the eradication of undulant fever is very important, indeed.

I was aware of the fact that the Department of Agriculture preferred to have the money to continue this program come from direct appropriations. So far as that goes, I would, too, but I do not wish to take any chance of having an interruption in the program. Some State legislatures, including the legislature of the State of the occupant of the chair, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], are now meeting and considering the appropriation of money to carry on their end of the program.

It is important that there be no lapse in the program, so I say, let us pass this bill. Let the Department of Agriculture try to get the $17 million or $20 million through direct appropriations, if it can do so; but in the event it should fail, we may be sure that with this proposed legislation on the books the program will continue uninterrupted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the pending bill would permit continuation of the accelerated program for the eradication of brucellosis. This provision was embodied in a bill which was introduced a year ago, of which I was a cosponsor. I refer to Senate bill 2408. While serving in the State Department of Agriculture as Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture, I had some of the responsibility connected with this program in Minnesota.

The late Dr. Cotton, then Executive Secretary of the State Livestock Sanitary Board, was one of the men who suggested and fought for the program to eradicate brucellosis in dairy cattle, as well as to eradicate tuberculosis. Our State did some very fine work in both fields.

When I was privileged to come to the Senate, I was very well acquainted with the program, because I had served as Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture in the State of Minnesota and later as Governor of the State. Therefore when I came to the Senate it was my desire to sit on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order that I might continue my work in the field of health measures affecting the livestock industry, and in safeguarding the health of the public by the eradication of diseases which could be transmitted through the consumption of milk.

When the State Livestock Sanitary Board, which has as its responsibility the safeguarding of the livestock industry in the State, informed me of the shortage of funds with which to continue the program of eradication of such diseases, I immediately endeavored, through the Department of Agriculture, to have the program stepped up. It was for that reason that a year ago an increased appropriation was requested. That request was granted by Congress.

When we convened again this year, the RECORD will show, one of the first bills introduced was the bill to continue the accelerated brucellosis control program. I introduced that bill on January 27th, and it became embodied in the bill which is before the Senate. It is a most worthy legislative measure. It will safeguard the health of human beings, and it will greatly increase the productivity of dairy cattle and the profits of those engaged in the dairy industry. I say that because every time a cow is afflicted with brucellosis it is apt to abort and lose its calf, and it may result in the cow losing its productivity for that year.

Therefore the program must continue. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for having given us an opportunity to vote on the subject and that we have the bill on the calendar at this early time for consideration by the Senate.

The veterinarians who administer the program for the Department of Agriculture and those who work in the respective States will have knowledge that the law to continue the program at a high rate has been passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to point out to the Senator that the testing required under the bill is being done by veterinarians for a very small fee, and that although the indemnity to be paid to cattle owners for cattle is $25 for scrub cattle and $50 for pure-bred cattle, the average has been below that amount. As a matter of fact, as I recall, there were four States in which no indemnity payments were made. The farmers took such great interest in the program of eradicating brucellosis that they did it on their own. Ninety-five percent of the reactors found during fiscal 1957 were destroyed.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. We certainly do not want the program to stop now, because we have made very good progress in eradicating the disease. It would be a loss of all the effort of the years past if we did not continue the program as we have in the past.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is entirely right. It would be impossible to have an effective program unless it were a program of national scope. It must be nationwide. It would do no good to have a clean county, and next to it an infected county, or a clean herd on one side of the fence and an affected herd on the other side. The disease would be carried back and forth across fence lines or from one truck to another. Therefore a national program is the only effective program to bring about the eradication of the disease.

The work is not yet completed. However, a stepped-up program promises to bring an early accomplishment of the desired result. I might point out that it is not only dairy cows that are affected by the bill, but all cows, whether they be of a beef herd or a dairy herd. The

serious danger is that the disease can be transmitted through fluid milk to the consuming public. The program is part Federal and part State. The farmer must dispose of his animal once it has been found to be infected. In that case it goes off his premises and is immediately branded. If the carcass can be salvaged, it is sold for whatever it will bring, and the difference between that and the appraised value of the animal is made up by the Federal Government and the State government. An item of importance in connection with it is that it is a nationwide program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me, as chairman of the committee, by the Department of Agriculture under date of February 14, in which they do not object to the program—on the contrary, they desire that it be continued—but recommend that the funds be appropriated directly from the Treasury, as in the case of other appropriations, instead of transferring the funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1958.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1958, for a report on S. 3148, a bill to extend the accelerated brucellosis-control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years.

The Department recommends against the enactment of S. 3148.

The bill would extend the accelerated-brucellosis-control program 2 years to June 30, 1960. The additional 2 years would be financed through use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds as authorized by section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 465, 84th Congress, approved April 2, 1956. The purpose of the accelerated-brucellosis-control program is to eliminate both the disease and the infected cattle as rapidly as possible.

We are in full accord with the objectives of S. 3148, but have recommended against its enactment, since the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the purpose of accelerating the brucellosis-eradication program was a temporary measure. The Department has other adequate legislative authority to continue a brucellosis-eradication program, and funds for this work should be provided by the regular budgetary process. The 1959 budget estimates propose that the accelerated-brucellosis program be financed by a direct appropriation of $15 million to the Agricultural Research Service.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The State Legislature of Kentucky has been considering the possibility of extending the program. Naturally, my colleague [Mr. MORTON]—who is the present occupant of the chair—and I are interested in it. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question.

If the bill is passed, will it mean that the money will be immediately available for the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The Commodity Credit Corporation has funds on hand, and the bill, if enacted, will make the funds available for the program without further action, to the extent the Department sees fit to use them. I may say to the Senator, however, that it may depend upon the Budget Bureau. I understand that there are some funds available, left over from the authority now existing, but that the Department has in some way been deprived of utilizing the money by action of the Bureau of the Budget. I have interceded to the extent of my ability, but so far I have not been able to move Mr. Brundage. Quite a bit of money could be spent under existing authority, but somehow it is being held back.

Mr. COOPER. How much would be authorized for fiscal 1958?

Mr. ELLENDER. Twenty million dollars is available for fiscal 1958. The bill would authorize the same amount for each of the next two fiscal years. What has been made available in the past has not all been used.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to state my appreciation of the prompt action on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in getting before the Senate S. 3341, to extend the Armed Services dairy products program; S. 3342, to continue the special milk program for children; and S. 3343, to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program. I wish to thank the chairman for his action. I know of his interest in and concern for the development of those programs.

Of course the special school milk program is in addition to the great school-lunch program which I believe the Senator from Louisiana fathered, if I am not mistaken. I believe our late and beloved colleague from Georgia, Senator George, and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], were also very active in getting the school-lunch program established.

The brucellosis program has been outlined very thoroughly, and I shall not say any more about it, except that a continuation of it for 2 years is very important in terms of a legislative program. As the Senator said, State cooperation is needed.

The special school-milk program goes farther in its application than merely to the schools. It also goes to day camps and community centers caring for underprivileged children. This in itself is a very commendable activity.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, it was the distinguished Senator from Minnesota who put those 3 groups in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I offered an amendment 2 years ago which included the additional groups which were mentioned—the day camps, the needy children, and the community health centers.

The committee bills are the result of a pooling of several bills. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and other Senators indicated they had bills on these subjects, as did the junior Senator from Minnesota. I am happy we are about to get this action. I only hope that the bills may be expedited through Congress and become public laws.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana and leadership for calling them up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was very glad to have the bill reported. I considered it to be my duty as the chairman of the committee to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "and 1958" and inserting "through 1960."

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PROVIDE FOR EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1313, S. 1041.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1041) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the act of May 18, 1910, making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, so as to provide that the separate departments of the District of Columbia government may include illustrations, charts, maps, and graphs in their annual reports, if they are authorized to do so by the Commissioners. There is a specific prohibition against this at the present time. The bill received the unanimous approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of the first paragraph under the caption "Contingent and Miscellaneous Expenses" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 381; sec. 1–239, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read as follows: *"Provided*

further, That hereafter no department, board, office, or agency of the government of the District of Columbia shall include any illustration in any annual report prepared by it unless such illustration be authorized by regulations approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

GRANT OF ADDITIONAL POWERS TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1314, S. 1706.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1706) to amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 819), as amended (sec. 1-244, D. C. Code, 1951), is amended by adding at the end of such section the following subsections:

"(i) (1) To purchase and sell maps, and regulations and parts of regulations issued by any agency of the government of the District of Columbia and amendments thereof, including binders therefor (hereinafter referred to as 'material'), at such prices as the Commissioners or their designated agent may from time to time determine to be necessary to approximate the cost thereof, including the cost of distribution. All receipts from the sale of such material on hand as of the effective date of this amendment, shall be deposited into a fund which is hereby established, to be known as the 'District of Columbia Publications Fund,' which fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all necessary costs connected with the procurement, publication, and distribution of such material, including postage. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the revenues of the District of Columbia $50,000 to provide working capital, which sum shall be deposited to the credit of the fund established by this section, and receipts from the sale of such material shall likewise be deposited to the credit of such fund: *Provided*, That as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, after provision has been made for payment of all obligations then incurred, the amount in such fund in excess of $50,000 shall be deposited to general revenues of the District of Columbia.

"(2) To issue such material without charge, in the discretion of the Commissioners, to officers and employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia to States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, local governmental units, and foreign governments; to institutions of research and learning; to applicants for, or holders of, particular licenses issued by the District of Columbia; and to any other person when it is determined by said Commissioners or their designated agent or agents that it is in the best interest of the District of Columbia to furnish such material without charge; and to delegate to the heads of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia the authority likewise to make the distribution authorized by this paragraph of such material as may be purchased by the departments and agencies. Material to be distributed under the authority of this paragraph shall be supplied to the District of Columbia department or agency proposing to make such distribution, only upon payment by the department or agency of the cost thereof.

"(j) To place orders, if they determine it to be in the best interest of the District of Columbia, with any Federal department, establishment, bureau, or office for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services of any kind that such Federal agency may be in a position to supply or be equipped to render, by contract or otherwise, and shall pay promptly by check to such Federal agency, upon its written request, either in advance or upon furnishing or performance thereof, all or part of the estimated or actual cost thereof as determined by such department, establishment, bureau, or office as may be requisitioned; but proper adjustments on the basis of the actual costs of the materials, supplies or equipment furnished or work or services performed, paid for in advance, shall be made as may be agreed upon by the departments, establishments, bureaus, or offices concerned. Orders placed as provided in this subsection shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors.

"(k) To authorize any department, office, or agency of the District of Columbia government, when it is determined to be in the best interest of the District of Columbia so to do, to place orders with any other department, office, or agency of the District for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services of any kind that such requisitioned department, office, or agency may be in a position to supply or equipped to render. The department, office, or agency placing any such orders shall either advance, subject to proper adjustment on the basis of actual cost, or reimburse, such department, office, or agency the actual cost of materials, supplies, or equipment furnished or work or services performed as determined by such department, office, or agency as may be requisitioned. Orders placed as provided in this subsection shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors."

SEC. 2. The Commissioners are authorized to delegate any of the functions to be performed by them under the authority of this act to any officer or employee of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The second paragraph under the caption "District of Columbia" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1910, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 202, 208), as amended (title 49, sec. 110, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is hereby repealed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia so as to authorize them to perform certain designated functions:

First, to purchase, sell, and to give to certain persons, institutions, and governmental agencies, both municipal and Federal, at the discretion of the Commissioners or their designated agent, copies of various municipal regulations.

Second, to make advance payments to Federal agencies for supplies to be furnished or work to be performed in accordance with agreements between the Commissioners and such agencies.

Third, to empower the Commissioners to authorize the several departments, establishments, bureaus, and offices of the government of the District of Columbia to place orders with other agencies of the District, and to make payment for such orders either in advance or on a reimbursement basis.

The bill was recommended by the Board of Commissioners. It will not involve any cost to the District of Columbia. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, INC.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1317, S. 2725.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2725) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to exempt from taxation lot No. 55, in square No. 242, situated at 1318 Vermont Avenue NW., in the city of Washington, so long as the lot is owned and occupied by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., and is not used for commercial purposes. The exemption is made subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia."

The National Council of Negro Women, Inc., was incorporated in the District of Columbia on June 26, 1936. It is a charitable and volunteer organization.

The taxes involved in this particular transaction are $359.90 a year.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the real estate described as lot No. 55, in square No. 242, situated in the city of Washington, D. C., owned by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089).

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1318, S. 3057.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3057) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to increase the salary of the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia to $22,000 a year. A study of the salaries paid the superintendents of schools in 18 cities of the United States having a population of more than 500,000 currently places Washington, D. C., in 18th place in terms of the salary paid to its Superintendent of Schools.

If the bill shall become law, the District of Columbia will be in a median line with other cities of comparable size. I think it will be in 10th or 11th place, rather than in 18th place, the position it now occupies.

The bill received the unanimous approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Board of Education, and interested educational and parent-teachers' associations. It also received the unanimous approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That class 1 of section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955, approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521; Sec. 31–659a–1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition, Supp. V), is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1. Superintendent of Schools, $22,000."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period following the approval of this act.

DEALERS' AIRCRAFT REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1309, S. 3016.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3016) to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1290) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3016) to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

I. SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Commerce. It amends title V of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 521 et seq.) by adding a new section to provide specific statutory authority for the issuance by the Secretary of Commerce of dealers' aircraft registration certificates. Furthermore, it states that aircraft owned by the holders of such certificates shall be "deemed registered under" the act.

II. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

For some time, the Department of Commerce has been issuing dealers' registration certificates (similar to automobile dealers' license plates) to aircraft manufacturers, distributors, and dealers for periods of 1 year. Distributed under the Department's general title V authority, these certificates enable their holders to operate aircraft owned by them without the necessity of registering each craft individually. The question has risen, however, whether aircraft operated under such certificates are legally "registered" under the act and, thus, properly definable as "civil aircraft of the United States" under section 1 (15).

As explained in the letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, included at the end of this report, section 503 of the act requires the Department to maintain a record of all documents affecting the title of "civil aircraft of the United States." Unless the aircraft in question are to be considered as embraced within this term, some doubt will exist whether the recording of liens created against them offers the protection to lien holders generally contemplated by this section. Lending institutions are understandably reluctant to accept these planes as security for money advanced if not assured that their liens will be given the full protection of the law.

S. 3016 would remove any doubts as to the full priority and enforcibility of liens against aircraft operated under a dealer's certificate. For this reason, your committee believes it should be enacted.

III. AGENCY COMMENTS

A letter, dated January 10, 1958, from the Acting Secretary of Commerce requesting the introduction of this legislation, and explaining in detail its purpose, is included at the end of this report.

The Comptroller General makes no recommendation regarding the enactment of this measure.

IV. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italic; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 (52 STAT. 973; 49 U. S. C. 401)

* * * * *

"Title V—Nationality and ownership of aircraft

* * * * *

"SEC. 504. No persons having a security interest in, or security title to, any civil aircraft under a contract of conditional sale, equipment trust, chattel or corporate mortgage, or other instrument of similar nature, and no lessor of any such aircraft under a bona fide lease of 30 days or more, shall be liable by reason of such interest or title, or by reason of his interest as lessor or owner of the aircraft so leased, for any injury to or death of persons, or damage to or loss of property, on the surface of the earth (whether on land or water) caused by such aircraft, or by the ascent, descent, or flight of such aircraft or by the dropping or falling of an object therefrom, unless such aircraft is in the actual possession or control of such person at the time of such injury, death, damage, or loss.

"Dealers' Aircraft Registration Certificates

"Sec. 505. The Secretary of Commerce may, by such reasonable regulations as he may find to be in the public interest, provide for the issuance, and for the suspension or revocation, of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, and for their use in connection with aircraft eligible for registration under this Act by persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling aircraft. Aircraft owned by holders of dealers' aircraft registration certificates shall be deemed registered under this Act to the extent that the Secretary of Commerce may, by regulation, provide. It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any regulation, or any term, condition, or limitation contained in any certificate, issued under this section."

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed proposed bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, be introduced in the Senate.

This proposed legislation is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to title V of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 521 et seq.), under which this department provides for the registration of civil aircraft owned by United States citizens and the recordation of documents affecting title to such aircraft.

For over 8 years, this department has been issuing special purpose dealers' aircraft registration certificates under general authority contained in title V. These certificates, similar to the more familiar automobile dealers' license plates, are issued to aircraft manufacturers, distributors, and dealers for 1 year. A dealer's certificate may be used by the holder to operate aircraft for production flight tests, in ordinary trade channels, and for demonstration purposes. This makes it unnecessary for the holder to register each aircraft that he owns in the course of his business during the year. It

greatly facilitates the dealers' operations and simplifies the Government's work by eliminating the need for a large number of applications for individual registration of the aircraft held in normal trade channels. The regulations presently governing the issuance and use of dealers' aircraft registration certificates are published as part 502 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A special problem has arisen because of certain language contained in section 503 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 523). Under that section, this Department is directed to "establish and maintain a system for the recording of" title documents affecting "civil aircraft of the United States." The term "civil aircraft of the United States" is defined in section 1 (15) of the act to mean "aircraft registered under this act." Our authority to record title documents might thus be considered limited to those affecting registered aircraft.

Where a dealer holds an aircraft under a dealers' aircraft registration certificate, the aircraft itself may not be considered to be registered under the act even though the dealer has been issued a certificate of registration valid for special use of the aircraft under our regulations. Accordingly, although we now place in our records documents received from the public which affect title to aircraft held under dealers' certificates, but not otherwise registered, some doubt exists that the persons who file them are afforded the full benefit of the priority provided in this section for recorded documents. (See footnote 3, 14 C. F. R. 503.3 (a) (4).)

It is important that this priority for recorded liens against aircraft held by manufacturers, distributors, and dealers under dealers' certificates be assured. This industry, like many others involving the sale of relatively high cost articles, requires credit for its operations. Lending institutions are reluctant to advance money against this equipment unless the security of their liens is assured.

The amendment which we propose in the enclosed bill would give specific statutory authority for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, and would provide that aircraft held under such certificates would be (to the extent provided in regulations of this department) "deemed registered under" the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This would make it possible to insure the validity of liens recorded against such aircraft.

We believe that this bill is highly desirable to facilitate the financing of the operations of aircraft manufacturers, distributors, and dealers, and we recommend it to the Congress for early enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER WILLIAMS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 22, 1958.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of January 17, 1958, acknowledged on January 20, requesting the comments of the General Accounting Office concerning S. 3016, 85th Congress 2d session, entitled "A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates."

We have no special information or knowledge as to the need for or desirability of the proposed legislation and, therefore, we make no recommendation with respect to its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill was reported to the Senate after its unanimous approval by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It merely provides for the registration of aircraft, so that lienholders may have their priority. The bill removes all doubt about such questions. It was introduced at the request of the Department of Commerce. No objection whatsoever has been raised to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973; 49 U. S. C. 401), as amended, is amended by adding, immediately following section 504 thereof (49 U. S. C. 524), a new section 505 to read as follows:

"DEALERS' AIRCRAFT REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES

"SEC. 505. The Secretary of Commerce may, by such reasonable regulations as he may find to be in the public interest, provide for the issuance, and for the suspension or revocation, of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, and for their use in connection with aircraft eligible for registration under this act by persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling aircraft. Aircraft owned by holders of dealers' aircraft registration certificates shall be deemed registered under this act to the extent that the Secretary of Commerce may, by regulation, provide. It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any regulation, or any term, condition, or limitation contained in any certificate, issued under this section."

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1311, S. 2114.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2114) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for field sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "following", to strike out "section" and insert "sections"; in line 6, after the word "are", to insert "specifically"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "any", to strike out "permanent"; and, on page 3, line 16, after the word "entitled", to strike out "An act making funds appropriated to the National Bureau of Standards available for certain types of expenditures" and insert "An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities in the Department of Commerce and for other purposes"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish the National Bureau of Standards," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 13. To the extent that funds are specifically appropriated therefor, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to acquire land for such field sites as are necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein.

"SEC. 14. Within the limits of funds which are appropriated for the National Bureau of Standards, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to undertake such construction of buildings and other facilities and to make such improvements to existing buildings, grounds, and other facilities occupied or used by the National Bureau of Standards as are necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein: *Provided,* That no improvement shall be made nor shall any building be constructed under this authority at a cost in excess of $40,000 unless specific provision is made therefor in the appropriation concerned.

"SEC. 15. In the performance of the functions of the National Bureau of Standards the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to undertake the following activities: (a) The purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards; (b) the repair and alteration of buildings and other plant facilities; (c) the rental of field sites and laboratory, office, and warehouse space; (d) the purchase of reprints from technical journals or other periodicals and the payment of page charges for the publication of research papers and reports in such journals; (e) the furnishing of food and shelter without repayment therefor to employees of the Government at Arctic and Antarctic stations; (f) for the conduct of observations on radio propagation phenomena in the Arctic or Antarctic regions, the appointment of employees at base rates established by the Secretary of Commerce which shall not exceed such maximum rates as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation concerned, and without regard to the civil service and classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and (g) the erection on leased property of specialized facilities and working and living quarters when the Secretary of Commerce determines that this will best serve the interests of the Government."

SEC. 2. Such act is further amended in section 11, paragraph (a), by striking out the word "therein" and substituting therefor the word "herein."

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes," approved July 21, 1950, is hereby repealed in its entirety.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, S. 2114 received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards so as to authorize the acquisition of field sites for the Bureau; to incorporate the provisions of Public Law 618, 81st Congress, 2d session, into the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards; to clarify the authority of the National Bureau of Standards to undertake improvements or construction projects and raise the limita-

tion on such projects from $25,000 to $40,000; to authorize certain construction on leased property; and to correct a minor error in a recently enacted amendment to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.

The bill received the unanimous approval of the departments concerned.

The necessity for the early passage of the bill is that the National Bureau of Standards, in playing a great part in the new so-called scientific and technological age as it relates to research in the Government, must have, in many instances, field sites in various parts of the country so as to conduct its operations. The bill simply enables the Bureau to erect quarters on such sites, and also on leased sites, for the purpose of conducting the operations necessary in the research program.

The matter is quite pressing, as it concerns the proposed radio propagation field sites, on which the Bureau is making antenna studies. It is also conducting ionospheric radio astronomy and upper atmosphere physics research, and is conducting many other tests in accordance with the broad program of the Government in the scientific field.

Five sites have been tentatively selected for the proposed radio-propagation work, four in the Colorado area, and one at Havana, Ill.

It will be necessary for the Bureau to come before the Committee on Appropriations, in all cases, to justify any expenditure of a large amount of money. But in some cases smaller buildings—costing $40,000 or less—are erected, for the conduct of these experiments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 2114) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REQUIREMENTS FOR INVESTMENT OF RESERVE FUNDS BY SUBSIDIZED VESSEL OPERATORS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1342, Senate bill 2255, amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2255) to amend section 607 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1177), is amended by inserting at the beginning of the first two paragraphs of subsection (d) thereof the designations "(1)" and "(2)," respectively, and by inserting at the end of such subsection (d) the following new subdivisions:

"(3) (A) Upon application of the contractor, the Secretary of Commerce, in his discretion, may permit the contractor to transfer not exceeding 50 percent of his capital reserve fund and 50 percent of his special reserve fund to a trustee which is incorporated as a bank or trust company under the laws of the United States, or of any State, and which is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, in trust nevertheless for the benefit of the contractor and of the United States as their interests are stated in this section (1) to hold in separate trusts the principal of the capital and special reserve funds so transferred, one trust for the capital reserve fund and one trust for the special reserve fund; (2) to invest and reinvest the principal of such trusts in such common stocks of corporations organized and existing under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia or of any State of the United States which are currently fully listed and registered upon an exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities exchange, and which would be acquired by prudent men of discretion and intelligence in such matters who are seeking a reasonable income and the preservation of their capital; (3) to accumulate the income from the capital reserve fund trust in such trust, to pay the income from the special reserve fund trust into the capital reserve fund trust, and to invest and reinvest such income in common stocks in which the trustee is authorized to invest principal under this subdivision (3); and (4) to pay to the contractor and the Secretary of Commerce, as trustees of the special reserve fund and the capital reserve fund, after reasonable notice, from the principal and accumulated income of the trusts such amounts, in cash, as the contractor and the Secretary of Commerce direct.

"(B) Consent by the contractor to an investment which is not authorized by this subdivision (3) shall not be a defense to the trustee. Such common stock trusts shall be revocable by the Secretary of Commerce at any time and upon notice of the revocation, the common stock trustee shall reduce the principal and accumulated income of such trusts to cash and shall pay such cash to the contractor and the Secretary of Commerce as trustees of the capital reserve fund and special reserve fund. In the administration of such common stock trusts, capital gains, stock dividends, and rights to purchase stock shall be considered principal; cash dividends, whenever earned, shall be considered income. At the end of the contractor's recapture period, however, after satisfaction of the contractor's recapture obligations, an amount of the special reserve fund trust equal to the value of the capital gains made (whether realized or not), the stock dividends declared, and the rights to purchase stock issued to the special reserve fund trust during such recapture period, to the extent the special reserve fund trust contains this amount, shall be transferred (in cash or in stock) to the capital reserve fund trust. For the purpose of determining the 50 percent of the capital reserve fund and the special reserve fund the transfer of which to a common stock trust the Secretary of Commerce may approve, the market value of each such fund as of the date of such transfer shall be used. The common stock trusts authorized by this subdivision (3) shall at all times remain a part of the capital reserve fund and the special reserve fund.

"(C) If immediately before a deposit is made in a capital or special reserve fund, 50 percent or more of the value of such fund is invested in common stock, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve, upon application of the contractor, the transfer of not exceeding 50 percent of such deposit to the common stock trustee upon the trusts authorized in this subdivision (3). When payments are made, or funds are withdrawn, from a capital reserve fund or a special reserve fund, as authorized in this section, if 50 percent or more of the value of such capital reserve fund or special reserve fund, as of the date of such payment or withdrawal, is invested in common stocks, such payment or withdrawal shall be made from the common stock trust in the proportion that the value of such common stock trust bears to the value of the entire capital reserve fund or special reserve fund. If, however, less than 50 percent of the value of such capital or special reserve fund, as of the date of such payment or withdrawal, is invested in common stocks, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, upon application by the contractor, to approve the allocation of the payment or withdrawal entirely to the portion of such capital or special reserve fund not invested in common stocks, or to approve the allocation of such payment or withdrawal between the common stock trust and the remainder of such capital or special reserve fund in any proportion, so long as the value of the common stock trust immediately after such withdrawal does not exceed 50 percent of the value of such capital or special reserve fund, and if the contractor makes no such application or if the allocation requested in such application is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce, then such payment or withdrawal shall be allocated in the manner above provided for when the value of the common stock trust is 50 percent or more of the value of the entire capital reserve fund or special reserve fund.

"(D) Trust indentures executed under the authority of this subdivision (3) may contain such other terms and conditions not inconsistent with this subdivision (3), as the Secretary of Commerce determines are desirable to protect the interests of the United States. The authority of the Secretary of Commerce to grant approvals, give directions, make determinations, and make regulations under this subdivision (3), and to act as trustee of the capital reserve fund and special reserve fund under this section may be delegated to the Maritime Administrator."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this bill also received the unanimous approval of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill has been subject to a great deal of discussion, following its introduction.

The bill would amend the second paragraph, of section 607 (d), Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the Federal Maritime Board/Maritime Administration, upon application of the contractor, to permit, in its discretion, investment by the operator of some or all of the contractor's capital and special reserve funds in approved securities, upon condition that the income from such securities be deposited in the capital reserve fund. This would eliminate the requirement that the funds be invested in interest-bearing securities, and would authorize investment in any approved securities, including common stocks.

The Comptroller General sent to the committee a statement regarding some of the criteria. Those criteria and suggestions as to how the money would be invested were incorporated in the bill.

Of course the real objective is not to let these moneys lie idle during the period when they are in the reserve fund. In the long run, the bill probably will save the Government a great deal of money, because the funds which are for maritime expansion, are now frozen. Many members, and also the Maritime

Board, thought that instead of having the funds lie idle they should be used as suggested, and probably in that way add a little to the fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF CLAIMS OF IMMUNITY FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1299, Senate bill 6, to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies as instrumentalities.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 6) to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies as instrumentalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment on page 3, line 2, after the word "to", to strike out "tax liabilities accruing" and insert "business activities occurring", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 4 of title 4 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 112. State and local taxation with respect to certain contracts with Federal Government.

"(a) Except as otherwise provided by law, no person shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for, any tax imposed by a State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to impose such a tax, with respect to any business activity or any person conducting any business activity on the ground that such person is—

"(1) a contractor performing work for the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof and acting as the agent of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof in the procurement of tangible property of any kind for use in the performance of the contract, or

"(2) selling tangible personal property or furnishing services to a person described in paragraph (1).

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any possession of the United States.

"(2) The term 'business activity' includes the selling, furnishing, fabricating, installing, repairing, leasing, renting, storage, distribution, use, or consumption of tangible personal property of any kind for a consideration."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 4 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"112. State and local taxation with respect to certain contracts with Federal Government."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to business activities occurring after the date of the enactment of this act.

OPPOSITION TO GRANTS TO COMMUNIST POLAND

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I strongly support the stand of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, in total opposition to our Government's allotting $98 million to Communist Poland.

The issue is national defense.

The satellite nations are the arsenals which maintain the Soviet war machine. Their unwilling people are enslaved to provide the food, the oil, the uranium, and the armament which the Soviet Union must have if it is to keep its war machine in high gear.

The Soviet economy is inherently wasteful. The cost of Party Commissars, purges, occupation troops, and economic espionage is so high that the Soviet Union must make up for its inefficiency by tribute exacted from its neighbors in a 20th century revival of human slavery.

While so-called experts and columnists grow lyrical with admiration for Soviet economic achievements, Soviet armies stand guard to drain off the past industrial and technological achievements of Polish agriculture and manufacturing, Czechoslovak uranium and arms manufacture, Hungarian coal and steel, and Rumanian oil.

All the vast extensions of Soviet power over free people since 1945 were necessary to fill the production quotas of the Soviet war economy.

Their conquest of Eastern Europe in 1945, their capture of China in the following years, and their planned expansion into the Near East and Indonesia today, are all part of their hunger for raw materials, labor, and minerals to feed the fires of war mongering.

There cannot be two opinions about American policy at this moment.

The greatest contribution we can make to peace is to shut off the war supplies the Soviet war machine obtains from its conquered provinces.

When the Soviet rulers are once again limited to Soviet food production, Soviet oil, and Soviet war materials, manufactured under the eyes of their police-state apparatus, the bold policies of the Soviet leaders will become less bold, their aggressiveness will become less violent, and their power to make the free nations tremble will come to an end.

There can be no excuse for American Government policies which permit the Soviet Union to get its war supplies by enslavement of the satellites.

When the United States was the granary and arsenal of the Allies in 1917 and in 1939, the Germans directed all their energies to cutting off the ships which carried supplies from the United States to the British Isles and the war fronts. We devoted every ounce of energy to keep those lanes open. Why? Because without a constant stream of supplies, no war machine can function.

The same military principle applies today. Without a constant stream of supplies from the satellites, the Soviet war machine could not be maintained, and Khrushchev's roar would become a beep.

The success of American efforts to prevent a Soviet-made war depends on our using every means to interrupt the flow of grain, oil, and arms from the outlying states to the heart of the Soviet empire.

The obvious place to begin cutting down Soviet war supplies is in the satellite nations, whose people were first robbed of their national freedom, before they were reduced to economic slavery.

It is incredible that any American official would seriously recommend strengthening the supply lines of the ruthless Soviet war machine. But the proposal to give Poland the use of $98 million of American wealth, mostly in the form of American farm products, is openly defended on the ground that it will pacify Polish farmers who are angry at the Soviet forcible grain collection. Thus it is proposed that Americans help quiet the patriotic resistance of the Polish farmers to Soviet exploitation.

Every time we keep a bushel of wheat, or barrel of oil, or a carlot of munitions, produced by satellite slave workers, from the Soviet rulers, we help free the people of Indonesia from the threat of Soviet conquest. We help free the people of Korea from a new invasion. We help free the Near East, and Western Europe, and the United States itself from the growing Soviet threat. This is the first step, and the indispensable step, to the goal of peace and freedom for all nations.

I have spoken of the military issue because that issue, for some strange reason, is most neglected. But the moral issue is equally strong.

The satellite countries were freed by our arms. The Soviet Union kept its airmen grounded in Eastern Europe, while our men were dying in the fight to defeat the German Luftwaffe. Stalin gave his solemn word to us that he would free the countries of Eastern Europe and permit them to live their own lives.

President Roosevelt told Stalin that the American people would never compromise on that question, and that friendly relations with the Soviet Union could not be preserved unless the Soviet rulers kept their pledge.

Why should we refuse now to support President Roosevelt's last statement to Stalin? The President, at that moment, was giving voice to moral sentiments which are held firmly by every American.

President Eisenhower restated our determination in his first inaugural address. Americans can never consent to have American arms and American blood used to impose tyranny on any people. The issue will never be settled—until it is settled right.

Our deepest self-interest leads straight to a policy of blocking Soviet exploitation of the satellite nations.

Our highest moral principles lead straight to a policy of blocking Soviet restoration of human slavery with help we gave her only to preserve her own independence.

Our military and our moral interests lead to the single aim—to keep the Soviet Union from maintaining its war supplies by human slavery. Furthermore, by cutting off its tribute from the satellites, we prevent the Soviet war machine

from enslaving the new millions of helpless human beings who wait in fear in the path of its advance.

When self-interest and idealism lead clearly to one policy, what strange forces in our Government are trying to persuade us to do what is directly opposite to our military necessity and our deepest moral instincts? Who in our Government is willing to help the Soviet Union intimidate the rest of the Free World?

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 3, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1568. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; and

S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate now adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, March 4, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 3, 1958:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, 540A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ralph J. Steinhauer, Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, Maple Shade, N. J., offered the following prayer:

O God, most high, Who created all things, we thank Thee for the blessings of life, for those who watch over us, for our Nation that guards and protects us.

We thank Thee for Thy strengthening hand which comes to us through Thy holy spirit.

In our need, O God, we call and come to Thee. Wilt Thou bring us to a spirit of understanding and brotherhood?

Turn us from all that is unreal. Turn us in our moments of decision from all earthly things, so that our faltering feet may not suffer us to fall.

Give our representatives courage and strength for our times. Suffer not their trust in Thee to fail. Give them a clear understanding of Thy will, a lofty purpose, and unfaltering speech for good.

Bless all who bear the weight of responsibility, that they with us may show forth the power of Thy name.

In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 27, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5836. An act to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 734. An act to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

THE LATE HONORABLE LAWRENCE COWLE PHIPPS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Lawrence Cowle Phipps, of Denver, who served in the United States Senate for two terms, from 1919 to 1931. Senator Phipps passed away in Los Angeles, Calif., at the age of 95. I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of his passing.

Senator Phipps was born and raised in Amwels Township, Washington County, Pa., on August 30, 1862. He was the son of Rev. and Mrs. Henry Phipps. His father was born in England and his mother was born in Scotland. He went to school in Pittsburgh and graduated from Pittsburgh High School in 1879. After leaving school he was employed in one of the iron mills owned by the Carnegie Co. He filled various positions until that company was absorbed by the United States Steel Corp. in 1901, at which time he resigned as vice president and treasurer of the Carnegie Co. and retired from active business. From the time of his retirement he made his home in Denver and took an active part in the industrial, political, social, and religious life of Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Colorado in his tribute of respect to the memory of the late United States Senator Lawrence Phipps.

Senator Phipps was truly one of the great men of Colorado. He was an able and a most successful businessman. He was a devoted public servant. His record of achievement shows him to have been a most effective statesman. He served his State and Nation in the United States Senate during a most difficult and trying period. During his service in such capacity he rendered outstanding service to his State and Nation. His was a long life, having attained the age of 95 before his passing. During his later years he made his home in California. However, during all this time he maintained an active interest in the welfare of Colorado in particular and in the Nation in general. It was my privilege to hear from him occasionally on matters of interest to the State of Colorado since beginning my service in the House of Representatives in 1949.

I extend my sympathy to his family and to his countless friends who are grieved by his passing.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to thank my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I wish to join with our colleagues from Colorado in expressing our distress at the loss of a great man, a former Senator from Colorado, Lawrence C. Phipps, who served for 12 years in the United States Senate.

He was a friend of all of us; especially did he help the West. He was an example of the typical American boy coming up from the most humble type of work in a steel mill to the very top in industrial leadership.

After reaching this position in industry he retired to Colorado and became active in politics, was elected on the Republican ticket to the United States Senate in 1918 and reelected in 1924. He was not a candidate for reelection in 1930. He was one of our great leaders of Colorado and the West.

I am sorry indeed to learn of his passing. The Colorado delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, extend our deepest sympathy to the family of Senator Phipps.

I include from the Washington Post and Times Herald a short biography of Senator Phipps:

LAWRENCE PHIPPS, 95; SERVED IN UNITED STATES SENATE

LOS ANGELES, March 2.—Lawrence C. Phipps, 95, who helped Andrew Carnegie build his steel company and later served two terms in the United States Senate from Colorado, died last night.

Phipps joined the Carnegie Co. in Pittsburgh as an 18-year-old millhand and was one of its top executives when it was merged into the United States Steel Co. in 1900.

He retired to Denver at the age of 38 as one of the largest individual stockholders in the newly formed giant of the steel industry.

Mr. Phipps was elected to the Senate in 1918 and reelected in 1924. Federal aid for highway construction and the building of

Hoover Dam were two of the programs he was closely identified with during his Senate career.

He retired at the end of his second term in 1931 and since then had devoted himself to his wide-ranging business investments and his large family. He died at his winter home in Los Angeles after a brief illness.

He leaves his wife; 3 sons, Lawrence, Allan, and Gerald Phipps, all of Denver; and 3 daughters, Mrs. William White of Haverford, Pa., and Mrs. Van Holt Garrett, and Mrs. Donald Bromfield of Denver.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of our departed friend, the late Senator Phipps. He represented Colorado in the United States Senate for 12 years.

Senator Phipps had an outstanding business career and had actually retired from business when he came to the State of Colorado. There he became interested in public affairs, and his contribution to the development of the west since his many years of residence there has been greatly appreciated by the people of my State. Further than that, the people of the State recognize that not only was he an outstanding statesman, but he was also one of their leaders. While it is true that he had been retired from public life for many years at the time of his passing, and had lived to the ripe old age of 95, we in Colorado will miss him.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Senator Phipps was truly a great American. He served with distinction in the United States Senate. For many years he was one of our leading citizens in Colorado. His life is an inspiration and a challenge to the young man of today.

Senator Phipps was called upon frequently to help charitable causes, and contributed liberally to the many groups and organizations who sought financial assistance. He founded and endowed the Agnes Memorial Sanitorium in Denver for the treatment of tuberculosis. He received an honorary degree of master of arts from the University of Denver.

He voluntarily retired from the Senate and did not seek reelection in 1930. I am confident that the voters of Colorado would have given him another term in the Senate, but he preferred to return to Denver and devote his time to his business enterprises.

I was proud and happy to have Senator Phipps as a friend. I shall always be grateful for his many kindnesses to me. I visited with him frequently in Denver and always valued his advice and counsel. Mrs. Chenoweth and I had the pleasure of a visit with him in Santa Monica about 3 years ago, and found him alert and enjoying life.

The passing of Senator Phipps is an irreparable loss, not alone to Colorado, but to the entire Nation. He was a faithful public servant while in the Senate, and an outstanding citizen in private life. It is impossible to place a value on the contribution he made to the growth and development of Colorado.

Senator Phipps is survived by his widow and six children: Lawrence C., Jr., Allan R., and Gerald H., all of Denver; Mrs. William White, of Haverford, Pa.; Mrs. Van Holt N. Garrett, and Mrs. Donald C. Bromfield, both of Denver.

I extend my deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Phipps and each member of his family.

ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. BAILEY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of advising my colleagues that I am today offering a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that Eric Johnston should immediately register and report as a lobbyist.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is brief and reads as follows:

Whereas Eric Johnston, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., has launched a nationwide campaign to solicit funds to secure the passage by Congress of legislation extending the President's power to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; and

Whereas the said Eric Johnston has publicly announced on a television program that he has received contributions for such purpose amounting to over $50,000; and

Whereas the said Eric Johnston has sent numerous letters to persons and firms throughout the United States soliciting funds for such purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Eric Johnston is required by the terms of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act immediately to register and report under such act.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the action taken by my colleague, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as reported in the press last week, in sending back to the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior their budget requests for 1959 and calling their attention to the fact that the programs which they have sent up here are completely inadequate, particularly in light of the current economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the views so ably expressed, in his letters to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, and I have today written to the Secretary of the Army giving him my views and explaining why I believe the Bureau of the Budget would be justified in increasing its request, particularly in those areas which have suffered economic disasters, to provide an accelerated program which would not only help relieve the current recession but which would provide needed relief through the construction of projects for which Congress has already given its approval by authorizing appropriations which should be made now.

I think I am expressing the views of many of my colleagues, who like myself, have been sympathetic to a realistic mutual aid program, but who have reached the logical conclusion that the United States cannot continue such a program at the expense of destroying our economy here at home. If we can afford to be generous with our friends and allies in foreign countries, we can certainly afford to follow a more generous policy in the appropriation of funds for the acceleration of the programs which this Congress has approved here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that those departments will take cognizance of the matter and that we can have an increased public-works program to take up some of the slack and to avert any further economic disturbances throughout the country.

It is certainly time for this administration to take stock of what is happening throughout the United States. We must admire the courage of our great chairman of the Appropriations Committee who has issued this challenge to the administration to face up to the issues. If the Bureau of the Budget does not revise its estimate in line with the views of Chairman CANNON, then, of course, that committee will be justified in throwing aside the budget requests, disregarding the recommendations of the administration, and proceeding to do the things that need to be done.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. FLOOD. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in all coal mines regardless of the number employed at each operation.

The Federal act now covers only those mining operations that regularly employ 14 or more persons, but over the past 3-year period accidents occurring in what are classified as title I mines—employing less than 14 persons—have been steadily increasing.

During the 1955–57 period, total fatal accidents in title I underground mines have increased from 19.2 percent in 1955 to 25.9 percent during the year of 1957.

In view of these figures it becomes obvious that protection must be given these smaller installations by providing an inspection program designed to safeguard the lives of those employees working in these so-called title I mines. In my judgment, anyone who goes below the surface of the ground to extract either anthracite or bituminous coal is entitled to every and all precautions that the Federal Government can provide.

This is a humanitarian approach to the mine-safety problem and should not be otherwise.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the 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.

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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish an experiment station or stations for the purpose of carrying on a program of research and experimentation—

(1) to determine species of fishes most suitable for culture on a commercial basis in shallow reservoirs and flooded ricelands;

(2) to determine methods for production of fingerling fishes for stocking in commercial reservoirs;

(3) to develop methods for the control of parasites and diseases of brood fishes and of fingerlings prior to stocking;

(4) to develop economical methods for raising the more desirable species of fishes to a marketable size;

(5) to determine the effects of fish-rice rotations, including crops other than rice commonly grown on rice farms, upon both the fish and other crops;

(6) to develop methods for the control of obnoxious weeds developing in the fish-rice rotation; and

(7) to develop suitable methods for harvesting the fish crop and preparing it for marketing, including a study of sport fishing as a means of such harvest.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized (1) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands, to construct such buildings, to acquire such equipment and apparatus, and to employ such officers and employees as he deems necessary; (2) to cooperate with State and other institutions and agencies upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be appropriate; and (3) to make public the results of such research and experiments conducted pursuant to the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. The Department of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in carrying out the provisions of this act by furnishing such information and assistance as may be requested by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 8, between the words "determine" and "the" insert the following: ", in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture".

On page 2, line 10, following the word "crops;", insert the following: "and".

On page 2, delete lines 11 and 12.

On page 2, line 13, delete "(7)", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(6)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF LANDS ON CERTAIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8544) to provide for the restoration of tribal ownership of all vacant and undisposed-of ceded lands on certain Indian reservations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands now or hereafter classified as vacant and undisposed-of ceded lands (including townsite lots) on the following named Indian reservations are hereby restored to tribal ownership, subject to valid existing rights:

Reservation and State:	*Approximate acreage*
Klamath River, Calif.	159.57
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	12,877.65
Crow, Mont.	5,480.95
Fort Peck, Mont.	41,450.13
Spokane, Wash.	5,451.00

Provided, That such restoration shall not apply to any lands while they are within reclamation projects heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. Title to the lands restored to tribal ownership by this act shall be held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe or tribes, and such lands are hereby added to and made a part of the existing reservations for such tribe or tribes.

SEC. 3. The lands restored to tribal ownership by this act may be sold or exchanged by the tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

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.

TO CONVEY CERTAIN INDIAN LAND FOR CHURCH PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8958) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Indian land to St. Anthony's Parish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the wishes of the General Council of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, as expressed by referendum vote on May 14, 1957, is hereby authorized to convey to St. Anthony's Parish for church purposes, and to the town of Flambeau, Wis., for cemetery purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America and of the said band in and to the following described tracts of lands:

To St. Anthony's Parish:

Lot 1, block 26, in section 5, township 40 north, range 5 east, fourth principal meridian, Wisconsin, plat of the village of Lac du Flambeau, Wis., and that portion of Church Street lying northwesterly of State Highway No. 47, subject to all existing valid rights-of-way.

To the town of Flambeau:

A parcel of land in the west fractional half of the northeast quarter of section 6, township 40 north, range 5 east, fourth principal meridian, Wisconsin, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at a point 25 feet east of the center of section 6; thence north 33 feet to a point of beginning, said point being on the east right-of-way line of the Pokegama Trail; thence north along said right-of-way line, a distance of 1,485 feet; thence east along the south right-of-way line of said trail, a distance of 396 feet to the drainage canal; thence south 31 degrees east along said drainage canal, a distance of 1,089 feet to swamp; thence southwesterly along edge of said swamp, a distance of 1,221 feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be subject to the condition that title to the land shall revert to the United States of America in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, when the land is no longer needed or used for the purpose for which the land is conveyed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "St. Anthony's Parish" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the diocese of Superior, Superior, Wis."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "St. Anthony's Parish" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the diocese of Superior, Superior, Wis."

Page 3, line 1, following the word "Indians", insert the words ", its successors or assigns."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Indian land to the diocese of Superior, Superior, Wis., for church purposes, and to the town of Flambeau, Wis., for cemetery purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFORM SERVICE AND CHARGES FOR BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10320) to provide for additional charges to reflect certain costs in the acceptance of business reply cards, letters in business-reply envelopes, and other matter under

business-reply labels for transmission in the mails without prepayment of postage, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 940; 39 U. S. C. 303), is amended to read as follows:

"ADDITIONAL CHARGES FOR TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN MAIL MATTERS WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF POSTAGE

"SEC. 2. Under such regulations and conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, without prepayment of postage, business reply cards, letters in business reply envelopes, and any other matter under business reply labels. Postage thereon at the regular first-class rate, and additional charges thereon (which shall be prescribed by the Postmaster General) shall be collected on delivery. Such additional charges shall equal, as nearly as is practicable, the approximate administrative and operating costs incurred by the Post Office Department with respect to the collection of postage and other lawful charges thereon, but such additional charges shall not be adjusted more frequently than once every 2 years."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall become effective on July 1, 1958.

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.

MONTANA POLICE JURISDICTION OVER BLACKFEET HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to retrocede to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway and its connections with the Glacier National Park road system, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk will read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such concurrent police jurisdiction as has been ceded to the United States of America over the rights-of-way of the Blackfeet Highway, including the highway itself, and over the rights-of-way of its connections with the Glacier National Park road system on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, including the highways themselves, the same being the jurisdiction ceded by the act of the Legislature of Montana, approved February 27, 1929 (laws of Montana, 1929, p. 63), and accepted by act of Congress approved May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 144).

SEC. 2. Following acceptance by the State of Montana of the retrocession provided herein, the laws and regulations of the United States pertaining to Glacier National Park shall cease to apply to the territory of said rights-of-way and highways.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ISSUANCE OF CHECKS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 916) to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in case of the death, resignation, or separation from office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department the accounts of such disbursing officer may be continued and payments made in his name by the assistant disbursing officers designated by the Postmaster General or designated by any official of the Post Office Department authorized by the Postmaster General to make such designation, for a period of time not to extend beyond the last day of the second month following the month in which such death, resignation, or separation shall occur. Such accounts and payments shall be allowed, audited, and settled, and the checks signed in the name of the former disbursing officer for the Post Office Department shall be honored in the same manner as if the former disbursing officer for the Post Office Department had continued in office. The former disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, his estate, or the surety on his official bond, shall not be subject to any legal liability or penalty for the official accounts and defaults of the assistant disbursing officers acting in the name or in the place of the former disbursing officer, but such assistant disbursing officers and their sureties shall be responsible therefor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO A BEAR RIVER COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1086) granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River compact, and for related purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., The consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to the Bear River Compact entered into by the States of Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming. The compact reads as follows:

"BEAR RIVER COMPACT

"The State of Idaho, the State of Utah, and the State of Wyoming, acting through their respective Commissioners after negotiations participated in by a representative of the United States of America appointed by the President, have agreed to a Bear River Compact as follows:

"Article I

"A. The major purpose of this Compact are to remove the causes of present and future controversy over the distribution and use of the waters of the Bear River; to provide for efficient use of water for multiple purposes; to permit additional development of the water resources of Bear River; and to promote interstate comity.

"B. The physical and all other conditions peculiar to the Bear River constitute the basis for this Compact. No general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream is intended to be established.

"Article II

"As used in this Compact the term

"1. 'Bear River' means the Bear River and its tributaries from its source in the Uinta Mountains to its mouth in Great Salt Lake;

"2. 'Bear Lake' means Bear Lake and Mud Lake;

"3. 'Upper Division' means the portion of Bear River from its source in the Uinta Mountains to and including Pixley Dam, a diversion dam in the Southeast Quarter of Section 25, Township 23 North, Range 120 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"4. 'Central Division' means the portion of the Bear River from Pixley Dam to and including Stewart Dam, a diversion dam in Section 34, Township 13 South, Range 44 East, Boise Base and Meridian, Idaho;

"5. 'Lower Division' means the portion of the Bear River between Stewart Dam and Great Salt Lake, including Bear Lake and its tributary drainage;

"6. 'Upper Utah Section Diversions' means the sum of all diversions in second-feet from the Bear River and the tributaries of the Bear River joining the Bear River upstream from the point where the Bear River crosses the Utah-Wyoming State line above Evanston, Wyoming; excluding the diversions by the Hilliard East Fork Canal, Lannon Canal, Lone Mountain Ditch, and Hilliard West Side Canal;

"7. 'Upper Wyoming Section Diversions' means the sum of all diversions in second-feet from the Bear River main stem from the point where the Bear River crosses the Utah-Wyoming State line above Evanston, Wyoming, to the point where the Bear River crosses the Wyoming-Utah State line east of Woodruff, Utah, and including the diversions by the Hilliard East Fork Canal, Lannon Canal, Lone Mountain Ditch, and Hilliard West Side Canal;

"8. 'Lower Utah Section Diversions' means the sum of all diversions in second-feet from the Bear River main stem from the point where the Bear River crosses the Wyoming-Utah State line east of Woodruff, Utah, to the point where the Bear River crosses the Utah-Wyoming State line northeast of Randolph, Utah;

"9. 'Lower Wyoming Section Diversions' means the sum of all diversions in second-feet from the Bear River main stem from the point where the Bear River crosses the Utah-Wyoming State line northeast of Randolph to and including the diversion at Pixley Dam;

"10. 'Commission' means the Bear River Commission, organized pursuant to Article III of this Compact;

"11. 'Water user' means a person, corporation, or other entity having a right to divert water from the Bear River for beneficial use;

"12. 'Second-foot' means a flow of one cubic foot of water per second of time passing a given point;

"13. 'Acre-foot' means the quantity of water required to cover one acre to a depth of one foot, equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet;

"14. 'Biennium' means the 2-year period commencing on July 1 of the first odd numbered year after the effective date of this Compact and each 2-year period thereafter;

"15. 'Water year' means the period beginning October 1 and ending September 30 of the following year;

"16. 'Direct flow' means all water flowing in a natural watercourse except water released from storage or imported from a source other than the Bear River watershed;

"17. 'Border Gaging Station' means the stream flow gaging station in Idaho on the Bear River above Thomas Fork near the Wyoming-Idaho boundary line in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 14 South, Range 46 East, Boise Base and Meridian, Idaho;

"18. 'Smiths Fork' means a Bear River tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming and flows in a general southwesterly direction to its confluence with Bear River near Cokeville, Wyoming;

"19. 'Grade Creek' means a Smiths Fork tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming and flows in a westerly direction and in its natural channel is tributary to Smiths Fork in Section 17, Township 25 North, Range 118 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"20. 'Pine Creek' means a Smiths Fork tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming, emerging from its mountain canyon in Section 34, Township 25 North, Range 118 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyo-

ming, and in its natural channel is tributary to Smiths Fork in Section 36, Township 25 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"21. 'Bruner Creek' and 'Pine Creek Springs' means Smiths Fork tributaries which rise in Lincoln County, Wyoming, in Sections 31 and 32, Township 25 North, Range 118 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, and in their natural channels are tributary to Smiths Fork in Section 36, Township 25 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"22. 'Spring Creek' means a Smiths Fork tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming, in Sections 1 and 2, Township 24 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, and flows in a general westerly direction to its confluence with Smiths Fork in Section 4, Township 24 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"23. 'Sublette Creek' means the Bear River tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming and flows in a general westerly direction to its confluence with Bear River in Section 20, Township 24 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"24. 'Hobble Creek' means the Smiths Fork tributary which rises in Lincoln County, Wyoming, and flows in a general southwesterly direction to its confluence with Smiths Fork in Section 35, Township 28 North, Range 118 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"25. 'Hilliard East Fork Canal' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the right bank of the East Fork of Bear River in Summit County, Utah, at a point West 1,310 feet and North 330 feet from the Southeast corner of Section 16, Township 2 North, Range 10 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah, and runs in a northerly direction crossing the Utah-Wyoming State line into the Southwest Quarter of Section 21, Township 12 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"26. 'Lannon Canal' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the right bank of the Bear River in Summit County, Utah, East 1,480 feet from the West Quarter corner of Section 19, Township 3 North, Range 10 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah, and runs in a northerly direction crossing the Utah-Wyoming State line into the South Half of Section 20, Township 12 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"27. 'Lone Mountain Ditch' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the right bank of the Bear River in Summit County, Utah, North 1,535 feet and East 1,120 feet from the West Quarter corner of Section 19, Township 3 North, Range 10 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah, and runs in a northerly direction crossing the Utah-Wyoming State line into the South Half of Section 20, Township 12 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"28. 'Hilliard West Side Canal' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the right bank of the Bear River in Summit County, Utah, at a point North 2,190 feet and East 1,450 feet from the South Quarter corner of Section 13, Township 3 North, Range 9 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah, and runs in a northerly direction crossing the Utah-Wyoming State line into the South Half of Section 20, Township 12 North, Range 119 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming;

"29. 'Francis Lee Canal' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the left bank of the Bear River in Uinta County, Wyoming, in the Northeast Quarter of Section 30, Township 18 North, Range 120 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, and runs in a westerly direction across the Wyoming-Utah State line into Section 16, Township 9 North, Range 8 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah;

"30. 'Chapman Canal' means that irrigation canal which diverts water from the left bank of the Bear River in Uinta County, Wyoming, in the Northeast Quarter of Section 36, Township 16 North, Range 121 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, and runs in a northerly direction crossing over the low divide into the Saleratus drainage basin near the Southeast corner of Section 36, Township 17 North, Range 121 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, and then in a general westerly direction crossing the Wyoming-Utah State line;

"31. 'Neponset Reservoir' means that reservoir located principally in Sections 34 and 35, Township 8 North, Range 7 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Utah, having a capacity of 6,900 acre-feet.

"Article III

"A. There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the 'Bear River Commission' which is hereby constituted a legal entity and in such name shall exercise the powers hereinafter specified. The Commission shall be composed of nine Commissioners, three Commissioners representing each signatory State, and if appointed by the President, one additional Commissioner representing the United States of America who shall serve as chairman, without vote. Each Commissioner, except the chairman, shall have one vote. The State Commissioners shall be selected in accordance with State law. Six Commissioners who shall include two Commissioners from each State shall constitute a quorum. The vote of at least two-thirds of the Commissioners when a quorum is present shall be necessary for the action of the Commission.

"B. The compensation and expenses of each Commissioner and each adviser shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All expenses incurred by the Commission in the administration of this Compact, except those paid by the United States of America, shall be paid by the signatory States on an equal basis.

"C. The Commission shall have power to:

"1. Adopt by-laws, rules, and regulations not inconsistent with this Compact;

"2. Acquire, hold, convey or otherwise dispose of property;

"3. Employ such persons and contract for such services as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this Compact;

"4. Sue and be sued as a legal entity in any court of record of a signatory State, and in any court of the United States having jurisdiction of such action;

"5. Cooperate with State and Federal agencies in matters relating to water pollution of interstate significance;

"6. Perform all functions required of it by this Compact and do all things necessary, proper or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, independently or in cooperation with others, including State and Federal agencies.

"D. The Commission shall:

"1. Enforce this Compact and its orders made hereunder by suit or other appropriate action;

"2. Annually compile a report covering the work of the Commission for the water year ending the previous September 30 and transmit it to the President of the United States and to the Governors of the signatory States on or before April 1 of each year;

"3. Prepare and transmit to the Governors of the signatory States, and to the President of the United States on or before a date to be determined by the Commission, a report of expenditures during the current biennium, and an estimate of requirements for the following biennium.

"Article IV

"Rights to direct flow water shall be administered in each signatory State under State law, with the following limitations:

"A. When there is a water emergency, as hereinafter defined for each division, water shall be distributed therein as provided below.

"1. Upper Division

"a. When the divertible flow as defined below for the Upper Division is less than 1,250 second-feet, a water emergency shall be deemed to exist therein and such divertible flow is allocated for diversion in the river sections of the Division as follows:

"Upper Utah Section Diversions—0.6 percent,

"Upper Wyoming Section Diversions—49.3 percent,

"Lower Utah Section Diversions—40.5 percent,

"Lower Wyoming Section Diversions—9.6 percent.

"Such divertible flow shall be the total of the following five items:

"(1) Upper Utah Section Diversions in second-feet,

"(2) Upper Wyoming Section Diversions in second-feet,

"(3) Lower Utah Section Diversions in second-feet,

"(4) Lower Wyoming Section Diversions in second-feet,

"(5) The flow in second-feet passing Pixley Dam.

"b. The Hilliard East Fork Canal, Lannon Canal, Lone Mountain Ditch, and Hilliard West Side Canal, which divert water in Utah to irrigate lands in Wyoming, shall be supplied from the divertible flow allocated to the Upper Wyoming Sections Diversions.

"c. The Chapman, Bear River, and Francis Lee Canals, which divert water from the main stem of Bear River in Wyoming to irrigate lands in both Wyoming and Utah, shall be supplied from the divertible flow allocated to the Upper Wyoming Section Diversions.

"d. The Beckwith Quinn West Side Canal, which diverts water from the main stem of Bear River in Utah to irrigate lands in both Utah and Wyoming, shall be supplied from the divertible flow allocated to the Lower Utah Section Diversions.

"e. If for any reason the aggregate of all diversions in a river section of the Upper Division does not equal the allocation of water thereto, the unused portion of such allocation shall be available for use in the other river sections in the Upper Division in the following order: (1) In the other river section of the same State in which the unused allocation occurs; and (2) In the river sections of the other State. No permanent right of use shall be established by the distribution of water pursuant to this paragraph e.

"f. Water allocated to the several sections shall be distributed in each section in accordance with State law.

"2. Central Division

"a. When either the divertible flow as hereinafter defined for the Central Division is less than 870 second-feet, or the flow of the Bear River at Border Gaging Station is less than 350 second-feet, whichever shall first occur, a water emergency shall be deemed to exist in the Central Division and the total of all diversions in Wyoming from Grade Creek, Pine Creek, Bruner Creek and Pine Creek Springs, Spring Creek, Sublette Creek, Smiths Fork, and all the tributaries of Smiths Fork above the mouth of Hobble Creek including Hobble Creek, and from the main stem of the Bear River between Pixley Dam and the point where the river crosses the Wyoming-Idaho State line near Border shall be limited for the benefit of the State of Idaho, to not exceeding forty-three (43)

percent of the divertible flow. The remaining fifty-seven (57) percent of the divertible flow shall be available for use in Idaho in the Central Division, but if any portion of such allocation is not used therein it shall be available for use in Idaho in the Lower Division.

"The divertible flow for the Central Division shall be the total of the following three items:

"(1) Diversions in second-feet in Wyoming consisting of the sum of all diversions from Grade Creek, Pine Creek, Bruner Creek and Pine Creek Springs, Spring Creek, Sublette Creek, and Smiths Fork and all the tributaries of Smiths Fork above the mouth of Hobble Creek including Hobble Creek, and the main stem of the Bear River between Pixley Dam and the point where the river crosses the Wyoming-Idaho State line near Border, Wyoming.

"(2) Diversions in second-feet in Idaho from the Bear River main stem from the point where the river crosses the Wyoming-Idaho State line near Border to Stewart Dam including West Fork Canal which diverts at Stewart Dam.

"(3) Flow in second-feet of the Rainbow Inlet Canal and of the Bear River passing downstream from Stewart Dam.

"b. The Cook Canal, which diverts water from the main stem of the Bear River in Wyoming to irrigate lands in both Wyoming and Idaho, shall be considered a Wyoming diversion and shall be supplied from the divertible flow allocated to Wyoming.

"c. Water allocated to each State shall be distributed in accordance with State law.

3. Lower Division

"a. When the flow of water across the Idaho-Utah boundary line is insufficient to satisfy water rights in Utah, any water user in Utah may file a petition with the Commission alleging that by reason of diversions in Idaho he is being deprived of water to which he is justly entitled, and that by reason thereof, a water emergency exists, and requesting distribution of water under the direction of the Commission. If the Commission finds a water emergency exists, it shall put into effect water delivery schedules based on priority of rights and prepared by the Commission without regard to the boundary line for all or any part of the Division, and during such emergency, water shall be delivered in accordance with such schedules by the State official charged with the administration of public waters.

"B. The Commission shall have authority upon its own motion (1) to declare a water emergency in any or all river divisions based upon its determination that there are diversions which violate this Compact and which encroach upon water rights in a lower State, (2) to make appropriate orders to prevent such encroachments, and (3) to enforce such orders by action before State administrative officials or by court proceedings.

"C. When the flow of water in an interstate tributary across a State boundary line is insufficient to satisfy water rights on such tributary in a lower State, any water user may file a petition with the Commission alleging that by reason of diversions in an upstream State he is being deprived of water to which he is justly entitled and that by reason thereof a water emergency exists, and requesting distribution of water under the direction of the Commission. If the Commission finds that a water emergency exists and that interstate control of water of such tributary is necessary, it shall put into effect water delivery schedules based on priority of rights and prepared without regard to the State boundary line. The State officials in charge of water distribution on interstate tributaries may appoint and fix the compensation and expenses of a joint water commissioner for each tributary. The proportion of the compensation and expenses to be paid by each State shall be determined by the ratio between the number of acres therein which are irrigated by diversions from such tributary, and the total number of acres irrigated from such tributary.

"D. In preparing interstate water delivery schedules the Commission, upon notice and after public hearings, shall make findings of fact as to the nature, priority and extent of water rights, rates of flow, duty of water, irrigated acreages, types of crops, time of use, and related matters; provided that such schedules shall recognize and incorporate therein priority of water rights as adjudicated in each of the signatory States. Such findings of fact shall, in any court or before any tribunal, constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

"E. Water emergencies provided for herein shall terminate on October 15 of each year unless terminated sooner or extended by the Commission.

"Article V

"A. Existing storage rights in reservoirs heretofore constructed above Stewart Dam are as follows:

"Idaho	324 acre-feet
"Utah	11,850 acre-feet
"Wyoming	2,150 acre-feet

Additional rights are hereby granted to store in any water year above Stewart Dam, 35,500 acre-feet of Bear River water and no more for use in Utah and Wyoming; and to store in any water year in Idaho or Wyoming on Thomas Fork 1,000 acre-feet of water for use in Idaho. Such additional storage rights shall be subordinate to, and shall not be exercised when the effect thereof will be to impair or interfere with (1) existing direct flow rights for consumptive use in any river division and (2) existing storage rights above Stewart Dam, but shall not be subordinate to any right to store water in Bear Lake or elsewhere below Stewart Dam. One-half of the 35,500 acre-feet of additional storage right above Stewart Dam so granted to Utah and Wyoming is hereby allocated to Utah, and the remaining one-half thereof is allocated to Wyoming, but in order to attain the most beneficial use of such additional storage consistent with the requirements of future water development projects, the three Commissioners for Utah and the three Commissioners for Wyoming are hereby authorized, subject to ratification by the legislature of Utah and the legislature of Wyoming, to modify by written agreement the allocations of such additional storage.

"B. The waters of Bear Lake below elevation 5,912.91 feet, Utah Power & Light Company Bear Lake datum (the equivalent of elevation 5,915.66 feet based on the sea level datum of 1929 through the Pacific Northwest Supplementary Adjustment of 1947) shall constitute a reserve for irrigation. The water of such reserve shall not be released solely for the generation of power, except in emergency, but after release for irrigation it may be used in generating power if not inconsistent with its use for irrigation. Any water in Bear Lake in excess of that constituting the irrigation reserve may be used solely for the generation of power or for other beneficial uses. As new reservoir capacity above the Stewart Dam is constructed to provide additional storage pursuant to paragraph A of this Article, the Commission shall make a finding in writing as to the quantity of additional storage and shall thereupon make an order increasing the irrigation reserve in accordance with the following table:

Additional storage acre-feet	Lake surface elevation Utah Power & Light Company Bear Lake datum
5,000	5,913.24
10,000	5,913.56
15,000	5,913.87
20,000	5,914.15
25,000	5,914.41
30,000	5,914.61
35,500	5,914.69
36,500	5,914.70

"C. Subject to existing rights, each State shall have the use of water for farm and ranch domestic, and stock watering purposes, and subject to State law shall have the right to impound water for such purposes in reservoirs having storage capacities not in excess, in any case, of 20 acre-feet, without deduction from the allocation made by paragraph A of this Article.

"D. The storage rights in Bear Lake are hereby recognized and confirmed subject only to the restrictions hereinbefore recited.

"Article VI

"It is the policy of the signatory States to encourage additional projects for the development of the water resources of the Bear River to obtain the maximum beneficial use of water with a minimum of waste, and in furtherance of such policy, authority is granted within the limitations provided by this Compact, to investigate, plan, construct, and operate such projects without regard to State boundaries, provided that water rights for each such project shall, except as provided in Article V, paragraph A thereof, be subject to rights theretofore initiated and in good standing.

"Article VII

"A. No State shall deny the right of the United States of America, and subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, no State shall deny the right of another signatory State, any person or entity of another signatory State, to acquire rights to the use of water or to construct or to participate in the construction and use of diversion works and storage reservoirs with appurtenant works, canals, and conduits in one State for use of water in another State, either directly or by exchange. Water rights acquired for out-of-state use shall be appropriated in the State where the point of diversion is located in the manner provided by law for appropriation of water for use within such State.

"B. Any signatory State, any person or any entity of any signatory State, shall have the right to acquire in any other signatory State such property rights as are necessary to the use of water in conformity with this Compact by donation, purchase, or, as hereinafter provided through the exercise of the power of eminent domain in accordance with the law of the State in which such property is located. Any signatory State, upon the written request of the Governor of any other signatory State for the benefit of whose water users property is to be acquired in the State to which such written request is made, shall proceed expeditiously to acquire the desired property either by purchase at a price acceptable to the requesting Governor, or if such purchase cannot be made, then through the exercise of its power of eminent domain and shall convey such property to the requesting State or to the person, or entity designated by its Governor provided, that all costs of acquisition and expenses of every kind and nature whatsoever incurred in obtaining such property shall be paid by the requesting State or the person or entity designated by its Governor.

"C. Should any facility be constructed in a signatory State by and for the benefit of another signatory State or persons or entities therein, as above provided, the construction, repair, replacement, maintenance and operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facility is located.

"D. In the event lands or other taxable facilities are acquired by a signatory State in another signatory State for the use and benefit of the former, the users of the water made available by such facilities, as a condition precedent to the use thereof, shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such facilities are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes a sum of money equivalent to the average of the amount of

taxes annually levied and assessed against the land and improvements therein during the ten years preceding the acquisition of such land. Said payments shall be in full reimbursement for the loss of taxes in such political subdivision of the State.

"E. Rights to the use of water acquired under this Article shall in all respects be subject to this Compact.

"Article VIII

"Stored water, or water from another watershed may be turned into the channel of the Bear River in one State and a like quantity, with allowance for loss by evaporation, transpiration, and seepage, may be taken out of the Bear River in another State either above or below the point where the water is turned into the channel, but in making such exchange the replacement water shall not be inferior in quality for the purpose used or diminished in quantity. Exchanges shall not be permitted if the effect thereof is to impair vested rights or to cause damage for which no compensation is paid.

"Article IX

"A. The following rights to the use of Bear River water carried in interstate canals are recognized and confirmed.

Name of canal	Date of priority	Primary right, second-feet	Lands irrigated	
			Acres	State
Hilliard East Fork.	1914	28.00	2,644	Wyoming
Chapman	8-13-86	16.46	1,155	Do.
	8-13-86	98.46	6,892	Utah
	4-12-12	.57	40	Wyoming
	5- 3-12	4.07	285	Utah
	5-21-12	10.17	712	Do.
	2- 6-13	.79	55	Wyoming
	8-28-05	[1] 134.00	--------	
Francis Lee	1879	2.20	154	Do.
	1879	7.41	519	Utah

[1] Under the right as herein confirmed not to exceed 134 second-feet may be carried across the Wyoming-Utah State lines in the Chapman Canal at any time for filling the Neponset Reservoir, for irrigation of land in Utah and for other purposes. The storage right in Neponset Reservoir is for 6,900 acre-feet which is a component part of the irrigation right listed above for the Utah lands.

"All other rights to the use of water carried in interstate canals and ditches, as adjudicated in the State in which the point of diversion is located, are recognized and confirmed.

"B. All interstate rights shall be administered by the State in which the point of diversion is located and during times of water emergency, such rights shall be filled from the allocations specified in Article IV hereof for the Section in which the point of diversion is located, with the exception that the diversion of water into the Hilliard East Fork Canal, Lannon Canal, Lone Mountain Ditch, and Hilliard West Side Canal shall be under the administration of Wyoming. During times of water emergency these canals and the Lone Mountain Ditch shall be supplied from the allocation specified in Article IV for the Upper Wyoming Section Diversions.

"Article X

"Applications for appropriation, for change of point of diversion, place and nature of use, and for exchange of Bear River water shall be considered and acted upon in accordance with the law of the State in which the point of diversion is located, but no such application shall be approved if the effect thereof will be to deprive any water user in another State of water to which he is entitled. The official of each State in charge of water administration shall, upon the filing of an application affecting Bear River water, transmit a copy thereof to the Commission.

"Article XI

"Nothing in this Compact shall be construed to prevent the United States, a signatory State or political subdivision thereof, person, corporation, or association, from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under State or Federal law or under this Compact.

"Article XII

"Nothing contained in this Compact shall be deemed

"1. to affect the obligations of the United States of America to the Indian tribes;

"2. to impair, extend or otherwise affect any right or power of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities involved herein; nor the capacity of the United States to hold or acquire additional rights to the use of the water of the Bear River;

"3. to subject any property or rights of the United States to the laws of the States which were not subject thereto prior to the date of this Compact;

"4. to subject any property of the United States to taxation by the States or any subdivision thereof, nor to obligate the United States to pay any State or subdivision thereof for loss of taxes.

"Article XIII

"At intervals not exceeding twenty years, the Commission shall review the provisions hereof, and after notice and public hearing, may propose amendments to any such provision, provided, however, that the provisions contained herein shall remain in full force and effect until such proposed amendments have been ratified by the legislatures of the signatory States and consented to by Congress.

"Article XIV

"This Compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

"Article XV

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this Compact to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or to the Constitution of the United States, all other severable provisions of this Compact shall continue in full force and effect.

"Article XVI

"This Compact shall be in effect when it shall have been ratified by the Legislature of each signatory State and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America. Notice of ratification by the legislatures of the signatory States shall be given by the Governor of each signatory State to the Governor of each of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States of America, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the Governor of each of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States of America.

"In witness whereof, the commissioners and their advisers have executed this compact in five originals, one of which shall be deposited with the General Services Administration of the United States of America, one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States, and one of which shall be made a part of the permanent records of the Bear River Commission.

"Done at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 4th day of February 1955.

"For the State of Idaho:

"FRED M. COOPER.
"MELVIN LAURIDSEN.
"MARK R. KULP.

"For the State of Utah:

"GEORGE D. CLYDE.
"J. LORENZO WEIDMANN.
"A. V. SMOOT.
"LAWRENCE B. JOHNSON.
"ALONZO F. HOPKIN.
"E. M. VAN ORDEN.
"ORSON A. CHRISTENSEN.

"For the State of Wyoming:

"L. C. BISHOP.
"H. T. PERSON.
"HOWARD B. BLACK.
"EMIL C. GRADERT.
"S. REED DAYTON.

"Approved:

"E. O. LARSON,
"Representative of the United States of America.

"Attest:

"E. J. SKEEN,
"Secretary of the Bear River Compact Commission."

SEC. 2. All officers, agencies, departments, and persons of and in the United States Government shall cooperate with the Bear River Commission, established pursuant to the compact consented to hereby, in any manner authorized by law other than this Act, it being the purpose of Congress that the United States Government shall assist in the furtherance of the objectives of a Bear River Compact and in the work of the commission created thereby.

SEC. 3. Any modification of the allocation of storage rights contained in Article V shall become effective only when consented to by the Congress.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act granting the consent of Congress to a Bear River Compact, and for related purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "and approval."

Page 6, line 23, strike out the word "Rrange" and insert "Range."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to a Bear River Compact, and for related purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF LEASES ON CERTAIN LANDS IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8483) to authorize the extension of leases of certain lands in the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141), or of the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, where a lessee of waterfront lands in the Territory of Hawaii, under lease on November 4, 1952, or March 9, 1957, has spent substantial sums in repairing or replacing improvements on such lands damaged or destroyed by either or both of the tidal waves of such dates, then the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, in his discretion and at the request of the lessee, may extend the term of the lease at the original rental; however, no lease may be extended pursuant to this act beyond November 3, 1973.

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.

APPROVING JOINT RESOLUTION 28 OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9501) to approve Joint Resolution 28 enacted

by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1957, relating to the conditions and terms of right of purchase leases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Joint Resolution 28, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1957 and entitled "Joint resolution relating to the conditions and terms of right of purchase leases, and amending section 99-92 (a) of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1955, subject to approval of the Congress, and requesting such approval" is hereby approved.

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.

VALIDATION OF SOIL-BANK CONTRACTS IN COUNTIES BROUGHT INTO COMMERCIAL CORN AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn-acreage allotments.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the author of the bill please give us a little information as to what is contained in this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the Department of Agriculture to postpone the enforcement of section 114 of the Soil Bank Act 1 year in these counties that were recently placed in the commercial corn area. It seems that the order did not come out until rather late, and has caused undue hardship to the already depressed farmer. The Department officials appeared before my committee and testified that they made every effort possible to prevent these counties from being placed in the commercial corn area, but had no alternative under the law. Therefore, it was necessary to amend the act.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I point out that there are no departmental reports on this bill. My information is that there was a witness from the Department of Agriculture who appeared before the committee and expressed opposition to one part of the bill which, I suppose, could be interpreted as an adverse report, if a report had been furnished. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to let the matter lay over until the next calendar day. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman withhold that request for 1 minute?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my request and yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that this is really an emergency matter. If this bill does not pass right away, it will not do the farmers any good this season.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman may know that the next bill on the Consent Calendar involves a somewhat similar situation to the one presently before us, a bill which I have sponsored and which has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture. I can assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that in either instance time is of the essence.

I was present before the Committee on Agriculture when the Department of Agriculture people appeared and it seemed to me from their testimony they were not objecting to this type of legislation. What this does is to give them an opportunity to grant administrative relief in hardship cases, cases which developed primarily because of a bad sequence of events from the standpoint of time. Under the existing law, apparently, the Department of Agriculture has no authority to give administrative relief in hardship cases where serious inequities have developed. It seems to me, with time of the essence and the need for this administrative relief, it is important that this legislation be approved today.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to state further that the Department really did not object to this bill. In fact, they favored the legislation but they could not come out and approve it. I suppose that is why we do not have a report from the Department. But they did not seriously object to it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman answer a question? His contention is that time is of the essence. What is the time deadline involved here? If it is only a month or so, that would make a difference.

Mr. McMILLAN. The corn is being planted now in Georgia and Florida. This affects counties in Georgia and Florida.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the basis that time is important and the fact that the Department could have sent up an adverse report if they were really opposed to the bill, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

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 section 114 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section—(1) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage reserve contract for 1958 by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if the county in which such farm is located is included in the commercial corn producing area for the first time in 1958; (2) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under a conservation reserve contract by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if such contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn producing area: *Provided,* That the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall apply only to a farm for which an 'old farm' corn allotment is established for such first year. For purposes of this provision, a contract which has been terminated by the producer under the program regulations by reason of the fact that the county in which the farm is located was included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958, and which is reinstated, shall be deemed to have been entered into as of the original date of execution of such contract."

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.

REMOVE OTTAWA COUNTY, MICH., FROM COMMERCIAL CORN AREA FOR 1958

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10316) to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn-producing area during 1958.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say this: it is my understanding that the bill previous to this does take care of the problems which resulted in the initiation of H. R. 10316. I should like to include in my remarks 3 questions addressed to the representative of the Committee on Agriculture to pin down the fact that the bill, H. R. 10843, takes care of all the problems that resulted in my introduction of the bill H. R. 10316.

Mr. McMILLAN. Although all of these counties were designated commercial corn countries before the completion of the soil-bank signup for any crop except winter wheat, the committee feels that such designation, and the importance of it in connection with the soil-bank program, was not actually made known to farmers in these counties until after they had made their farming plans for 1958, and, in some cases, not until after they had actually signed up wheat, cotton, or other acreage in the soil bank.

This bill does not remove these 38 new counties from the commercial corn area, but simply provides (1) that, with respect to acreage reserve contracts for 1958, such contracts will not be invalidated if the farmer overplants his corn acreage allotment in 1958, and (2) with respect to conservation reserve contracts no such contract will be invalidated by the farmer overplanting his corn acreage allotment, if the conservation reserve contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the calendar year in which the county is brought into the commercial corn area for the first time.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Agriculture did not submit a formal report on this bill, but its representatives in the hearing held by the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee stated that the Department was not in favor of the exemption granted for 1958 with respect to the acreage reserve

contracts, but does favor the permanent exemption granted with respect to conservation reserve contracts.

To the committee it seems that the principle involved is precisely the same. The Department favors farmers being relieved of the corn compliance requirement in connection with conservation reserve contracts if those contracts were made before the county was designated as a commercial corn county. The principle involved is that farmers have entered into their soil-bank contract without being aware that they would later be called upon to comply with newly established corn allotments. Precisely the same principle applies to the farmers in the counties which were brought into the commercial corn area in 1958 and who may have their acreage reserve contracts invalidated for that reason. They should be exempted from the requirement this year, because they did not have effective notice of the establishment of corn acreage allotments before they made their plans to put their wheat, cotton, or other acreage into the soil bank.

I hope the gentleman from South Carolina or someone from the Committee on Agriculture will answer those questions, which I know they will do.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will ask his quesitons, I will try to answer them.

Mr. FORD. May I ask this question: Will H. R. 10843 take care of those farmers who signed up for the wheat acreage reserve in counties like the 38 which became new commercial corn counties in October of 1957?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, my bill H. R. 10843 will take care of those counties. I thank the gentleman for introducing his bill and appearing before the Agriculture Committee to explain the situation existing in his State. I certainly would not want my bill to pass if it would not take care of the farmers in the gentleman's district from Michigan, as he introduced the first legislation to give these newly created commercial counties some relief.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

There are two other questions: Second, will H. R. 10843, if enacted into law, protect those who have subsequently signed up for the corn acreage reserve in the 38 new commercial corn counties?

Mr. McMILLAN. Our committee counsel advises it will.

Mr. FORD. One final question. Does H. R. 10843 remove any of these 38 new counties from the commercial corn county category?

Mr. McMILLAN. No; it is my understanding it will not.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina and the Committee on Agriculture for acting promptly and I think correctly in trying to remedy the inequity developed when these 38 commercial corn counties were established in October 1957. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture when H. R. 10843 becomes law will have administrative authority to grant relief in those hardship cases where the facts justify such action.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his valuable assistance. He appeared before the committee twice and gave us valuable information as to the situation existing in his counties, which have been vitally affected by the Department of Agriculture order placing those counties in the commercial corn area.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCORPORATION OF CERTAIN BUSINESSES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4634) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," with respect to the incorporation of certain businesses.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, as amended (48 U. S. C. 77), is amended by striking out "conduct of business of" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "conduct of all lawful businesses including but not limited to:".

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of August 24, 1912.

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.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8476) to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to extend the period of tax exemption of original lessees from 5 to 7 years.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (7) of section 208 of the Hawaiian Home Commission Act, 1920, as amended (48 U. S. C. 702 (7)) is amended by striking out "5" and inserting in lieu thereof "7."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxes imposed for periods after the date of its enactment.

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.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9461) to amend the joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended by the act of August 23, 1954, to permit the granting of patents in fee simple to certain occupiers of public lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1949, as approved by the act of September 1, 1950 (64 Stat. 572) and amended by the act of August 23, 1954 (68 Stat. 764), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. A fee simple patent shall be issued to every occupier under a certificate of occupation, and to every lessee under a 999-year homestead lease, of public lands, where such lands have been improved under such certificate or lease, or improved under such a certificate and such a lease, and have been used as a place of residence by such occupier or lessee for an aggregate continuous period of not less than 10 years, upon payment to the commissioner of public land of a fair price, disregarding the value of the improvements made by the occupier or lessee, which price shall be determined by three disinterested citizens to be appointed by the Governor."

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.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5033) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., authorized to be built by the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission and its successors and assigns by the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939 (53 Stat. 747), shall be the 4-year period and the 6-year period, respectively, beginning on August 9, 1957.

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.

WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9653) to provide that the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in honor of the late Senator Walter F. George, the name of the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River north of Fort Gaines, Ga., shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam, and shall be dedicated as a monument to his distinguished public service. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is referred to as the Fort Gaines lock and dam shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam by the name of the Walter F. George lock and dam.

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.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8482) to authorize the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for public highway purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any limitation imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (48 U. S. C. 673), the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, in his discretion but with the approval of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii and two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands, is authorized to exchange public lands, consisting of rights-of-way of existing public highways which are to be relocated or realined, for the purpose of acquiring privately owned lands of equal value required for such relocation or realinement of public highways.

SEC. 2. The lands received in the exchanges authorized in the first section of this act shall, except as otherwise provided, have the same status and be subject to the same laws as the lands given in exchange.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(48 U. S. C. 673)," and insert "(48 U. S. C. 673), or section 99–48, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1955."

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT, S. 1451 AND H. R. 7026

Mr. MULTER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Financial Institutions Act, which passed the Senate last year as S. 1451, and its counterpart in the House, H. R. 7026, a bill of some 252 pages, may shortly come before the House for action. It undoubtedly will be presented as a revision or codification of the Federal banking laws.

If that is all the bill were, it would have been referred to the Judiciary Committee which is charged by law with "revision and codification of the statutes of the United States." The fact of the matter is that the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Revision of the Laws has for some time been working on such a project. Because the title of the bill includes the word "amend" as well as the word "revise" the bill was referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee.

My purpose at this moment is to alert the membership to the situation presented by the attempt to enact this bill.

Every witness who testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee has referred to and discussed changes in the Federal statutes "of major importance." If the bill is enacted with these changes, most of the safeguards written into our banking laws since the 1920's will be eliminated and destroyed. Bank depositors and stockholders will again be put at the mercy of the moneyed interests and the big bankers of the country. The moneychangers who were driven out of the temple in the 1930's will not only move back into the temple, but they will take it over, lock, stock, and barrel.

BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 8002

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a substitute which I propose to offer to H. R. 8002 and an analysis thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8002, the so-called accrued expenditure appropriation bill, is scheduled to be considered by the House this Wednesday, March 5. It is a very bad bill in its present form. The Committee on Appropriations thinks it is a very bad bill in its present form. I therefore propose to offer an amendment which will enact a procedure which will better accomplish the main objective of H. R. 8002 but without its costly and confusing features.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(b) Each department and establishment of the Government to which an appropriation is made shall annually submit to the Bureau of the Budget a justification for the continued availability of such funds and the President, in his annual budget message or supplemental messages, shall transmit to Congress his recommendations for action in the event he desires such availability to be continued, and, if so, in what manner and for what purpose.'

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to include in appropriation bills, or in amendments thereto, provisions pertaining to the availability of funds referred to in section 201 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section are enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO BE PROPOSED TO H. R. 8002

The proponents of H. R. 8002 have repeatedly asserted that its main purpose—the crux of the bill—is to enact a formal procedure to secure systematic review and reapproval of further use of unexpended carryover balances of prior appropriations.

The standing practice of the Committee on Appropriations has been to do that very thing each year in the hearings in order to be able intelligently to arrive at determination of new appropriations to be added to the carryovers or balances to be transferred or withdrawn. The purpose of H. R. 8002 is to enact this practice into law. The standing Rules of the House, however, do not now contain authority for the Committee on Appropriations to rescind, transfer, or reappropriate such unexpended balances found to be no longer needed for the original purpose.

To achieve the purpose of H. R. 8002 without enacting its bad and costly features, the proposed Taber amendment will be offered. It is a simple, direct, and effective approach without introducing endless confusion and the expensive device of contract authority which was discarded in 1950 after many years' experience.

Mr. Speaker, it also effectively responds to the argument of the proponents of H. R. 8002 that Congress does not, but should, directly control the annual rate of disbursements. Here is how it would do so:

About two-thirds of actual disbursements—about $48 billion of the $72 billion, using the current budget as an example—in any one fiscal year are out of appropriations made for that same year. Cuts made in the appropriations requested for that year therefore automatically cut disbursements represented by the $48 billion disbursements estimate, just by the simple act of cutting the appropriations from which the $48 billion was going to be spent. So, as to two-thirds of the disbursements estimated in the budget, Congress now has all the direct disbursements controls it needs. Therefore, the Taber amendment does not apply to this $48 billion part of the $72 billion disbursements estimate.

The other one-third of actual disbursements is from appropriations of previous years—in other words, from unexpended carryovers. This represents about $24 billion of the $72 billion disbursements figure. This is the part which H. R. 8002 is primarily designed to get at because at present it is disbursed without any formal type procedure being routinely available in the law or the rules by which it can be directly controlled. The Taber amendment prescribes such a formal procedure for this $24 billion portion and, in conjunction with the existing direct control procedure on the $48 billion portion described above, gives Congress a formal type procedure for dealing directly with the entire $72 billion disbursements figure.

THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNISM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there appeared yesterday in the magazine section of the Washington Post a very fine article by Commander John S. Gleason of the American Legion entitled "We Must Teach the Truth About Communism."

I hope everybody all over the United States will read it.

The article is as follows:

WE MUST TEACH THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNISM

(By John S. Gleason, Jr., national commander, American Legion)

(No organization in the United States is more stanchly anti-Communist than the 3-million-member American Legion. Thus many people were surprised last November when the Legion urged that children in every United States public and private secondary school should be taught about communism, its true history and its vast fallacies. In this exclusive article, John S. Gleason, Jr., national commander of the Legion, explains why he supports that stand.—The Editors.)

Know your enemy. That is perhaps the oldest military maxim in the world, and only a fool would dispute its worth. But it is not enough to know the number of soldiers, sailors, and airmen, the weapons at their disposal, the tactics and strategy that will direct them.

It is vital also to know the mind of the enemy, his history, his fears and ambitions, his form of government, his national character, his strengths and weaknesses—in fact, all things that make him think the way he does.

Today America's threat, and the threat of the whole of the free world, is Soviet Russia. In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said bluntly that the Russian leaders were waging "total cold war" against the West, and that the only answer for the West was to wage "total peace."

But peace, by a strange and bitter paradox, is harder to wage than war. For the battle line does not run clear and sharp. It is drawn in the thoughts and hopes of millions of people. In short, the battle for peace is the battle for men's minds.

How well is the average American prepared for this new battlefield? How well does he know his enemy, how well is he protected by firmly based and reasoned convictions against the lures, traps, and pitfalls of the Communists? The answer is: Not nearly well enough. It no longer is sufficient to hold a bland belief that communism is evil. It is necessary to know why it is evil so that its temptations can be refuted and resisted. In the waging of total peace, understanding is the sharpest sword of all.

FAITH IS NOT ENOUGH

Once the American people had great faith that if each new generation was raised in full knowledge of what our democracy is, how it came about and the concepts on which it is based, then we need never fear for the future of these concepts. Education in the American way of life and in its values is doubly important today. But it is equally important to recognize the perils that threaten that way of life.

Beginning in the depression, continuing through World War II and into the postwar years, a mood of cynicism was bred in which every national difficulty was attributed to the failure of democracy. This fad of little faith was quickly seized upon and exploited by the Communists.

Hundreds of men and women, distinguished in their own fields, were sucked in by Communist trickery. They became fellow travelers, lending their names and support to Communist-front organizations. Extremists went even further, becoming a fifth column working actively to destroy America.

The Communists were skillful. They claimed to be "liberals," "progressives," even "reactionaries." They called their satellites, so ruthlessly annexed and bloodily held down, "peoples' democracies." They claimed they were the real fighters for peace, and that all who opposed them were "capitalist warmongers."

Then America began to wake up. Korea, the Rosenbergs, Congressional investigations sounded the alarm and laid bare the threat and the extent to which Americans of all classes had been duped. Succeeding crises, such as Hungary and Soviet expansion into the Middle East, have heightened the apparent danger.

A CHALLENGE WITHOUT END

But, like an iceberg, Soviet policy shows only its tip above the surface. The real peril lurks below.

One fact is clear: No matter what current settlements may be negotiated with Soviet Russia as the "other" world power, our children and grandchildren will have to face the challenge of Communist competition throughout their lives. If we have been deceived and bamboozled in the past, it is because, as a nation, we did not take enough trouble to learn about communism.

When American college students went to Moscow recently, the State Department had cause for real anxiety. Not enough of the students were adequately equipped to argue the cause of free democracy versus communism. They had little training in debate and practically none in Soviet history. It is amazing how little is taught today in our schools, colleges, and universities of even a skeleton history of the Soviet Union and its ruling Communist Party.

To those who know Soviet history, the door is open to the interpretation of Russia's day-to-day moves and the prediction of future moves. If it does nothing else, such knowledge slams the door on wild hopes and wishful thinking.

How many Americans know the details of the Russian constitutional convention of 1918; why the Kerensky regime failed; the history of the revolt of the Kronstadt sailors; the blood bath that brought Lenin to power; the liquidation of the kulaks, or landowning peasants; the "rights" of Soviet citizens; the life stories of Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin; the real story of the 1937 Moscow "traitor" trials; the birth and death of the Comintern; the creation of the Cominform; the background to the nonaggression pact with Hitler and the partition of Poland; the history of the Communist Parties in America, France, Italy, and Germany?

There is no $64,000 prize for learning about Soviet Russia and the worldwide Communist plot. The reward is too great to be measured in money.

If I were an educator, I could not sleep nights if I were not doing everything in my power to see that our children—the citizens and leaders of tomorrow—know all that they can know about communism. They must escape its entrapments and learn how to deal with it realistically.

That is why the American Legion says, "Young America must learn to know the enemy."

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Mr. BEAMER. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are directed toward both sides of the House. This is my first political speech on the floor of the House in 8 years.

Some people, even including members of my own party, have been pointing a finger at Secretary of Agriculture Benson. I would want to remind these good friends, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, that they must remember always that when they point a finger at anyone, they always have three fingers pointing back accusingly at them.

To carry this illustration a bit further, may I suggest that one of the these fingers would point back accusingly at Henry Wallace, a former Democrat Secretary of Agriculture, who killed little pigs, plowed down every fourth row, and painted potatoes purple. A second finger would point back accusingly at another Democrat Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickard, who was a dismal failure as a Secretary of Agriculture. Back in Indiana, we know him as a man who acquired a farm by inheritance and who reportedly used this farm as a means of evading service in World War I. We also know him as the Administrator of REA who would have tried to overburden this worthwhile project with debts in order that the Federal Government could take over the REMC's that rightfully belong to the farmers.

A third accusing finger would point to Charles Brannan, another Democrat Secretary of Agriculture, whose chief interest was and apparently continues to be, the socialization of the agriculture of this country.

So I say to my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle that they should remember the sins of their own former Secretaries of Agriculture before pointing out any of the shortcomings of Mr. Benson. I would also say to my friends on the Republican side that they would render a greater service to the party and to the country at large by pointing out the difficult task that confronts a Secretary of Agriculture and then by contrast show how much better job Mr. Benson has been doing than any of these three previous men in his position.

I do not approve of all of Mr. Benson's policies but perhaps it would be better for all of us if we would put our shoulders to the wheel and help to get agriculture out of a rut, if it is in one—and I do not think it is in one—instead of criticizing individuals who are trying to do a good job and who are trying to help the farmers. Perhaps my own Republican friends who presently are criticizing Mr. Benson are thinking about their own political skins more than they are thinking of the welfare of the farmer and their colleagues in other areas. Agriculture is too important to be used as a political football.

SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks that we have been gathered in this Chamber in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, indeed not since the Soviet piercing into outer space awakened America to her scientific lag, have I been more heartened, more assured of the future, than on Friday evening when I met with the 40 high-school students who were selected in the science-talent search as the most talented and promising in scientific scholarship. The competition included all public, private, and parochial high schools in the United States and the winners—8 young women and 32 young men—were designated the cream of the crop after a series of rigid tests and examinations. The tests were conducted by the science clubs of America for the Westinghouse science scholarships.

I was privileged to be present at the dinner on Friday evening in their honor. Our beloved former Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, was there. Three of my distinguished colleagues from Illinois, Mrs. CHURCH, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. MCVEY, were there. But it was because of nothing that any of us had done. The only way a Congressman could qualify for that dinner was to represent the district of one of these 40 cream-of-the-crop young scientists.

To Miss Bernadette Genevieve Londak, brilliant and charming daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. Kent Londak, 7749 South Langley Avenue, Chicago, I am deeply indebted for the privilege of being a participant in this thrilling event. Miss Londak, a senior at Mercy High School in the District I have the honor to represent, was selected as one of the 40 winners out of the 25,000 original candidates. Some idea of the tremendous proportions of this distinction can be gained from the fact that she was the only winner from the entire city of Chicago, the second city in population in the United States.

Miss Londak, an amateur astronomer with plans for a career in the teaching of physics and mathematics, is a member of an official moonwatch team tracking artificial earth satellites launched during the International Geophysical Year. She has had an outstanding high-school career, and I am certain that she, along with thousands of unheralded American youths, will safeguard our scientific future. Her selection as a finalist is a tribute to her ability, to the inspiration and guidance of her family, to Mercy High School and its scientific program, to Sister Mary Mark, the dedicated principal of Mercy High School, and to the entire Second Congressional District of Illinois.

The entire Illinois delegation may take pride, moreover, in the fact that only one State in the Union placed more finalists in this science-talent search than the great State of Illinois. Our State, with four finalists, has once again exhibited to the Nation the results of a belief in sound education and in scientific stimulation of its youth.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the science service and its dynamic director, Watson Davis, and the Westinghouse Educational Foundation on the great success of the 17th annual science-talent search. I know of no work in the field of scientific education that is more timely and constructive, more fired with vision, in the encouragement of our youth to carry these United States of ours again to world supremacy in science as in all things. In the awarding of scientific scholarships to these young people, to the value of $34,250, the Westinghouse Educational Foundation merits the applause of the Nation.

ANTI-TRAITOR VENUE BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to strengthen enforcement of laws against traitors and other persons who commit serious crimes against this country. The bill is designed also to clarify the jurisdiction of Federal courts to try offenders for crimes committed outside the United States or its possessions.

Enactment of this measure would give the Federal Government powerful weapons in its never-ending battle against traitors to our country.

The law today provides that anyone who has committed a crime against the United States outside the jurisdiction of our courts must be tried in the district in which he is found or into which he is first brought. This means that when two or more offenders act jointly abroad, but are found in different United States districts, they must be indicted and tried in different jurisdictions rather than together. The expense of separate trials is often prohibitive. This bill would permit the trial of two or more joint offenders in the district in which any one of them is first taken into custody or is first brought. This would bring traitors to justice speedily and with a saving of thousands of dollars to the American taxpayer.

Another difficulty in combating traitors under present law is that it is doubtful whether one who commits a crime outside the jurisdiction of United States courts can be indicted anywhere until he returns to the jurisdiction of our courts. There is, of course, little incentive for such a person to return. If he can remain outside the country for the period of the statute of limitations, which is 3 years in all but capital cases, he may avoid prosecution altogether. This is a loophole in the law through which traitors and other criminals have been escaping prosecution for too long a time. This bill would provide that in such situations an indictment or information could be filed in the district of the last known residence of the accused in order to prevent running of the statute of limitations.

This bill also removes any doubt as to the district in which these offenders should be tried. In a much-publicized case not long ago, a Sergeant Provoo was convicted of treason, but escaped punishment because the Government failed to try him in the proper district. He was tried and convicted in the southern district of New York, where he had been arrested, but on appeal from his conviction, the court of appeals determined that he had not actually been found in New York, within the limitation of the statute. The case was remanded and he was then indicted in Maryland, where he had first been taken into custody. But the district court of Maryland dismissed the indictment on the ground that the Government had taken so long to prosecute the defendant that he had been denied his right to a speedy trial.

Under this bill offenders such as these would be tried in the district in which they were first taken into custody. This provision would remove any uncertainty on the part of arresting officers and courts as to the forum in which traitors to this country may be brought to justice.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend section 3238 of United States Code, title 18

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3238. Offenses not committed in any district.

"The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district in which the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is first taken into custody or continued in custody for any such offense, or into which he is first brought; but if such offender or offenders are not so taken into custody or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, or in the District of Columbia."

EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from Gastonia, N. C., Chamber of Commerce and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, B. T. Dickson, executive vice president of the Gastonia, N. C., Chamber of Commerce, wrote a letter to Mr. Philip M. Talbott, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on February 19, 1958, in which he set forth his views with reference to extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

It occurred to me that this letter, which follows, would be of interest to my colleagues in the House:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Gastonia, N. C., February 19, 1958.

Mr. PHILIP M. TALBOTT,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALBOTT: Since talking with several people who were at your AIRCADE

meeting in Charlotte, we have concluded that the one-sided vote favoring extension of the Trade Agreements Act did not represent audience sentiment on that controversial question. Of course, we realize that the vote did not determine any policy of the national chamber, but we don't want you to get the erroneous impression that it represented the deliberate view of the business people down here in this textile manufacturing section of the country.

On the face of it, this trade agreement policy seems to be a very fair, fine rule of international commerce. Up to the present time it apparently has been a boon to most industries in this country, and probably will be for a time in the future. Following World War II all the free nations of the world have looked to the United States largely for raw materials and for finished goods. Under these circumstances the hungry demand for United States goods has boosted our exports to unprecedented heights; and, pending the rehabilitation of industry in most foreign nations, imports to this country have been absorbed in most cases without serious injury to our economy. Textile products, plywood, bicycles, certain chemicals, and probably a few other products seem to be the notable exceptions.

From your experience at Woodward and Lothrop you must be familiar with the sad plight of the American cotton-textile industry. On my desk here are two sport shirts—one made in Japan of Japanese gingham, the other made in America of American gingham. The Japanese shirt retailed in McCrory's store for $1, the American counterpart in the same store for $1.98, and the sad part of the story is that 60 percent of the people to whom I show these shirts (labels have been removed) guess that the Japanese shirt is American-made since it is of comparable quality material and of superior workmanship. You realize, of course, that this is possible because Japanese textile mills can buy cotton grown here in the South at 7½ cents per pound cheaper than our mills in Gastonia can buy the same grade of cotton, and that our workers—as low as their wage is—get 10 times the pay as their Japanese competitors.

One does not have to be an economist to reach a conclusion in this situation. The committee for economic development stated it very succinctly in their pamphlet dealing with tariffs and foreign trade when they said that where labor constitutes any appreciable percent of the cost of an article our American manufacturers cannot compete with cheap foreign labor without the benefit of a protective tariff or an import quota.

The textile industry can bear sad testimony to the truthfulness of that theorem. In 1947 the United States exported cotton textiles to the extent of $748.8 million and imported from other countries $24 million, but in 1955 our exports had declined to $242 million and imports had climbed to $123.3 million. The past 2 years show the same trend continued. For some years now the net profits of the textile industry have run just about one-half of the net of all of the Nation's industries, percentagewise. Value added by manufacturing is also a good criterion of an industry's condition—the textile industry is the only major one in the United States that showed a decline in that respect from 1947 to 1954. We are not averse to building up Japan's economy as a bulwark against communism, but we don't think the textile industry should, nor is able, to bear the full weight of that rehabilitation. There are 2 million people employed in the textile and garment-making industries—a large number to sacrifice—and besides, the industry is necessary to our national defense.

But, you say, the escape clause takes care of any undue hardship cases such as the textile industry has undergone. Such has not been true in practice, and right there is my whole story. The textile industry complained time and time again to the Tariff Commission, to Mr. Weeks, to Mr. Dulles, and to the President, only to be completely ignored in effect. Finally, when the President took note of the situation it was only to accent a voluntary quota from Japan which can be rescinded by Japan at any time. Goods are now, as you know, pouring in from Hong Kong with a strong suspicion that they are being reshipped from Japan. All the time these pleadings were going on with the executive branch of the Government prices were demoralized, mills were going broke, and employees were being thrown out of work. Textiles, as you must know, is still a very sick industry.

The Founding Fathers wrote into that Constitution of ours that the Congress should have the power to regulate tariff and govern foreign trade. If my memory is correct, the American Bar Association has gone a step further and said that the Congress has no power under the Constitution to delegate that power to anyone or any other department of Government. They had a carefully studied reason for about everything they wrote into that Constitution and apparently the Founding Fathers wanted to keep this vital function close to the wishes of the people.

This is where we disagree with the policy of the national chamber and we believe you will agree that if you had been in the "boots" of the textile industry for the last 4 or 5 years, you too would want this foreign trade matter to be in sympathetic hands.

Don't you think this tariff and foreign trade question is much bigger than just the textile industry? Seems to me that the textile industry is the first one to get it in the neck but that others will inevitably follow so long as there is such a big differential in wage rates throughout the world. If I read the facts correctly, the textile industry was about the first industry to be rehabilitated in France, in Germany, and certainly in Japan. What is going to happen when other nations get into chemicals, electrical goods, automobiles, etc., to the degree that they are in textile production? We had a small machinery manufacturer here in Gastonia who made a certain part for a textile machine at a cost of $5.35. He woke up some months ago to find that a similar part of good quality was being shipped in to the nearest port of entry from both France and England for $2.85. Today this machinery manufacturer is as dead as a dodo. This is a small potato but it illustrates a trend. The Brazil Bulletin of February 1 says: "By the beginning of the year (1958) the Brazilian Government had authorized 19 foreign companies, including General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Willys, and Studebaker to establish or enlarge plants in Sãa Paulo, which eventually will make Brazil self-sufficient in passenger cars, trucks, and other vehicles * * * with a capital investment of $600 million." In 1956 American-made cars accounted for 57½ percent of the autos sold in Brazil. We may not be giving Brazil the $2 billion we gave Japan but automobiles are following the pattern of textiles.

How far can Mr. Dulles go with his tariff free trade?

Is the policy of the United States chamber in this matter based on a settled course which it will choose to follow regardless of the leanings of the Chief Executive and his advisers? Or is it just a present expedient?

We just wanted to let you know how this textile manufacturing section feels about the trade agreement extension, since you may have gotten the wrong impression from the quicky straw vote at Charlotte on the 10th.

Sincerely yours,

B. T. DICKSON,
Executive Vice President.

RECIPROCAL TRADE LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the membership of the House be alerted to the fact that the greatest lobby in the history of Congress has been set up in the National Capital for the express purpose of securing an arbitrary and unfair extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Leading the vanguard of this drive is Eric Johnston, best remembered as a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and as czar of the moving-picture industry in Hollywood, Calif. He has been invited by the President to front for the long-haired internationalists who would trade the jobs of American workmen for friendship abroad that we failed to buy with American dollars.

Mr. Johnston, who was being interviewed on television only yesterday, boasted that contributions to the drive to put across the trade-agreements program were already in excess of $50,000 and many more were expected.

Mr. Johnston, it would appear, has completely overlooked the fact that we have anti-lobby legislation. Inquiry at the records office of the Clerk of the House discloses that he has not as yet made application for registry as a lobbyist. If funds, that may well run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, are being collected to high-pressure the Congress on any kind of legislation, it is time that the Congress, for its own protection, insists on knowing all the details of the group who would try to influence them.

If there is any doubt in the minds of my colleagues that Mr. Johnston is not "putting the bite" on industry and other big business interests, their doubts can be allayed by actual proof that he is soliciting contributions.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I desire to recognize the Honorable JOHN E. HENDERSON, Member of Congress from the 15th Ohio District.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there have been bitter denunciations of both the continuation of foreign aid, which had its inception under a previous administration, and reduction of tariffs, which only in recent years has obtained substantial Republican support. Now these two policies seem to have been incorporated as an unfortunate part of the program of both parties. We have only to witness the meeting of last week, held in Washington, wherein dignitaries of both parties, of both the previous and present administrations, shared the platform on behalf of continued foreign aid, to see that it is a bipartisan program. It must be opposed in the same fashion, by bipartisan action.

I do not know how the Mutual Security Budget Committee is obtaining its funds, but apparently it is asking for contributions from various industries. Mr. H. D. McClelland, who is the chairman of the board of Universal Potteries, Inc., of Cambridge, Ohio, which company is

a manufacturer of pottery, and has suffered grave and serious threats from unlimited and unrestrained imports, has forwarded to me a copy of a telegram under date of February 26, 1958, to Eric Johnston, Chairman of the Mutual Security Budget Committee, Washington, D. C. In the telegram, Mr. McClelland points to the trade policy and foreign-aid programs as being the exclusive property of the present administration. With that premise I cannot agree, but the thoughts included in his telegram are a critical indictment of both the free trade and unrestrained aid concepts with which the Congress must deal this year. The telegram is as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1958.

ERIC JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Mutual Security Budget Committee, Washington, D. C.

Retel: Your request of our company for contribution to the Mutual Security Budget Committee is a little bit asinine in that it is the Eisenhower tariff program that is bankrupting our industry. We, as many other industries, are starving to death due to high taxes and foreign competition caused by the present administration's lack of foresight. Only big tax reduction immediately to business and middle-bracket employers and all employees alike will save this country from one worlders like yourself and others. Can you tell me, and if so please do, how American business can survive if our own Government expects and demands of us to maintain high standard of living against cheap foreign 40-cent-per-day labor? Your Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act is a one-way street. Have you ever taken the time to investigate the tariff walls of other countries in relation to ours? If you have you will find our products almost 100-percent prohibited entering these countries. We are sinking fast in this country due to the present administration's policy. We need help at home first. If you were to send all the money in this country to foreign lands you would not stop communism. You cannot buy friendship.

H. D. MCCLELLAND,
Chairman of the Board, Universal Potteries, Inc.

I would like also to read from a letter which I received only this morning from an oil producer in Perry County. You see, Mr. Speaker, there are many industries that are being adversely affected by import practices. Oil producers, and not necessarily Texas oil producers, are feeling the sting. Here is the complaint of an Ohio oil producer:

CLYDE M. FORAKER & SONS,
New Lexington, Ohio, February 28, 1958.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Since 1954, when imports of crude oil and petroleum products averaged 656,000 barrels per day, the administration has been promising relief to the domestic oil producer through the reduction of imports.

Last year imports had climbed to an average of over 1,500,000 barrels per day and according to IPAA reports, the 4-week period ending February 14, averaged 1,626,000 barrels per day with the week of February 14 reaching an average of 1,897,500 barrels per day.

Two of the three grades of crude in this district have been cut in value since the first of the year and it appears to be only a matter of time until the third grade is also cut. Domestic producers must have relief, especially the little fellow, the independent.

On March 4, Mr. J. W. Straker, president, and Mr. Ira M. Korst, excutive secretary of the Ohio Oil & Gas Association, will be in Washington to appear before the House Committee on Ways and Means. They will no doubt be in touch with you prior to that time and will appreciate any assistance you can afford them.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE M. FORAKER, Jr.

Turning to yet another industry, we find that our tariff policy is harmful to the stainless steel industry. Recently, I have had letters and petitions from employees of the Ekco Co., of Byesville, Ohio, producers of stainless steel kitchenware, which is facing serious threats from Japanese importations. This morning, I had a letter from a salesman selling American stainless and silver plate, who is seeing increased competition in this field from Japanese imports. That letter is as follows:

NEWARK, OHIO, *February 28, 1958.*

The Honorable JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you regarding tariff on Japanese stainless.

I know at the present time there is a tariff commission studying this problem.

As a salesman selling American stainless and silver plate, I run into Japanese stainless every day. Naturally it is priced much lower than what I am selling because of the tremendous difference in the wage scale in Japan and the United States.

It is of great importance to me, my company, and any other American company that manufactures stainless, that we have high protective tariffs on all Japanese stainless. If we only have increased tariffs on low-priced stainless, the Japanese will only produce a higher priced stainless. This of course will not help relieve the situation at all.

I am therefore writing to ask you to do whatever you can to relieve the situation as it now exists. Anything that you can do will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,

LESTER CHAPIN.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, not all of the propaganda being used to urge participation on the part of America in our present trade policies is coming from the one-worlders and long-haired internationalists residing in America. I desire to call your attention to the propaganda from abroad from the groups who are reaping a harvest through our present trade policies.

Some days ago, a full-page ad appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald under the caption, "On Foreign Trade and Aid Let's Talk Sense." This ad was paid for by a Spanish importing firm and urges that America go all out on a free-trade policy by removing all of our tariff barriers and other restrictions on foreign imports.

I desire at this time to insert excerpts from this editorial:

The American contribution to world economic development can only be in terms of the institutions Americans know best; i. e., the free-enterprise system. We suggest that this system, which some regard as a golden goose in the American barnyard, is instead a first-class political weapon of intercontinental range.

We propose that this weapon be employed in the following drastic manner: That the United States declare its traditional protectionism at an end, open its shores to the free enterprisers of all nations and embark on a new policy of free trade. The purpose of this dramatic move would be to strengthen alliances and set new standards of world prosperity to which communism can never aspire.

Fortunately the Free World has been enjoying a long boom, sparked largely by free enterprise. But this boom threatens to dwindle before it has begun to satisfy the world's unfilled need for trade and investment. Nor has the United States, the supposed headquarters of free enterprise, done nearly what it should to stimulate this boom toward its incredibly greater potential.

A defensive United States trade policy represents a failure of leadership. The challenge to the United States now is to take a giant step and put its trade policy on the offensive. For that, the time is riper than ever.

This step is to adopt the policy of complete free trade. The United States should declare it toward all countries willing to accept certain minimum standards under which free enterprise can work. The gains to America from such a deal would be immense, the costs small.

Defense? Let the Armed Forces name the items they cannot trust to free trade and subsidize their domestic production openly instead of by tariff. Readjustment? Not more than 100,000 United States jobholders are vitally dependent on tariff protection; they could easily be assisted in their transition to new ones.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no time better than the present when Americans must be on guard to protect their own economy. In view of the mounting unemployment, this is no time to trade American jobs and American payrolls in an effort to buy friendship abroad which we have failed to buy by direct appropriations of American taxpayers' dollars from the United States Treasury.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters and other pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

FLORIDA ORANGE MARKETERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the current position of world leadership enjoyed by this Nation is due to a great extent to the aggressiveness and adaptability of its citizens—to their unique ability to meet and cope with our changing civilization.

We see this dramatic spirit of cooperation in action every day in the manufacturing plants and business offices of industrial America. Our comfortable standard of living is a reflection, too, upon the never-ending pursuit of new and improved agricultural and marketing methods.

Today, this American heritage is effectively being carried forward in a forceful and encouraging manner within the flourishing citrus industry of the dynamic State of Florida.

The growth, the development, and expansion of Florida's citrus industry over the past decade is highly indicative indeed of the ever-increasing role which citrus is destined to play in the overall economy of our changing southland.

For example, conservative Sunshine State bankers have estimated that production and sale of last year's citrus crop—more than 138 million boxes of oranges, grapefruit, lemons, tangerines, and other citrus varieties—has resulted in the addition of more than $2 billion to Florida's economic activities.

Before the recent freezes in Florida, the USDA 1957–58 crop estimate of 144 million boxes seemed to promise prosperity to even the most pessimistic citrus grower. Experts who have surveyed Florida's freeze damage now feel it advisable to reduce those estimates by some 30 to 40 percent.

The law of supply and demand now is being felt in Florida. Growers able to salvage the major portion of their citrus for delivery to processors still look forward to a profitable year.

Florida's citrus picture for the next few years is still hazy and cannot be brought into focus until the March budding season, when it can be determined just how many of the growers' young trees have sustained severe damage or fallen prey to the killing cold this winter.

Of Florida's 43½ million citrus trees, nearly one of every four is not yet at the productive stage. These 10¼ million young trees would have reached maturity during the next 5 years to boost the State's citrus output by almost 25 percent in 1962. Freezes have radically altered this optimistic outlook.

Yet, the Florida citrus grower—like all persons involved in agricultural activities in our rapidly urbanizing Nation—has always faced many serious and perplexing problems.

He is ever subject to the whim and caprice of Mother Nature, although she is usually quite benevolent to our fair State. A look at the record, however, shows the effects of her cold disposition in the early forties when ruinous freezes destroyed the greater portion of our most profitable crop—the delicious Florida orange.

More recently, in 1956, the dread Mediterranean fruitfly swept across the State. Thousands of acres of highly productive grove were infested, resulting in a citrus embargo which might have cost the grower many millions of dollars had it not been for the prompt and effective action of the State and Federal Departments of Agriculture.

The grower also faces the increasing costs of grove maintenance, fertilization and skyrocketing land prices which discourage acquisition of new acreage.

And, until recent years, the Florida grower has been forced to play the role of speculator—selling his fruit when he thought the market was right, only to see citrus prices spiral higher and higher.

Of course, the grower can do little about the weather. He can only light his smudge pots and offer up a prayer that the freeze will be less severe than the last one. And, if he is financially able, he can strive to improve the hardiness of his stock through citrus research and soil improvements.

With the aid of Federal and State agencies, great strides are being taken in methods to detect and destroy citrus pests before they are able to constitute a threat to the multi-million-dollar crop.

With respect to harvesting and maintenance costs, many growers have found it more advantageous to lease their groves to large processors who are able to reduce costs per acre through mass production methods.

The last of the problems I have mentioned—price fluctuation—is now being overcome through the formation of various grower organizations.

The instability of citrus prices, the growers discovered, was due largely to a broadening gap between the grower and the ultimate consumer—the housewife. Until emergence of the citrus processing industry in the late 1940's, most citrus was being shipped throughout the Nation as fresh fruit. Profits from sale of the citrus were divided only between the grower, the shipper and the retail merchant.

Today, however, almost 75 percent of the Florida orange crop is marketed in cans—either as whole juice or as juice concentrate—with 65 percent of the buying power in the hands of the large chain groceries. Since the basic policy of these supermarkets is to sell at the lowest possible price, the grocers in turn are in a position to offer lower prices to the grower for his fruit.

Obviously, the citrus grower must make a decision. He can attempt to reduce his production expense to the lowest possible level, curtailing his efforts at expansion and improvement of quality. Or he can become a participant in the overall operation of the industry, a partner in the actual processing, merchandising, and selling of the citrus he has grown.

The scope and principles of modern American merchandising, however, make it physically impossible for any individual grower to personally market the products of his acreage. So, many of them have banded together to finance their own processing equipment, sales teams, and advertising programs.

They formed a number of organizations, called cooperatives, which are very similar in principle to the supplier co-ops found in many other phases of agriculture throughout the Nation. Co-op members generally earmark a portion of their crop earnings for capital outlay—money paid into the cooperative to finance the huge plants and extensive equipment necessary to manufacture the citrus concentrate.

Another portion of the cooperative grower's assessment is used to market the finished product—the cans of frozen concentrate.

And in today's highly competitive and complex citrus market, much money also must be spent in development of a brand name under which the co-op's citrus products will appear on grocers' shelves all over the country.

The various co-op plans in existence in Florida have contributed greatly to the stabilization and improvement of the citrus industry. But there are still a large group of growers who feel that investment in such fixed assets as processing plants is unnecessary.

These independent growers have, of course, been in complete agreement with the long-range price stabilization objectives of the cooperatives. They felt it wiser, however, to examine the existing facilities within the citrus industry before embarking upon a program of duplication of effort and expense.

Led by Mr. J. Dan Wright, Jr., a veteran Sanford, Fla., citrus grower and an executive of the Patrick Fruit Co., the group approached one of the world's largest citrus processors, the Minute Maid Corp. This company, which actually pioneered in the business of producing and marketing frozen citrus concentrate, expressed immediate interest.

They saw that this group of growers could provide the company with an adequate supply of high-quality fruit, which long has been a major problem for the large processor.

Further conferences developed the details of an equitable plan and resulted in the formation of a grower-controlled organization to supply Minute Maid with the citrus it requires in great quantity. The organization was named Florida Orange Marketers.

In the Florida Orange Marketers, the grower at last has found a profitable and highly effective agent for bringing his product to the housewives of America. The Minute Maid Corp., through its wide distribution and recognition as a leader in the industry, offers the growers the opportunity of having their fruit marketed under an established brand name. More than $17 million has been invested in advertising the Minute Maid brands. And these brands have an annual sales volume of over $60 million in citrus products alone.

Facilities for processing, shipping, and marketing the growers' oranges already were in existence. This means that the individual grower does not have to supply the capital for construction and maintenance of plants and equipment. The grower is assured of a steady outlet for his fruit; the processor receives the advantage of an adequate citrus supply, which leads to operating economies and the opportunity to plan sales and merchandising campaigns on a sound, continuing basis.

One of the most unique features of the Florida Orange Marketers is that the processor also is a member of the association. The Minute Maid Corp. itself is one of the world's largest citrus growers. The company maintains nearly 20,000 acres of groves in Florida, and produces some 5 million boxes of oranges and grapefruit each year. This provides the greatest incentive for Minute Maid to strive for maximum economies and returns.

But, regardless of Minute Maid's size and productive capacity as a grower, the association bylaws of the Florida Orange Marketers provide that each member is entitled to only one vote. Therefore, the smallest grower-member of Florida Orange Marketers has just as much voice as any other member, and he receives the same percentage of profit. There is no opportunity for the processor to dominate the operation or policies of the association.

Minute Maid, as the processing factor in Florida Orange Marketers, has guaranteed every other FOM member that

the returns he receives this year will be equal to or more than that the grower would get from any of the other grower organizations.

The grower's marketing risk, therefore, is practically eliminated. He no longer must speculate in order to sell his fruit at a good price. And, what is more, each individual grower has the opportunity to share in the premium prices his citrus will bring when marketed under the nationally advertised Minute Maid labels.

Each member of the association is under contract individually with Florida Orange Marketers, which contracts in turn with the citrus processor—Minute Maid. Contracts are of 10 years duration, although each member has the option of withdrawal at the end of each season if he feels it advisable.

Formation of the Florida Orange Marketers has given the individual Florida grower the actual contact with the ultimate consumer which plays so dominant a role in stabilization of the entire citrus industry. Membership in Florida Orange Marketers provides a valuable incentive for the grower to utilize the full potential of his productive capacity.

The grower realizes, too, that as a member of Florida Orange Marketers the citrus concentrate made from his oranges will be produced in modern, up-to-date plants, with constant vigilance exercised by Minute Maid to assure a concentrate of the highest possible quality. He benefits, further, from the research being conducted by the processor to develop advanced and improved citrus products.

The FOM member now may be comfortable in the assurance that he also shares in the advantage of the economic, streamlined marketing policies of Minute Maid's national sales and merchandising staff.

This unique and exemplary organization, the Florida Orange Marketers, is an outstanding example of our American system of free enterprise. The citizens of Florida, and all other Americans, may well be proud of the ingenuity displayed by the founders of Florida Orange Marketers in helping to bring increased stability and much-needed security to the citrus industry.

4–H CLUBS ARE CHARTING THE ROAD TO A NEW AND BETTER AMERICA

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National 4–H Club Week is observed in March of each year by millions of 4–H Club members who unite head, heart, hands, and health in improving family and community living.

It is quite fitting that public attention should be focused on the values of 4–H Club training. I am aware of no group of young men and women who contribute more to the highest ideals embodied in our American way of life. As a practical youth program, 4–H Club work has succeeded because it is firmly grounded on worthy principles. The improvement of family and community living is the theme of this organization; and certainly in all the counties comprising the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, this theme has been developed until its impact is felt, and will continue to be felt, in each respective community.

The 4–H Club program is part of the national educational system of cooperative extension work in which the United States Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant colleges, and the counties share. The Federal Extension Service gives national leadership and the State extension services give State leadership to the program. The assistance given the boys and girls of the 4–H Clubs by their county agents, their home demonstration agents, as well as their vocational agricultural teachers, has been invaluable. These young people have profited through the counsel and knowledge thus imparted to them.

Farming has always been one of man's fundamental pursuits. It is the natural and good life. Almost from the time the United States declared its independence our forefathers started studying the problems besetting those who gained their livelihood from the soil. It was then that research, as we know it today, was put into effect. Benjamin Franklin began the practice of sending home seeds and improved breeds of domestic animals from abroad. John Quincy Adams recognized the feasibility in such action by instructing all United States consuls to forward rare plants and seeds to Washington. During the Adams administration a botanical garden was set up and a Committee on Agriculture was established in the Senate. Today, fortunately, our young people can profit through research as explained by their county agents, home-demonstration agents, and agricultural teachers.

In my Congressional District the boys and girls have demonstrated their ability, energy, and ambition by winning many of the 4–H Clubs' highest awards. And theirs is a well-rounded life with character development and good citizenship being their most significant goals. They have already felt a challenge in life and promise of future accomplishments. These young people have vision sustained by resolution and supported by unceasing effort. It was out of such vision that our Founding Fathers forged our priceless heritage. No land has been so blessed as ours; and, though the age in which we now live is a turbulent one, I am supremely confident that our young people of today, who shall be the leaders of tomorrow, will chart the road to a new and better America. They will look forward to the opportunity of tomorrow rather than back to the achievement of the past. The courage of youth counts, in spite of everything, on an unlimited future.

In saluting the 4–H Club members I also commend them for their courage, initiative, and unselfish devotion to the lofty aims of their organization.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DIES (at the request of Mr. DOWDY) on account of illness in family.

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. SHEEHAN, for 30 minutes on Wednesday, March 5.

Mr. MASON on Monday next, March 10, for 40 minutes, on the subject Federal Aid No Panacea for Our Educational Shortcomings.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 30 minutes tomorrow.

Mr. HERLONG, for 10 minutes today.

Mr GRAY, for 20 minutes tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include a news item.

Mr. BOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR and include the results of a recent poll.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include related matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois and to include an address by the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 734. An act to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1568. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; and

S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 4, 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:

1656. A letter from the comptroller of General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home-loan banks for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) and section 11 (j) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1431 (j)) (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1657. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 11, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on cooperative beach erosion control study of Palm Beach County from Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Fla., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1658. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 14, 1957, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Sun River at Great Falls, Mont., submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 15, 1947, requesting a review of reports on the Missouri River with a view to determining the feasibility of providing flood protection along Sun River, Mont., and its tributaries (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1659. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a progress report, prepared by the Federal Highway Administrator, on the highway cost allocation study, pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, approved June 29, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1660. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 209 (e) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to indemnify its contractors against unusually hazardous risks, to limit the liability of contractors so indemnified, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1662. A letter from the executive officer, National Monument Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting plans for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world, the ideals of a democracy as embodied in the freedoms, pursuant to section 2 (68 Stat. 1029); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1663. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to amend Public Law 85–162 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1664. A letter from the Chairman, Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, transmitting the preliminary report of the United States Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, pursuant to Public Law 262, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1665. A letter from the Chairman, Civil War Centennial Commission, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Civil War Centennial Commission, pursuant to section 6 (c) of the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1666. A letter from the national director, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting the annual report of the Boys' Clubs of America for 1957, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2042. An act to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war housing project Alaska–50083, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7149. A bill to provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian home administration account; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7226. A bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9410. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10679. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: H. R. 10803. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Resolution 451. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior and all departments of Government to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1447). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4445. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Chester Tomasi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry B. Kesler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8147. A bill for the relief of Kenneth W. Lenghart; with amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTOYA: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9490. A bill for the relief of Sidney A. Coven; with amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 285. An act for the relief of Paul Gustin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 879. An act for the relief of Anna Adora Jensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1600. An act for the relief of the C–L Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 11086. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 11087. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 11088. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. R. 11089. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11090. A bill to amend section 445 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide an exclusion from income for veterans' survivors eligible for pensions, for amounts paid by them for debts of the veteran and expenses of his last illness and burial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11091. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11092. A bill to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tulelake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota

provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 11093. 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. HIESTAND:

H. R. 11094. A bill to restrict military aircraft maintenance, overhaul, and modification functions in Government-operated facilities to performance of strictly military requirements that cannot be procured from private enterprise; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 11095. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 11096. A bill to amend section 3238, United States Code, title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. R. 11097. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 11098. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11099. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 11100. A bill to modify the project for the Coralville Reservoir on Iowa River in Iowa in order to provide for a highway bridge across Coralville Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11101. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 11102. A bill amending the jurisdiction of district courts in civil actions with regard to the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 556. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition, Los Angeles, Calif., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the dairy support price for the marketing year starting April 1, 1958, shall be not less than the current $3.25 per hundredweight for 3.95 percent butterfat milk and that the Secretary of Agriculture shall use a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period from July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive; 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. BERRY:

H. R. 11103. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Spindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 11104. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Mizuide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 11105. A bill for the relief of Margarete Strohner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 11106. A bill for the relief of Hironobu Kacho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 11107. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Batides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 11108. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christina Tules; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Res. 491. Resolution declaring it to be the sense of the House that Eric Johnston should immediately register and report as a lobbyist; 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:

448. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Claude Longenberger and other citizens of Columbia County, Pa., urging favorable action on a bill to grant pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

449. Also, petition of William E. Roach, and other citizens of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pa., urging the Congress to act favorably on legislation granting pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

450. Also, petition of Harold L. Ledyard, and other citizens of Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pa., urging the Congress to act favorably on legislation granting pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

451. Also, petition of Paul Jones and other citizens of Danville and Montour County, Pa., urging the Congress to act favorably on a bill to grant pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

452. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution by the Department of Public Utilities of the State of New Jersey that the present excise tax on transportation service performed by common carrier by motor vehicle and rail and contract carrier by motor vehicle is inimical to the use and maintenance of such service, injurious, not only to the carriers, but also to the people of the Nation and the Nation itself and should be forthwith repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

453. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Mahaska County, Iowa, urging support of bills to prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

454. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., requesting enactment of appropriate legislation authorizing the Federal Government to subsidize and support the establishment of an interisland roll-on, roll-off ferry system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. Also, petition of the president, Affiliated Chambers of Commerce of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., requesting that the planning, authorization, and financing of improvements to Kahului Harbor be expedited, bringing about early completion; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Neighborhood House Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the month of March in each year as Neighborhood House Month.

Established in 1886 to improve living conditions on the lower East Side of New York City, the settlement and neighborhood house movement has grown throughout the United States so that there are now more than 700 such establishments. They are located in almost every community of over 100,000 population. In my home city, Cleveland, Ohio, there are 12 settlements.

These settlements and neighborhood houses are helping to stimulate the interest of people in cities throughout our country in the conservation of their neighborhoods and the redevelopment and renewal of their cities. It is befitting that the public be made aware of the vital contribution of these centers to the sound well-being and cultural development of the cities of America. Therefore, I am introducing this resolution to designate the month of March of each year as Neighborhood House Month. It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Congress will take favorable action on it during this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution herewith:

Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the month of March in each year as Neighborhood House Month

Whereas the settlement movement in the United States was established in 1886 to improve living conditions on the lower East Side of New York City; and

Whereas the settlement house movement has grown throughout the United States so that there are now more than 700 such establishments in almost every community over 100,000 population in this country; and

Whereas settlements and neighborhood houses have enriched the lives of their neighbors of all ages, races, and creeds through skilled services and social reforms; and

Whereas the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, a federating body of many settlements and neighborhood houses, has for 47 years contributed much to the civic progress of our cities; and

Whereas settlements and neighborhood houses are helping stimulate the interest of people in cities throughout the United States in the conservation of their neighborhoods and the redevelopment and renewal of their cities; and

Whereas the settlements and neighborhood centers represent the voluntary efforts of citizens to improve their own environment and that of their fellow citizens; and

Whereas it is befitting that the public be aware of the vital contribution of settlements and neighborhood centers to the social well-being and cultural development of the cities of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue each year, beginning with the year 1959, a proclamation designating the month of March of such year as Neighborhood House Month and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the dean of the Illinois delegation, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and on behalf of all of the Members of Illinois I take the floor to pay tribute to the most recent honor accorded His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, outstanding religious prelate of Chicago. Our fair city is the seat of the largest Roman Catholic diocese in the United States. We congratulate him on his advance and wish him all success in his new role as the first American-born cardinal to be elevated to the Roman Curia, the central government of the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Stritch was named pro-prefect of the Roman Catholic faith. This agency supervises the spread of the faith to the missionary areas of the world. That such a singular honor should be bestowed upon his eminence is no mere coincidence. In our city of Chicago he has been called the cardinal of charity, stemming from his welfare efforts in orphanages and in hospitals of his archdiocese which treats upward of 200,000 patients annually. His energies and his efforts have added luster and stature as well as growth to the Stritch Medical School of Loyola University. His great devotion to the principles of education and higher learning have resulted in a woman's college and a Chicago high school named in his honor.

This man of unusual intelligence was ordained a priest at 22, and began a phenomenal rise, almost unheard of in ecclesiastical history. In 1917, he was made chancellor of the Nashville diocese; when 34 years of age, in 1921, he was appointed bishop of Toledo, Ohio, the youngest member of the church hierarchy in our country. In 1940, he was named archbishop of Chicago and raised to the rank of cardinal on December 23, 1945. Now, at the age of 70, his eminence assumes jurisdiction of 25,000 missionary priests, 10,000 missionary lay brothers, and 60,000 missionary nuns on 5 continents, as well as 30 million Roman Catholics in Africa and Asia.

Cardinal Stritch, with his demonstrated record of protector of the weak, guardian of the needy, and defender of the oppressed and their welfare, will bring much intensity of purpose and love of hard work into an area which represents one of the most critical locations in the tournament for the battle of men's minds.

Pope Pius XII, the spiritual ruler of nearly half a billion Roman Catholics, has done an honor to Chicago, to Illinois, and to the United States in singling out His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, a true prince of the church, for such an honor.

An Adequate National Guard and an Adequate Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Services Committee, which normally handles Reserve legislation, has been meeting over a period of weeks, holding hearings on the National Guard and Reserve program. These hearings were closed today and at the time of the closing of the hearings two important resolutions were unanimously adopted by the subcommittee. The first resolution concerns the National Guard and urges and gives full support from the subcommittee to a National Guard of not less than 400,000 strength, rather than a guard reduced to 360,000 as proposed.

The second resolution relates to the Reserve program. The subcommittee was unanimous in feeling that the Army Reserve should consist of 300,000 troops and the subcommittee urged that full efforts be made to prevent a reduction in the minimum Army Reserve strength of 300,000.

In other words, this subcommittee approved an Army consisting of National Guard and Federal Reserves of not less than 700,000 persons. The resolutions passed are herein set forth:

RESOLUTIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Whereas Subcommittee No. 1, House Armed Services Committee, has held extensive hearings on the proposal to reduce the size of the Army National Guard in fiscal 1959 from current strength of 400,000 to 360,000; and

Whereas the subcommittee has taken under consideration the proposal of the Army to develop a revised Reserve forces troop basis; and

Whereas the subcommittee has had the benefit of testimony from representatives of the Department of the Army, the National Guard Association, the Adjutant General Association, Members of Congress, the American Legion, governors, the governors' conference, and others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, a quorum being present, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, recommends the following to the full committee, that:

(1) The strength of the Army National Guard for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at 400,000, exclusive of persons engaged in 6 months' active duty for training; and

(2) Adequate spaces in the 6 months' training program be provided in fiscal year 1959 for the Army National Guard, and these be not less than a total of 48,000; and

(3) Recommendations be made to the Appropriations Committee to insure that language concerning Army National Guard and Army Reserve strength be made uniform with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of 6-month trainees; and

(4) The Army be directed to proceed with the development of plans for a revised National Guard troop basis, coordinating same with the States, through the National Guard Bureau, and that prior to its approval and implementation it be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of Congress; and

(5) Sufficient appropriations be provided to maintain the strength of the Army National Guard as set forth above and that these appropriations be in addition to funds now included in the budget and not less than the following:

National Guard	$38,000,000
Active Army (appropriations: Operations and maintenance in order to support the increased strength of Army National Guard)	13,800,000
Total	51,800,000

(6) The chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, be authorized to appear before the Appropriations Committee representing the Armed Services Committee in support of the foregoing recommendations.

Whereas Subcommittee No. 1, House Armed Services Committee, has held extensive hearings on the proposal to reduce the size of the Army Reserve in fiscal 1959 from current authorized strength of 300,000 to 270,000; and

Whereas the subcommittee has taken under consideration the proposal of the Army to develop a revised Reserve forces troop basis; and

Whereas the subcommittee has had the benefit of testimony from representatives of the Department of the Army, Reserve Officers Association, Members of Congress, and others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, a quorum being present, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, recommends the following to the full committee, that:

(1) The strength of the Army Reserve for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at 300,000, exclusive of persons engaged in 6 months' active duty for training; and

(2) Adequate spaces in the 6 months' training program be provided in fiscal year 1959 for the Army Reserve and these be not less than a total of 34,000; and

(3) Recommendations be made to the Appropriations Committee to insure that language concerning Army National Guard and Army Reserve strength be made uniform with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of 6-month trainees; and

(4) The Army be directed to proceed with the development of plans for a revised Reserve forces troop basis coordinating same with Reserve Forces Policy Board, and that prior to its approval and implementation it be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of Congress; and

(5) Sufficient appropriations be provided to maintain the strength of the Army Reserve as set forth above and that these appropriations be in addition to funds now included in the budget and not less than the following:

Army Reserve	$23,000,000
Active Army (appropriations: Operations and maintenance in order to support the increased strength of Army Reserves)	7,600,000
Total	35,600,000

(6) The chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, be authorized to appear before the Appropriations Committee representing the Armed Services Committee in support of the foregoing recommendations.

Results of McGregor 1958 Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of the questionnaire which I annually send to the people of the 17th Ohio District, the district which it is my proud honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

It has always been my belief that it is the duty and responsibility of every elected representative to do everything possible to obtain the views of those he represents on the vital national and international problems which confront us all. For this reason, I instituted the annual courthouse meetings, and for this reason I also circulate this questionnaire among the people of the district.

In connection with the distribution of the questionnaire, I want to mention particularly that the newspapers of my district have again provided wonderful cooperation. This year every daily paper in the district, and most of the weekly papers, published the questionnaire in a prominent place in their papers, so that a great many people who could not be reached by direct mail were given an opportunity to express themselves on these important matters. I am deeply grateful to these public-spirited editors and publishers for their assistance.

I am, of course, sorry that I could not reach every one of my constituents with this questionnaire, but it is my conviction that the replies received, coming as they do from representatives of almost every walk of life, provide me with a very helpful indication of the trend of thinking among a good cross-section of my people. As a part of the questionnaire, I ask them to mention their occupation or profession, and this gives me an opportunity to tabulate the results not only by overall percentages but also by somewhat more stratified separate groupings. I feel that this procedure gives me a more accurate and complete analysis of their opinions.

The population of my district is about half rural and half urban, and nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented, as well as both large and small business. In addition, there are two universities and two colleges. I am happy to report that answers were received from representatives of every one of these groups, and especially gratifying to me were the large number of completed forms which contained additional comments on the various questions. It is reassuring to me to know that so many constituents in my district are interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and are eager to express their views on them.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

A QUESTIONNAIRE

In an endeavor to learn the views of the folks back home relative to several subjects of national importance that will be before the Congress, may we have your considered opinion?

NATIONAL DEFENSE

After 18 months of continuous study, the nongovernmental Rockefeller studies group last week reported to the Nation that the United States must boost defense spending by about $3 billion each year for the next several years if it wants to halt a rapidly deteriorating position in the military race with Russia.

(NOTE.—The 21-man panel which made the Rockefeller study was a nonpartisan, nongovernmental group headed by Nelson Rockefeller. It consisted of a cross section of American life—scientists, representatives of labor, industrialists, former defense officials and military officers, atomic experts, educators, and publishers. Among the panel members was Gen. Lucius Clay, well known in our district.)

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Do you favor a larger Congressional appropriation for defense purposes?	76	24

TAXES

Before the successful launching of the Russian earth satellites, there was hope for the possibility of a tax cut this year. Now it appears that a choice must be made between stronger defense and lower taxes.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
Are you willing to postpone a tax cut in order that the necessary funds are available for defense needs?	81	19

EDUCATION

The Russians have apparently made tremendous strides in scientific education. Various proposals will be forthcoming concerning ways in which the Federal Government might assist in improving the level of education in this country.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
(*a*) Do you favor a system of Government-sponsored scholarships for the training of students showing exceptional aptitude in the sciences?	68	32
(*b*) Do you favor the appropriation of funds by Congress for construction of schools?	41	59

THE FARM PROGRAM

Do you believe that the soil bank program should be continued?	27	73
Do you believe that all Federal controls on farm products should be removed?	64	36

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY OCCUPATION OR PROFESSION

	Yes	No
Do you favor a larger Congressional appropriation for defense purposes?		
Total results, all occupations	76	24
Labor	71	29
Ministers	80	20
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Public officeholders and Federal employees	75	25
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers, etc.	77	23
Teachers	82	18
Attorneys	73	27
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	77	23
Farmers	48	52
Housewives	76	24
Students	95	5
Retired	70	30
Occupation not given	55	45
Are you willing to postpone a tax cut in order that the necessary funds are available for defense needs?		
Total results, all occupations	81	19
Labor	76	24
Ministers	100	0
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Public officeholders and Federal employees	75	25
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers, etc	80	20
Teachers	88	12
Attorneys	87	13
Businessmen, industry and salesmen	78	22
Farmers	62	38
Housewives	83	17
Students	93	7
Retired	78	22
Occupation not given	58	42
Do you favor a system of Government-sponsored scholarships for the training of students showing exceptional aptitude in the sciences?		
Total results, all occupations	68	32
Labor	68	32
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Public officeholders and Federal employees	64	36
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	55	45
Teachers	73	27
Attorneys	71	29
Businessman, industry and salesmen	68	32
Farmers	46	54
Housewives	72	28
Students	91	9
Retired	67	33
Occupation not given	44	56
Do you favor the appropriation of funds by Congress for construction of schools?		
Total results, all occupations	41	59
Labor	48	52
Ministers	66	34
Newspaper and radio	43	57
Public officeholders and Federal employees	44	56
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	32	68
Teachers	66	34
Attorneys	13	87
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	38	62
Farmers	29	71
Housewives	49	51
Students	62	38
Retired	23	77
Occupation not given	31	69

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY OCCUPATION OR PROFESSION—continued

	Yes	No
Do you believe that the soil-bank program should be continued?		
Total results, all occupations	27	73
Labor	18	82
Ministers	17	83
Newspaper and radio	38	62
Public officeholders and Federal employees	17	83
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	19	81
Teachers	29	71
Attorneys	14	86
Businessmen, industry and salesmen	16	84
Farmers	21	79
Housewives	35	65
Students	59	41
Retired	11	89
Occupation not given	14	86
Do you believe that all Federal controls on farm products should be removed?		
Total results, all occupations	64	36
Labor	73	27
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Public officeholders and Federal employees	78	22
Professional men, doctors, dentists, engineers	74	26
Teachers	41	59
Attorneys	74	26
Businessmen, industry, and salesmen	84	16
Farmers	74	26
Housewives	66	34
Students	21	79
Retired	86	14
Occupation not given	72	28

Washington Report by Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter for week of March 1, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Hon. BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 1, 1958.—A supplemental appropriations bill of $2.837 billion to get us through June produced some spirited debate. Another $175 million for the soil bank, beyond the $750 million already spent, was either "throwing good money after bad" or "being consistent, by extending aid to additional farmers," depending on your viewpoint. I opposed the increase. Additional funds ($10 million to each of 2 projects) for the upper Colorado River, the expense of 2 new "Federal cities": at Glen Canyon $12 million for housing 200 families; at Flaming Gorge $3½ million for housing 25 families. Also both have 7-lane roads planned, which in the smaller community would total 2 miles. All this is only a small part of this gigantic public reclamation and power project. This one passed also. My opposition was in the nature of protest over their spending so much more than their earlier estimate. This, of course, is all too customary in Federal planning. It's the foot in the door. Almost all power and reclamation projects greatly exceed original estimates (Uncle Sugar?). Lively debate accompanied other provisions: expanding immigration personnel ($375,000), additional U. N. contributions ($9.6 million), and more for the United States exhibit at the Brussels Fair. Causes for concern in the latter include: (1) Russia's $40–$45 million exhibit, the United States competitive stimulus, as earlier proclaimed, was revealed to be a $3½ million demountable building, whereas our beautiful exhibit building is permanent, (2) our expenditures were upped several times ($11.8 million—$2.2 million—now $9 million more) based on incorrect information, inept handling and general bungling.

Mutual security (foreign aid) was the subject of an amazing bipartisan array of public figures assembled to plead to a huge nationwide citizens group, for continued huge expenditures. Secretary Dulles said "600,000 Americans are employed as a result—the money is spent in the United States." (Is foreign aid intended as a subsidy to our industries?) Adlai Stevenson: "We must stop Russian expansion by creating strong nations and better customers. We must, in a global enterprise, push nations through stages of capital expansion so their savings expand, ending in solid economic apparatus of a modern state." (United States development took hundreds of years—also, is this the role of our Federal Government?) Rev. Dahlberg, Protestant; Rabbi Adams, Jew; and Bishop Sheen, Catholic, then gave the program the moral and spiritual backing of the church. These religious leaders, in fact, all the conference speakers, intentionally or not, revealed the anachronisms of our past Federal handouts, with strings attached, whether it be the economic, military, or political advantage we seek. One church leader claimed we have only one dimension to exemplify—the great religious and moral idea of our belief in God, individual dignity, and that government exists to serve man, not the reverse. Finally, his thought was to give the Federal money through existing religious missionary groups overseas in a true Christian spirit. Here then we'd join the church and state.

As I listened I marveled how we could all start, as Eric Johnston said, with just one purpose and reason as American citizens with love of country and come to such different conclusions. I felt the reasoning to be terribly wrong. Idealism had blinded many to the stark facts and lessons learned from giving $70 billion since World War II. Hardly mentioned was the heavily burdened taxpayer—or our present debt, or the failure of the program in so many ways. Could it be that trying to justify unconstitutional governmental activities only highlights the ideological self-contradictions? More of this later.

Former President Truman's criticisms caused many members to proclaim the total absence of facts in his statement. For example, Mr. Truman vigorously—almost gleefully—condemned unemployment, blaming the administration; yet, in 1950 when unemployment was even greater, he himself, said "a certain amount of unemployment, say from 3 to 5 million is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times—this is healthy for the economic body." Well, as I see it, Mr. Truman's planned economy is not the American way. Secretary of Commerce Weeks countered by saying "the Democratic gloom and doom brigade's whole program boils down to three words: 'Sell America short'." My concern—do people see through the political charges and countercharges?

Briefs: Reuther calling Senator GOLDWATER a moral coward provoked Republican HOFFMAN, of Michigan, to compare the war record of the two—GOLDWATER, a pilot in service; Reuther (classified 3–A—Reason? married) at home leading strikes which killed 41 people (1937–46). Hoover Commission summary shows 77 percent of recommendations accepted, but Congress hasn't acted on 50 recommendations. The farm program—a $3,500 wage earner, for example, pays (in taxes) $31.79 for just wheat, corn, and cotton supports, plus higher prices in the stores on these commodities. Secretary Benson, in trying to return the farmer to a free market, now takes the beating for us all who are tired of double taxation.

Manpower for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter Keenotes which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

What to do about manpower for the armed services is a problem which Congress and the country must face up to soon. Everyone agrees that the United States must maintain armed forces adequate to meet any emergency so long as the present stalemate between this country and the Russians continues. At the core of the manpower problem is the question of how the men are to be obtained for the armed services and how they are to be paid.

At the present time, we depend upon the draft and voluntary enlistments to fill the needs of the services. Turnover of personnel is high. The loss of trained personnel each year is not only a serious drag on the efficiency of the services but it is also extremely expensive.

It costs about $25,000 to recruit and train a man for duty with one of the services. If he serves only his draft period, or his short enlistment, this tremendous investment will be largely wasted.

The draft is a highly costly operation. Congress appropriates about $24 million each year to support the Selective Service System. The draft calls run about 10,000 men a month. Some experts contend the draft is a highly inefficient way of recruiting manpower in times of peace. It interrupts the lives of young men and, in many instances, delays if not prevents their college education.

An imposing array of experts in the field of defense manpower, both civilian and military, contend the problem can best be met by a more realistic method of paying men in the services. The pay scale should be based upon skill and ability and not upon length of service, these experts believe.

They offer convincing evidence to support their views. For instance, if highly skilled technicians, who are increasingly important to a defense system that relies more and more on missile and other intricate electronic devices, can be induced to choose one of the services as a career, the need for replacements will be greatly reduced.

The Cordiner report, named after the General Electric president who headed a Presidential commission, recommended pay scales for these experts based upon ability. The report recommends making the services attractive enough to keep the men from taking their skills, acquired at Government expense, to private industry at the end of enlistments.

Some men believe a revision of the pay scale, in line with the Cordiner report, would save $5 billion a year in the costs of recruitment and training. Perhaps this is high. But many experts agree that this proposed system would produce better qualified men and do away with the need for expensive and inefficient recruitment and drafting.

At the present time a House Armed Services subcommittee is engaged in a study of

defense manpower. This highly important hearing is not attracting the headlines of the investigation into FCC or studies of missiles and other outer-space developments.

But the result of this hearing could, in the long run, be of utmost importance to the future security of the country. Out of the hearings may possibly come a manpower system that will not only produce the necessary trained technicians but can do so at substantially less cost to the taxpayer.

This manpower problem is one that deserves the close attention and careful study not only of Congress but of all our people.

Investigation of Conditions in Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] at the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York City on February 20, 1958.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCLELLAN AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE TRAFFIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., FEBRUARY 20, 1958

Mr. Chairman, it is a very great honor to be your guest this evening. It is a high privilege indeed to have this opportunity to address such a magnificent audience. I have looked forward to this delightful occasion with keen pleasure and anticipation.

I have long heard that your annual dinners are distinguished by the fact that they attract large numbers of outstanding leaders who are truly representative of the transportation industry and the traffic systems of our great country, and this one is no exception.

Before this informed group it would be fruitless for me to talk about the vital importance of transportation as it is related to the growth, economic power, and security of our Nation. You who are directly associated with, and who are so thoroughly acquainted with, the history and outstanding achievements of our transportation industry could hardly be impressed by any statistics that I might quote, nor could you be entertained by, or benefit from, any glittering generalities in which I might indulge.

Although I am in a general way familiar with pressing problems now confronting some segments of transportation, it would be most presumptous of me, with my limited knowledge, to undertake at this time any informative discussion of them, or to offer any suggestion of a legislative program for their solution.

Some of your difficulties I know need legislative attention. The Congress is aware of that, and I am persuaded that it will give early consideration to bills that are designed to remove discrimination and to eliminate inequities wherever they may now exist. To that end, I shall gladly cooperate with my colleagues who serve on the respective committees having jurisdiction over those measures and who have the initial responsibility for processing and recommending appropriate corrective legislation.

But tonight my remarks shall be addressed, not to matters of peculiar interest to the transportation industry alone, but rather to subjects of grave concern to all of our citizens everywhere.

I do not believe it is an overstatement of reality to say that we stand today at a crucial turning point in world history. International tensions, it seems to me, mount rather than diminish. Our security continues to be threatened; our safety endangered; our freedom and our very survival challenged.

No Congress within my service or memory has been confronted with graver or more urgent problems demanding attention and action. These problems involve intricate, complex, and highly controversial issues that must be resolved. Their proper solution will require wisdom, courage, and statesmanship of the highest order.

During the past dozen years in the cold-war struggle with atheistic communism, we have spent (under the stress of compelling necessity) more than $300 billion for an arsenal to keep ourselves and our allies prepared for any eventuality. The Defense Establishment we have built has been, up to now, sufficient to deter Communist aggression.

Our aim has been to maintain such control of the land, of the sea, and of the air as would provide us protection and security. But a fundamental revolution has recently taken place. Science and technology have been advanced to such unprecedented dimensions that dominance of the land, of the sea, and of the air is no longer militarily sufficient to insure our safety.

The new frontiers projected on the horizon of this satellite age are fraught with hazards and dangers that force us into a contest with Russia for the mastery of outer space and for supremacy in ballistic missiles. Our survival may well depend upon—and I believe it does—our ingenuity and capacity to not only keep pace with, but ahead of, the totalitarian world in those areas of science and technology. Should the Communist powers prevail in this contest, they will dominate this planet on which we live and have all humanity at their mercy.

Such a potentiality is horrible to contemplate, but such a possibility must be kept uppermost in our minds during the months and years ahead. In this cosmic duel we must be the victors, else we may well become the vanquished.

Let us not be deceived. The struggle on which we have embarked has no end in sight. It is a desperate, unrelating conflict of indeterminable duration. In the days gone by we have not been indifferent, but neither have we been sufficiently alert.

Made complacent by the knowledge of our incontestable superiority in the past, and by our overoptimism for the future, we have taken too much for granted. We relaxed our guard and miscalculated and underestimated what Russia was doing. Thus we have failed to assess properly the overall effort and progress she was making. We have simply been too slow to grasp and acknowledge the full import and significance of the Communist tyranny and its international conspiracy.

Recent Soviet successes present harsh and irrefutable proof that in some vital areas of science and technology Russia has gained, at least, a temporary lead and advantage. To me, this cold fact has somber implications of military peril which we cannot ignore except at the risk of our own destruction. We must recapture as quickly as possible that which we have lost. It is imperative that we do so. We cannot permit any considerations to interfere; we cannot brook any delay in our efforts to speed progress in that direction.

Our highest hopes and aspirations, our ultimate goals, are, and have always been, to preserve freedom, to promote tranquillity among all nations, and to establish an honorable and lasting peace. These ends cannot be achieved by our reverting to a posture of military weakness, or by our lagging second best to the totalitarian powers in our scientific and technological achievements. Such a decline in our international stature, if permitted to occur, would promptly expose and subject the whole Free World to ruthless aggression and conquest.

The attainment of our objectives poses problems and necessitates projects that transcend in magnitude and importance all other tasks and issues awaiting resolvement. They must remain the top priorities of our labors and ingenuity.

To meet the exacting demands they have, and will, thrust upon us, we shall need to develop, conserve, and prudently use our economic strength and resources. Sound fiscal policies are vital if we are to keep our economy strong. The economic power that we shall surely need in the long and titanic struggle ahead is not reposed, nor can it be found, in an insolvent government and a bankrupt national treasury.

Nor can we tolerate, in this era of challenge and crisis, anything in our domestic affairs which has an adverse impact and a weakening influence upon the vigor and strength of our national economy. In my opinion, any improper practices, criminal activities, or oppressive conditions that prevail in labor-management relations definitely fall within that category.

When I first became chairman of the Senate select committee charged with the duty of investigating improper practices in management-labor relations, I had only a limited concept of the scope and the importance of the assignment that the committee was undertaking. Little did I realize then the full nature of the intimidation, coercion, force, violence, dictatorship, and corruption which were to be revealed, and the extent to which they had pervaded labor-management relations. The grim truth and ugly facts of the unwholesome conditions that prevail are now being brought to light before the bar of public opinion.

As you may know, the committee is now preparing, and will soon submit to the Senate, an interim report covering its work during the first year of its labors. When this report becomes available to the public, I strongly commend it to each of you as must reading. Although the press has given the committee's revelations fine coverage, it has been impossible for it to present the full story in all of its sordid details. I believe that when you read the report you will agree with me that the combined talents of our best fiction writers could not have created or contrived a more fantastic story.

The crime, corruption, and improper activities we have uncovered, as shown in the report, are so recurrent, shameful, and shocking as to constitute a national disgrace. It is almost incredible, almost unthinkable that such exploitation of the laboring man, of management, and of the general public as the committee has unearthed could happen in America, and, worse still, that it has occured, and still exists, with impunity.

I do not believe there can be found in the annals of Congress a record of any committee that ever labored more faithfully than this select committee, or that developed more factual and valuable information for legislative purposes.

Last year we held 104 days of public hearings in which we heard 486 witnesses whose recorded testimony covered 17,489 pages of transcript. In addition, the committee held many executive sessions and conferences. For each witness who appeared before the committee, the staff interviewed another 20 or 25 people; and the staff also examined, checked, and screened literally thousands of letters, records, documents, and accounts. Nearly 100,000 letters were received. Seventy-five percent or more of these were from

union members or their families. Thousands of complaints have been filed with us. Many of them have real merit and warrant committee action. It will never be possible, however, for this committee to process all of them.

From these facts alone, you can judge that the committee's task is stupendous. To describe it as colossal would be no exaggeration. It is certainly most arduous, difficult, and often unpleasant.

Necessarily, we have had to deal in many instances with people of low character, or of no character at all: manipulators and conspirators (both in labor and management), crooks, hoodlums, thieves, thugs, extortionists, and murderers. From such witnesses we try to get evidence—facts within their knowledge that would reveal what the public and the Congress have the right to know. Many of them resort to willful perjury; others invoke, capriciously use, and flagrantly abuse, the privilege of the fifth amendment; some sink into a coma of forgetfulness, and their memory faculties completely collapse when they are interrogated. Some of these witnesses who have appeared before us are among the Goliaths of the underworld and organized crime.

Professional criminals, racketeers, gangsters, and other assorted disreputable types have infiltrated the union movement—in some unions and some areas—to an extent that is alarming and dangerous. They have seized key positions from which they have been able to exploit labor-management relations for their own personal greed, gain, and profit.

Such infiltration has by no means been accidental. It has been the result of a deliberate and calculated effort by hoodlum and criminal elements to entrench themselves in the labor movement as a means of grabbing money and power. This infiltration constitutes one of the most critical problems which confront honest unionism. It poses one of the greatest threats to law and order, to our free economy, and to the civil and human rights to all of our citizens.

These elements not only flout the laws of common decency, equity, and justice—they have defied the AFL–CIO's enforcement of its ethical codes and standards and they will finally, if not stopped, challenge the very supremacy of our Government. These ruthless, evil men would, and will, unless prevented, create and perpetuate a gangster economy in this country.

Just take a look at the teamsters, the largest and most strategic labor union in the country, the one with which you in the transportation industry are directly concerned, and which wields tremendous power over the transportation services and facilities of our entire economy.

Notwithstanding the exposure of the corrupt and criminal activities of a number of its leaders, who befouled this great union with a racket-ridden, hoodlum-infested, scandal-packed administration, the Hoffa and O'Rourke elements still reign supreme, although the Teamsters International Union has been expelled from the parent federation, the AFL–CIO.

To illustrate the vicious and contemptible attitude of the rulers of the union, and their depravity of intellect and character, we need only quote from the remarks of Mr. Hoffa in an interview given to Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, and published in the January 12 issue of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Nashville Tennessean. In this interview Hoffa baldly declared that Glenn W. Smith, the teamster chief of Chattanooga, who served 2 penitentiary terms for robbery and burglary, and whom the committee exposed as 1 of the 3 men largely responsible for the violence and depredations committed in the Tennessee area, is the "kind of a guy needed to kick those hillbillies around" (referring to teamster union members in Tennessee and the South). Hoffa also is quoted as referring to truckers in the South as "them lice," and saying that the unprincipled employers with whom the union deals in Tennessee, and the "hillbillies" who are union members, make it necessary to keep men like Glenn Smith, "Hard of Hearing" Smith, and Don Vestal in official positions in the union.

Hoffa then, in effect, brazenly announced his purpose and intention to keep unreformed exconvicts, thieves, extortionists, hoodlums, racketeers, gangsters, and musclemen at the head of important local unions, and to rule and dominate by force and violence.

Another union comparable to the teamsters in the low stature of its leadership and administration is the International Union of Operating Engineers. There are a number of other unions—some of which the committee has already probed, such as the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union, and the United Textile Workers of America—which have a most unsavory record of dictatorial and corrupt operations. Preliminary investigations are underway by the committee preparatory to public hearings on still other unions which I am convinced will suffer in public esteem and confidence when their practices and conduct are bared to the spotlight of public inquiry.

The labor movement in this country has grown up. It is no longer a struggling infant. It is now big business. Labor organizations control billions of dollars of our national wealth. Their annual income from initiation fees, dues, and assessments exceeds $600 million. Their welfare and pension funds contain some $25 billion to $30 billion, with an inflow in excess of $5 billion annually.

This colossal and growing economic power must never fall under the management and control of this gangster element, which would make it a dynamic force for evil with a devastating effect on the economic, social, and political health of this Nation.

The rights of working people, the due-paying members of unions, and the public interest must be protected from the character of inflictions and exploitations to which I have referred.

The AFL–CIO can expel from its organization unions under corrupt leadership. It can condemn improper practices and place a stigma of disrepute on unions and leaderships that defy the laws of decency and integrity as prescribed by the AFL–CIO ethical practices code. But that is about the limit of what it can do. Notwithstanding the excellent and courageous efforts of Mr. George Meany and by his colleagues of the ethical practices committee, and the AFL–CIO executive board to drive these elements out of the parent federation of labor, strong remedial legislation is needed. It is imperative.

However commendable the action of the AFL–CIO with regard to such unions, mere expulsion lacks adequate corrective force.

The teamsters, for example, still operate as before their expulsion, with the same power, the same authority, the same arrogance. The union continues under the same corrupt leadership, with the announced purpose of continuing the shameful practices and criminal activities that brought dishonor to it. It can still impose dictatorial rule over its rank and file, denying them their proper rights under recognized democratic processes. It can continue to exploit management and the public. It is not out of business. It has not reformed, and no reformation is in sight.

Can Hoffa get away with this? Can others of his ilk get away with similar acts of defiance of the public welfare?

They can, unless the rank-and-file members show the courage to rebel against dictatorship, gangsterism, collusion, and thievery in their unions.

They can, unless the Congress of the United States enacts laws to liberate hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of American workers from the oppression and bondage to which they are now subjected by such malevolent, amoral men. Only the instrumentality of corrective legislation is left as a defense and protection against those segments of organized labor and their leaders who persist in their efforts to gangsterize the economy of this country.

The emphasis of responsibility in the legislative field is now shifting from the select committee to the Congress. During the committee's first year in existence, while it was in the initial process of factfinding, such Congressional action was not feasible. Now, however, enough evidence has been amassed by the committee so that the Congress can, and should, legislate in those areas where the facts have been developed and evils have been brought to light. Otherwise, the intensive labors of the committee will not have reaped their rightful harvest.

I believe the Congress will take action; encouraging signs point in that direction. The President has submitted the legislative recommendations of his administration. They are reasonably good as far as they go. I support in the main their general objectives, but they are inadequate in scope and strength to meet the full legislative responsibility.

Some 14 separate bills proposing legislation in this field have been introduced in the Senate since Congress convened. Other bills, I am confident, will be presented during this session. Before, or simultaneously with, the filing of the committee's interim report I shall, myself, introduce a measure covering some of the areas in which the committee has already made startling disclosures.

In general, we must enact laws that will, among other things, clearly define and prescribe basic standards and requirements for the administration of union affairs. Such standards and requirements must include the establishing of firm democratic processes that will restore to the rank-and-file members the right to choose their officials by secret ballot in elections at stated intervals, and also to determine and resolve major-policy issues by like method and procedure.

A complete and accurate accounting for, and a full report of, all union, welfare, and pension funds must be required; the investment of such funds regulated and the willful destruction of the financial and other pertinent records of unions prohibited, with criminal penalties invoked for any willful violation of such requirements.

Unreformed exconvicts, gangsters, and racketeers must be declared ineligible to hold any official or representative positions in any labor organization. The expenditure of union, welfare, and pension funds for nonunion purposes; organizational picketing of certain types; the use of force and violence; the arbitrary imposition of trusteeships on locals for an indefinite period; and collusion in management-labor relations must be prohibited; and the laws with respect to extortion and bribery must be strengthened.

Some sources are charging that it is the committee's purpose to induce Congress to enact restrictive, oppressive, and punitive legislation. That is not true. I shall never knowingly vote for a law designed simply to suppress or to oppress decent, honest unionism; but I am prepared to support legislation that is necessary to restrict, prohibit, and prevent the improper practices to which I have referred, and every law that I have suggested here tonight is definitely for the protection and in the interest of the rank-and-file members of organized labor and their families.

The arrogant, dishonest, crooked, and dictatorial leaders and the disreputable elements that have infiltrated some unions, and who are now engaged in the iniquitous exploitation of working people, of management,

and of the public at large should not only be restricted, oppressed, and punished, but with the help of decent unionism and its leadership, we need to drive those characters out of the labor movement and keep them out.

With the cooperation, support, and good will of all honest and respectable elements of American citizenry, within labor and management, and without, the committee will continue its searching effort to bring to the Congress all of the information it needs upon which to predicate remedial legislation; and I have faith that the Congress will enact laws which will bring about badly needed reforms in labor-management relations, and thus render a lasting and constructive service to our country.

Analysis of H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave heretofore granted, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following memorandum I have prepared with respect to H. R. 8002 which is scheduled to come to the floor on Wednesday, March 5. I hope the analysis and comments will prove helpful.

H. R. 8002 would amend section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921—now section 11 of title 31 of the United States Code—that being the section which defines the President's function and obligation with respect to preparing and submitting his annual budget.

That bill presents two problems: First, Is the end result at which the bill is aimed a good one? and, second, Does the bill in its plan and phraseology provide a sound and practical procedure for attaining that end? The announced purpose of the bill is good—it is like saying one is against sin to say that one would like to strengthen the control which can be exercised by Congress over departmental expenditures and especially the unobligated funds carried over from previous years. Neither among proponents nor among opponents of the bill have I found any criticism of or opposition to that broad objective.

I have found, however, that many colleagues have not considered the second question. Since that is the field of controversy, a short analysis of the bill may be helpful.

The bill declares that it is "the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis"; that the amount of proposed appropriations shall, "to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President, be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis"; that the conversion to the use of the annual accrued expenditure methods "shall be accomplished in such manner and at such time as may be determined by the President"; and finally that the bill shall cease to be in effect July 1, 1961.

Under the circumstances which exist, it seems to me that this is a queer and illogical plan for the changes proposed.

For one thing, would it not be ridiculous for Congress, after considering seriously and approving a change in policy such as that proposed in the bill, to wind up by saying that the change should cease to be effective after 2 years? Surely a bill of this kind should not be proposed as a 2-year experiment. If the scheme of the bill is sound and advantageous, it should be proposed on a long-term basis. If it is not demonstrably sound the bill should not be enacted.

Even more important, the 84th Congress, by Public Law 863, gave the President authority to require the several departments to adopt accrual accounting procedures. H. R. 8002 would be effective only with respect to departments which have so changed their accounting system. To date the President has been able to direct that change in only a few of the smaller departments. It is not expected that the Department of Defense, for example, can make such a change for another 3 or 4 years. Therefore, it would seem that if H. R. 8002 were to be enacted, there would not now be any substantial area of Government operations in which the bill could apply.

H. R. 8002 contains three sections. Section 1 would add four new subsections to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act. These four subsections are the provisions for the so-called annual accrued expenditure basis for appropriations. Section 2 is in effect a limitation of the scope of section 1. It provides some leeway for making contracts outside the limits set forth in section 1, and it states the rulemaking character of the bill. Section 3 contains the provision already referred to that the bill shall cease to be effective July 1, 1961.

Now for the details of the proposed basis for appropriations and some comments thereon:

The first subparagraph of section 1 attempts to define the reasons for the bill. It declares that revisions in the presentation of budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations are essential in order "to provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by Congress," but the bill does not provide for any information which the executive and legislative branches of Congress cannot get under present laws; "to reduce or eliminate the large carryover balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to another," but again these results are already within the existing power of Congress and the executive, and depend upon action by those branches of Government; "to bring about economy in Government expenditures," but the bill adds nothing to present law on the subject. The result described would come only by actions of the Congress outside of this bill.

The bill declares that, for the foregoing reasons, it is the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis. Since the three reasons quoted above are contrary to fact, the bill cannot be regarded as good legislation.

Section 2 of the bill attempts to define certain situations in which contracts may be made in addition to the amount of an appropriation authorized on the annual accrued expenditure basis. This is new law and provides authority for making contracts beyond the year covered by the annual accrued expenditure estimate. The section relates to technical matters which I am not qualified to discuss, but I am informed by those familiar with the technical side of appropriations and contracting that there is serious controversy on whether or not such contract authority should be granted.

The bill has been widely publicized as a measure which would enable the Government to make savings which it cannot make under the present law. I find no basis for that assertion. In fact an Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and one of the directors of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report have stated to me that the enactment of H. R. 8002 will not enable the Government to make any savings which could not be made under present law if the House committees and the Director of the Budget utilized their existing powers. The executive officers and the House committee have all the authority they need under the laws now in force. I have asked the Citizens Committee many times to give me a single case to which the foregoing statement would not apply, but on analysis none of the cases submitted sustains the assertion of those who support the bill.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 8002 should not be enacted.

Cardinal Samuel Stritch, of Chicago, Named Pro-Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the naming by Pope Pius of Cardinal Samuel Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, as pro-prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He becomes a member of the curia of the church in Rome, the first American ever to be so named.

The congregation is the seventh, in order, of the 12 congregations which govern the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church. The Pope is prefect of the first three, the congregations for the holy office, the consistory, and the oriental church.

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith originated in a commission of cardinals set up by Pope Gregory XIII to seek a reconciliation of the divergent eastern branches of the church.

SPREADS THE FAITH

The commission was expanded in its functions by Pope Clement VIII, and was created as a permanent consistory by Pope Gregory XV in 1622.

It was charged with the task of spreading the Roman Catholic faith throughout the world, and its jurisdiction today is one of the broadest in the church.

It has wide authority in the field of the church's missionary work, and in mission territories exercises the functions of other congregations of the church, as well.

The appointment brings the number of cardinals in the curia to 15. Previously these have always been Italian, French, British, Spanish, or Dutch. Only other non-Italian member at present is Cardinal Eugene Tisserant of France.

When the cardinals eventually are called on to pick a successor to Pope Pius, who celebrates his 82d birthday tomorrow, the cardinals are unlikely to choose anyone who has not had experience in the central government of the Catholic Church. Today's appointment will give Cardinal Stritch that experience.

CONGRATULATED BY CHICAGOANS OF ALL CREEDS

Chicagoans of all faiths reacted with expressions of pleasure and pride to the announcement yesterday that Cardinal Stritch, Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago, has been made pro-prefect of the Catholic Church's Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith.

Cardinal Stritch said he received the news with surprise. Noting that never before has an American prelate held such an important office, the cardinal declared modestly, "It is clear that Pope Pius XII in honoring me principally had in mind honoring the church in the United States.

DALEY GIVES CONGRATULATIONS

Mayor Daley, joining other Chicagoans in saying he was delighted to see Cardinal Stritch honored, said, "I shall be sorry to see him go. The cardinal has enjoyed the respect and admiration of everyone, and we are losing one of the Nation's great churchmen.

In Springfield, Governor Stratton said:

This is indeed a most fitting honor and distinction bestowed on Cardinal Stritch. The United States in general and the State of Illinois in particular is highly honored.

Among the thousands who sent their congratulations to Cardinal Stritch were the Reverend Dr. Paul M. Robinson, president of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, and Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, congregational director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

PERSONAL LOSS TO FRIENDS

A leading layman in the Chicago archdiocese, Charles C. Kerwin, of Lake Forest, former president of Catholic Charities of Chicago and vice president and treasurer of the Catholic Church Extension Society, said the departure of Cardinal Stritch will mean a great personal loss to everyone who has known him.

At the same time, he said, he was overjoyed that Cardinal Stritch has received the great honor. Kerwin is a knight commander of the Order of Pius IX, one of the highest orders in the church.

Cardinal Francis Spellman, of New York City, sent this telegram to Cardinal Stritch:

My heartfelt congratulations go to your eminence on the great distinction of being the first American cardinal in history to be designated a cardinal in the Roman Curia.

[From the Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1958]

TEXT OF STATEMENT

Cardinal Stritch issued the following statement after the announcement he had been elevated to the office of Roman Curia:

"When this news came to me, I was surprised and amazed. It never entered my mind that the holy father would think of me for such an important office in the Roman Curia, which assists his holiness in the government of the universal church.

"It is clear that his holiness in honoring me, principally had in mind honoring the church in the United States. Never before in history has an American prelate been called to such an important office. The Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, under the immediate authority of the holy father, is entrusted with the care of the foreign missions of the church.

CITES GROWING INTEREST

"The Catholics of the United States have shown a growing interest in these missions. Quite evidently, the holy father, in calling me to this office, wished to give another expression of his fatherly appreciation for this interest.

"At the call of his holiness I shall go to Rome and with God's help try to prove myself worthy of his confidence and of the great Catholic body of whom I shall be a symbol.

"To my clergy and people on this occasion I express my deep affection. They have been my support and edification through these 18 years. I know that I shall have their prayers in the discharge of the heavy responsibilities of the office to which I am called.

AWAITS OFFICIAL NOTICE

"I may say to them that I have not received the official document calling me to this important office. When I receive it I shall inform them in detail of what is involved in this call of the holy father.

"For the present, all that I know is that the holy father has called me to be the pro-prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith.

"The prefect is the esteemed Cardinal Fumasoni-Biondi, whom we remember as being apostolic delegate in the United States. It will be a great comfort for me to have at my side this great cardinal, who, with the exception of his years as apostolic delegate in the United States, has been an outstanding official from minor to prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of Faith.

TELLS LOVE FOR CITY

"His knowledge of the foreign missions, his great abilities and his understanding promises me some usefulness in helping the holy father in his great apostolate for the missions of holy church in these difficult times.

"May I add that after 18 years here in Chicago, despite my being from other parts, I am a Chicagoan and I love Chicago, its people and its warmth. It is my prayer that through the years which God will give me I shall be able to contribute my little part to making Chicago the world's greatest city, in which spiritual values will take precedence over material and humanistic considerations."

We, all the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois, honor this gentle, quiet, firm, religious man of God; his interest in the aged and the poor by fostering, stimulating and providing arranged financing for the building of homes for their betterment as one of his outstanding accomplishments.

He venerated and served the so-called older parishes of the disappearing home neighborhoods, near the heart of the downtown commercial areas of cities. He helped modernize their structures and developed programs for the return of parishioners. His attainments have benefited God and country in every emergency, either in times of war or peace. He was always an American and a patriot. We ask God's blessing and bid him Godspeed in his new work to care for the needy, the sick, and the forgotton humans, in the missions of the world, that a new peace may enter their lives.

A Bill To Amend the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the Social Security Act, and provide a more liberal application of the law.

In the first instance my bill would remove the present limitation of $1,200 per annum on outside income that can be earned by those who are recipients of social-security benefits. In this day and age when the cost of living continues to spiral upward, and savings have been evaporated, it is most difficult for many of our elder citizens to make ends meet, and to provide themselves with even the bare necessities of life. The removal of the income limitation will enable them to live more comfortably and securely in their old age, without the fear of dependency on other members of the family, or on society itself.

The second provision of the bill would make full social-security benefits payable to men at the age of 60, and to women at the age of 55. The current requirements are 65 years of age for men, and 62 years of age for women. The reduction in this age limit would permit many of our working force to retire earlier than anticipated from the labor market, and thus make room for the thousands of younger men and women who must be absorbed into this labor market each year. Today many firms in private industry have a fixed policy against hiring new workers who are over 40, and yet have a firm policy of retiring workers who have reached the age of 65. Labor and management have been giving much thought and consideration to the problem of the older worker and his retirement, but there is need for further research which must be undertaken by industry, labor, and the employees themselves. By 1975 it is estimated that there will be more than 20 million Americans 65 years of age and over. The number

of elder citizens in this country is growing larger each year, and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to reevaluate and revise, if necessary, our programs for the welfare of these senior citizens.

The third section of this package bill provides for the elimination of the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 before he is eligible to receive disability-insurance benefits. Under the present law many people who are disabled through no fault of their own must wait years before they reach the age of 50 and can apply for benefits. In the meantime they are forced to rely on relatives, friends or welfare agencies for their very existence. Removing the age limitation would permit a worker to file immeditaely for benefits after he has become disabled, and would in some small measure contribute to his support and that of his dependents.

The welfare of all our citizens, young or old, able or disabled, should be of primary concern to us, and I believe that this legislation, which brings into 1 package 3 major changes in the Social Security Act, would help us keep pace with the changing scene, and would certainly be a humanitarian act benefiting so many more of our people.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 26, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] made an important address before the Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

This address made a valuable contribution to our thinking on the subject of the importance of our mutual aid program. Because of the timeliness of the subject and the contribution which it makes to the mutual security legislation which we will presently be considering in this body, I ask unanimous consent that the address be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, AT LUNCHEON SESSION OF THE FIFTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1958

For some years now the United States has provided various types of assistance to other nations, both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis. These programs, under a variety of names—Marshall plan, point 4, mutual aid, mutual security, not to mention the various international or institutionalized programs—have generally enjoyed wide support. Of course, each year the request for appropriations has set off a debate. But overall, both parties have given their support and much of the argument has been over matters of detail rather than basic substance. Nevertheless, it is not news to suggest that this year the going for those who believe in the worth of the assistance programs is going to be much harder. This is particularly true of the economic and technical assistance programs.

Yet I think there is little doubt there will continue to be an assistance program in these areas. The reason is simple. There has to be. Basically we really have no choice as to that, though the form and the types and the amounts of assistance are another, and vitally important, matter.

It is not just the menace of communism that impels us. Certainly, that is important. Few will quarrel with the purely military assistance program. And most will recognize, too, that the military effort that our allies can put forth, especially those like Turkey, for example, in an exposed position, is directly affected by their economic situation. Hence the name of "defense support" for what is in effect economic aid to those countries with whom we are linked in defense pacts. The mutuality of interest in such activities is clear.

Neither is the threat of Communist economic penetration in the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations the whole justification for a program of economic assistance. Though the fact that the Communist bloc is now launched on an ambitious program of economic aid—and gives every indication of carrying it through—does indeed lend special urgency to our own efforts in this field.

In my own deep belief, were communism to disappear entirely from the world, we would still find ourselves impelled to help other nations in their efforts toward economic advance. For no nation, no less than no man, is an island entirely to itself, in Donne's famous phrase.

To turn an indifferent back to the struggles of other nations to realize their economic potentialities, and thereby to improve the well-being of their citizens, would be to go directly against all that is deepest and best in our tradition, to reject a basic precept of the heritage on which our society is built. It would also, of course, be to go against our own long-range material interests. But I stress the inherent rightness of our course because to debate the question solely on the basis of what's-in-it-for-us does injustice to our people, I believe. And it ill serves us in the eyes of others who are likely, not unnaturally, to take us at our own valuation.

As I see it, therefore, the real question we face is not whether we shall have an economic and technical assistance program, but how much and what kind of a program.

Most of the argument over economic assistance in the past has centered about the how much. No one who pays taxes can fail to have an interest in it. Last week the President submitted to Congress a program calling for $3.9 billion in mutual security funds for the next year. Of this, $1.8 billion is for direct military assistance and another billion for defense support and special assistance to allies, $788.5 million would be allocated to economic and technical assistance to other nations. (This excludes both the contingency fund and contributions to certain relief and other international programs.)

These are large sums. Yet the need to which they are directed is far greater. Indeed it is estimated by reputable economists that 1 to 3 billion a year from all capital sources is needed to accelerate the economic growth of the underdeveloped nations. Obviously, the United States cannot finance all the capital needs of the underdeveloped nations. But the disparity in the figures suggests that at least part of our concern should be, not how we can cut the program further, but, considering the stakes involved, is it enough?

Nonetheless, money is by no means the only or the chief of our problems.

It comes as something of a shock to most Americans to realize that in many parts of the world his country and its intentions are regarded with skepticism and often outright mistrust. Sons of revolutionaries ourselves, we find it strange indeed to be looked at as the inheritors or protectors of an outmoded colonialism. The extent to which the stereotype of the capitalist exploiter has taken hold confuses and angers us. Striving in our own country to achieve equal dignity and equal opportunity for all men, regardless of their race, we are shocked by the depth of bitterness against the white man—any white man—among many people of another color.

The injustice of such attitudes may rankle but the fact is they exist. And we have to reckon with them if we hope to influence the new nations toward the ways of peace and freedom.

Throughout Asia, in Africa, and in the Middle East, the old societies are breaking up. Everywhere there is change and, above all, a new and driving determination to achieve a better life, one way or another. We cannot stop the drive—even if we wanted to—but we can hope to help it go forward in ways that will at least be not unfriendly.

In concrete terms, that seems to me to require first of all a clear showing of our genuine interest and desire to help these nations in their efforts to advance economically. It must be a sustained interest for the element of continuity is vital to successful development. Nothing could be more calculated to breed resentment and bitterness than to raise hopes, only to disappoint them later. Unless we, the public and the Congress, are prepared to carry through, whatever the scale of the program we adopt, we would be better off, in my judgment, not to start it in the first place.

Let us acknowledge frankly that economic development is a long-term undertaking and that if we really want to do an effective job we cannot confine our commitments entirely to the fiscal year. A multipurpose dam, for example, designed to provide irrigation, power and flood control cannot be accomplished overnight. Many months of planning and engineering are required. The construction itself may take years. If several countries are involved, lengthy negotiations may be necessary before even the first stage is reached. Without assurance that financing will be available, few countries can afford the effort and expense involved merely in preparing a well-planned proposal.

At the last session the Congress, somewhat reluctantly, did approve the establishment of a development loan fund and authorized appropriations for 2 years as contrasted with the administration's request for a 3-year authorization. But even this modest step was marred by actual appropriation of only $300 million as against $500 million requested for the first year and authorization of $625 million for the second year. The President had asked for $750 million for the second and third years. Already the fund has received applications totaling well over $1 billion, which is some indication of the hopes placed in it.

There are, of course, important, but surely not insuperable, questions of constitutional and legislative prerogative involved in any departure from the annual appropriations basis. The significant thing to me is the fact that much of the objection to a longer period of appropriation is based less on the

constitutional grounds than on opposition to the longer term commitment itself. This view of economic assistance as a kind of emergency or temporary program to be determined almost anew each year seems to me, as I indicated earlier, a self-defeating approach.

There are other ways, too, in which the sincerity of our concern can be demonstrated. But none is likely to be more important or more far reaching than the influence and potential contribution of our businessmen.

Whether he chooses or not, the American businessman has a large role, for good or for ill, in the economic-assistance program.

I am thinking not only or even primarily in terms of capital. Capital contributed by private investment is important and it is encouraging to note that it has been flowing in increased amounts in some sectors. But the old pattern of private investment is no longer possible in many areas. Most of the new countries are determined to keep control of the development of their resources firmly in their own hands.

This is a basic premise which wise and prudent investment will accept or it will venture at its peril, as well as at the risk of discrediting further the free economic policies which in too many places invoke bitter images, however exaggerated, of colonial lords and hated foreign exploiters.

Far more than capital, however, the crying need of many of the underdeveloped nations is for know-how—technical, managerial, and administrative. Report after report on particular countries have pointed to the lack of trained and qualified personnel as the single most limiting factor on development efforts. It is noteworthy, for example, among the Arab States, Lebanon has probably the highest standard of living. Lebanon does not have the rich oil deposits of the other Arab States, indeed her natural resources are meager. But her people are relatively advanced and have the ability to organize themselves and make good use of such resources as are available.

Here is an area in which American enterprise is, I think, indisputably supreme. The American genius for effective organization is a hallmark of our country. We pride ourselves on our practicality, our pleasure in trying new approaches, our zest to get things done. What field offers a greater challenge in these respects than that of economic development? Provided, of course, they are accompanied by a willingness to adapt to the very different conditions that prevail among the underdeveloped nations and to take a long rather than a short view of their opportunities.

Such a positive constructive approach on our part can help immeasurably. Only such an approach can make clear that totalitarian methods are not required to achieve economic advance; rather, there is a real choice of roads to follow. Further, it can provide encouragement to choose the road compatible with the ways of democracy and the preservation of human values.

The task confronting the newly developing nations is enormous. Small wonder that so many of their leaders seem often to waver and shrink from the hard and often unpopular decisions that sound progress may require. We cannot and should not attempt to do the job for them. But we can help to strengthen their willingness to tackle the job and to enhance the chances of its successful accomplishment. The fate of millions turns on the choices that will be made over the next few years. Indeed, the existence of the Free World itself—our own ultimate security—may be at stake.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Oregon Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the State of Oregon soon will celebrate its 100th anniversary, and the President of the United States has signed an official proclamation heralding that event.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who was the author of Senate Joint Resolution 131, authorizing this Presidential proclamation, has written a most vivid and illuminating article for the New York Times of Sunday, March 2, 1958, entitled "Oregon Lays Groundwork for Its Centennial."

We of Idaho feel a particular affinity with Oregon because both our States were explored by the great frontiersmen, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, and both were once part of what was known as the Oregon country. We of Idaho share with Oregon the great mile-deep Snake River Canyon, bordered by the Seven Devils Range of Idaho on the east and the Wallowa Mountains of Oregon on the west.

I believe the fine article written by the junior Senator from Oregon about his State, which includes descriptions of the scenic realm which Oregon shares with Idaho, should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

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

OREGON LAYS GROUNDWORK FOR ITS CENTENNIAL

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

Valentine's Day, 1959, is a long way off but the State of Oregon is already busy planning a celebration that will start next February 14 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Oregon's admission to statehood. Appropriately on the Valentine's Day just past President Eisenhower signed the official proclamation "calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon into the Union."

Oregon became a State on February 14, 1859. James Buchanan was the President who signed that act. Thus the year 1959 will bring Oregon's centennial, but President Eisenhower was empowered to herald the occasion 12 months in advance because many events associated with the historic anniversary will occur this year. Most of these occasions are certain to be of prime significance to tourists and wayfarers, if only because few States contain the variety of scenery and recreational pleasures which long has characterized Oregon.

This pioneer State of the rugged Northwest stretches from a picturesque and wooded seacoast to alpine ridges cloaked with eternal snowbanks. It includes peaks more than 2 miles high and chasms a full mile in depth. It can offer ski tournaments in summer and golf tournaments in winter. It has wildlife refuges measured by horizons rather than acres, and it has national forests the size of New England States. Roses bloom in Portland most of the year, although Mount Hood's frosty glaciers are never out of sight from Portland on a clear day.

ROSES AND CONIFERS

Trees of fir and pine are more intimately identified with Oregon in the popular mind than is a delicate flower like the rose, for it is true that Oregon produces far greater quantities of lumber than any other State. Oregon is host to long, cool spring seasons and to summers without searing heat. This climate offers ideal hospitality to the rose, and so it is that Portland this June will mark the 50th anniversary of its famous Rose Festival. The occurrence will serve to inaugurate the precentennial events of 1958.

Portland's floral parade, principal feature of the Rose Festival, is rivaled only by that of Pasadena. Yet one great difference separates the two spectacles—the prize-winning roses of Portland are grown some 1,200 miles closer to the North Pole. To emphasize the contrasting diversions available in Oregon, a Golden Rose ski tournament is always held in connection with the Rose Festival. This take place at Timberline Lodge, in the solitudes of the Mount Hood National Forest, approximately 50 miles east of the city on a good State highway. In June of 1958, because the Rose Festival will be at half-century, a more elaborate occasion is planned.

INCREASING TOURISM

Anthony Brandenthaler, a lumberman from the upland community of Baker, is chairman of the Oregon Centennial Commission. He has predicted a substantial increase in the State's tourist trade this year, as a prelude to the 8 million visitors anticipated for the centennial year of 1959.

The dominant event of the centennial will be an exposition and international trade fair, to be held on the shores of the Columbia River, near Portland. It will continue from June 10 through September 20, 1959. Sponsors of the exposition hope to dramatize Oregon's strategic location on the Pacific frontier, with its deep harbors and sheltered bays. In addition to being a tourist attraction, it is designed to expand trade in Oregon fruits, lumber, fish, and grain with the countries of Asia.

Oregon's vivid past will play a strategic role in many of the plans for the centennial, and the active State Historical Society has had a major role in preparations. One such event is expected to take place this year. In 1956 Congress passed legislation authorizing the National Park Service to study the possibility of establishing a memorial park under Federal custodianship at Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, where the intrepid Lewis and Clark expedition spent the bleak winter of 1805–6. This report has been favorable, and the Interior Department has followed with a recommendation of a $280,000 governmental expenditure to launch the undertaking. If Congress approves these plans, the first national memorial park on the long 4,000-mile Lewis and Clark train could be dedicated this year.

Practically all such occasions in Oregon will involve, collaterally, innumerable sightseeing opportunities. Astoria, for example, is at the mouth of the Columbia River, mightiest of all the West's waterways. Some concept of the impressive proportions of the Columbia may be gained from the fact that it carries to tidewater nearly 10 times the flow of the Colorado River, author of the unsurpassed Grand Canyon. In fact, even the Snake River, chief tributary of the Columbia, contains more than twice the volume of the Colorado, and the Snake itself has trenched a 6,000-foot abyss along Oregon's eastern boundary known as Hells Canyon.

CONTRASTS

These two realms, some 400 miles apart, symbolize the wide range of contrasts which Oregon, near its first century as a State, offers to the traveler.

Some of the world's finest salmon fishing exists in the broad mouth of the Columbia, off the piers of Astoria. Boats owned by expert commercial fishermen are available for hire. The lordly Chinooks, weighing up to 70 or 80 pounds, cross the bar in thrashing schools as they return from salt water to fresh, on their mysterious migration to spawning grounds in the distant mountains.

The long Clatsop beaches, cloaked with glistening white sand, stretch southward from Astoria. Such resorts as Seaside and Gearhart are amply stocked with hotels, motels and good restaurants. U. S. 101 hugs the gnarled coastline like a lariat, extending to such other oceanshore resorts as Tillamook, Cannon Beach, Ocean Lake, Taft, Newport and many more. Golf courses are available at most such places, in addition to invigorating surf bathing in the chilly North Pacific for those who are young in heart and robust in health. The Centennial Commission has been encouraging the development of extra facilities for eating and lodging wherever feasible.

WILDERNESS

The Hells Canyon area of Oregon, by comparison, caters to the nomad who is willing to leave pavement behind and who does not object to terrain which has virtually been stood on end. This is a last great wilderness. In the Wallowa Mountains, which form the Oregon wall of the prodigious chasm, my wife and I have camped with the family of a cougar hunter, who made his living by delivering the pelts of the great cats at the county seat for $50 bounty apiece. This family never saw civilization through the long alpine winters. The mother educated their 8-year-old son with correspondence courses bought from a school on the faroff Atlantic coast. In these solitudes of Oregon there still is hunting for mule deer, stately elk and even cougar, if you can corner one on the dizzy rimrock. Out-of-State hunting licenses are somewhat more expensive than those for local residents.

The State has the most valuable national forests in the Nation. Ponderosa pine are as lofty as 20-floor office buildings, and a good deal more majestic. Creeks trill liltingly off rock ledges on their course to the Columbia. Trillium, Indian paintbrush, and the white puffs of bear grass turn meadows into a carpet of vivid colors. I doubt if any boy brought up in America has really savored what life can be in the spacious outdoors, until he has tented in the mountains of the Northwest.

Under the new $40 billion interstate highway program recently sanctioned by Congress, Oregon has two major roads which will qualify for such aid. One is U. S. 99, which bisects the State from Portland to Ashland in a north-and-south direction. The second is the principal artery of highway travel crossing Oregon from west to east—U. S. 30. This road is known all over the world as the Columbia River Highway, where it threads along the gorge which the great river has sliced through the Cascade Mountains and past such snowcapped sentinels as Mount Hood and Mount Adams. Sections of both U. S. 99 and U. S. 30 already have been built to 4-lane specifications. The entire routes are scheduled for such construction before the interstate program is completed.

CRATER LAKE

U. S. 99 goes through Medford, one of two main portals to Oregon's only unit of the national park system, the other entrance being the pine-lumber town of Klamath Falls. The park is Crater Lake, one of the extraordinary spectacles of nature's marvelous realm. Many epochs ago, an active volcano of the Cascade Range, Mount Mazama, blew off its summit in a mighty eruption. Crater Lake occupies the vast bowl thus created. Two-thousand-foot cliffs help to fashion a tureenlike effect, with Wizard Island a floating crouton in this massive receptacle. Crater Lake in color is an incredible blue—even bluer than the Mediterranean, claim experienced pilgrims.

Should your journey to Oregon include Crater Lake, be sure to vary this glimpse of a wonder of the outdoors by taking in a sample of mankind's talent, at the nearby community of Ashland. In August of each year, Ashland stages a Shakespearean festival which draws devotees of the theater in general and the Bard in particular from all 48 States.

NEW GLOBE THEATER

Southern Oregon College, which is in Ashland, actively sponsors this project. Thousands of visitors sit in their shirtsleeves and bare-armed dresses at a replica of the Globe Theater of Shakespeare's time. The balmy climate of southern Oregon makes this the natural thing to do.

Oregon, on the eve of its first 100 years as a State of the Union, contains nearly all of civilization's blessings, and yet is close to the frontier, too. While Oregon was a State, the last bitter war was fought with the encircled Nez Perce under the martyred chieftain, Joseph. Lieutenant Teller and H Company were wiped out to the last man, when a State government actually sat at Salem and passed laws.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most eloquent and informative speech was delivered to the St. Louis County Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in St. Louis on March 1, 1958, by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

In his able address, our colleague from Tennessee has emphasized the distinct responsibility which historically falls upon the legislative branch of Government when there is abandonment from the Executive in the White House. I believe that Senator GORE's address should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORE

The pleasure and joviality evidenced here tonight is characteristic of a Democratic rally. A Democratic get-together is synonymous with a good time. Even so, we have enough of the rebel and stubborn elements among us to make our party affairs not only interesting but uncertain.

There is no uncertainty about my pleasure and pride in being with you tonight. It would be an honor and a pleasure to speak to such a significant and loyal gathering as this under ordinary circumstances, but my pleasure in coming to Missouri is doubled by the fact that it has been my pleasure and profit to serve on committees and work in the closest harmony and friendship with your Senators. The privilege of their association in the Senate, the leadership which each has provided for our party and for our country prompts me to say that I am grateful to Missouri for Senators TOM HENNINGS and STUART SYMINGTON.

Senator HENNINGS, one of the outstanding constitutional authorities, not only in the Senate but in the entire country, has become a recognized champion of the rights of individual citizenship and has given the kind of leadership for election-law revision and reform in corrupt practices that makes us all proud to be Americans.

The one clear clarion voice for justice and fairness to beleaguered farmers, for adequate national defense, for educational and technological progress, and for permanent public improvements to strengthen our country's economy and productive capacity has come from Missouri's junior Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

The United States Senate is now performing a unique and unusual role in American history. It is a role of leadership with which the Congress can successfully cope only with the greatest difficulty, if at all.

By reason of constitutional limitations, the legislative branch of our Government cannot perform executive functions. By its very nature, its very division and diversity, it is hard for a legislative body to speak with that clear and certain voice which is the characteristic and function of executive leadership.

Yet the worldwide challenge to the greatness of our country and to the survival of our system and ideals, when we are plagued with weak executive leadership, constantly prods the United States Congress and, more particularly, the Senate into action, into qualified leadership of our country, and of the cause of freedom.

Once before, in the period immediately following the War Between the States, the legislative branch of the Government, especially the United States House of Representatives, provided leadership for the country. This was an attempt to usurp powers properly exercised by the President. The record of that performance is revolting to all decent sensibilities, the results tragic. The notorious Thaddeus Stevens led the Government and the country into shameful acts of prejudice, vengeance, and hatred. The deep scars from the Civil War were not allowed to heal, as they would have healed with time and the noble impulses of our people, but instead were kept open as a taunt and a prod to bigotry and demagogery of reprisal. These scars can still be seen today.

I hope and believe that the present ascendancy of the legislative branch of our Government will bring better results. At all events, we may be sure that the intent is not malevolent. The motivation springs from neither prejudice nor desire to usurp. Instead, the Senate is undertaking to encourage and spur the use of Presidential powers by the President himself, on the one hand, and to fill the vacuum of ideas and action through legislation, committee studies and reports, and varied articulation, on the other.

To put it bluntly, we are trying to persuade and to help the President do a job that he ought to be doing himself.

The motivations that unify and propel the Senate, let me emphasize, are essentially good and, in important respects, nonpartisan. They arise from patriotic concern for our country and a compassion for the well-being of its people, from a deep faith in the Nation's greatness and out of a dedication to its future glory.

Even so, the kind of leadership which the needs of the country require and deserve, both at home and in affairs abroad, can come only from one who is clothed with the power, prestige, the honor and glory of the Presidency of the United States. The Constitution provides for it, our country expects it,

conditions at home and in the world demand it.

Yet we do not have adequate executive leadership. I do not say this in a partisan sense, nor with pleasure. It is with sadness and concern that I say it. Nevertheless, I have never been one to believe that we will find the solution for any national problem by refusing to recognize and acknowledge it, thus hoping that it will go away if we just deny its existence.

Please forgive me if I refrain from undertaking to evaluate the reasons for the inadequacy of President Eisenhower's leadership. This is not essential to my thought tonight. It is the fact of its inadequacy rather than the reasons for it that impels the Congress into its present role of leadership.

Under the circumstances, the legislative branch has no choice but to do the very best it can, inadequately constituted and equipped as it is for the task.

Both the facts of today and foreseeable events are grim.

The grand alliance of free nations is threatened with gradual disintegration. The confidence of even our closest friends is shaken. Both friendly and uncommitted nations are tempted to follow a course of neutrality or outright hostility toward us.

Current Soviet superiority in ballistic missiles, rocket propulsion, satellites, large-scale atomic powerplants, number of submarines, and conventional military forces in being deeply disturbs the confidence of our friends and threatens the security of not only the United States, but the entire Free World.

At home, partly for want of sound programs and partly because of rampant influences of selfish interests, an estimated 5 million Americans, with many dependents, are totally unemployed. Uncounted additional millions are working only a few hours per week. Farmers suffer depressed conditions. Bankruptcies are at the highest rate in our history, business failures at a rate equal to the early 1930's. Steel production is at only fifty-some-odd percent of capacity.

Meanwhile, the cost of living reaches an alltime high.

It is because of these circumstances that Senators and Congressmen with vision and concern, despite constitutional and organizational limitations and handicaps, are resolutely undertaking to fill the vacuum in national leadership.

It has been from the floor of the United States Senate, for instance, that the country has been alerted to the dangers from Russian military supremacy; from the floor of the United States Senate that the voice of the people has cried out against the social injustice and economic needlessness of widespread unemployment and suffering, the inequity of tax favoritism, tight money, high interest rates.

It is in the United States Senate that bold programs for conquering space are being molded; in which adequate programs to maintain American leadership in the fields of technology, nuclear power, and missile research have been presented.

But there are things that Congress can do and things that Congress cannot do. Congress can appropriate money for national defense but it cannot spend it. Congress can pass bills authorizing contracts for valuable public improvements but Congress cannot sign the contracts. Congress can provide the necessary laws for public welfare but Congress cannot administer the laws.

These are executive functions which only the executive branch of the Government can perform.

Congress has acted—acted in many fields. But Congressional enactment of legislation, or passage of appropriations, as I have said, is not enough. Unless there is genuine acceptance of programs enacted by the Congress, and unless there is will to sincerely put them into effect, then Congressional labors are largely frustrated.

President Eisenhower and other administration leaders are now talking about a public-works program—if things get bad enough. Well, things are already bad enough. How much worse must they become to justify a public-works program to stimulate our economy, to provide employment by building needed public improvements. The administration still waits. Well, Congress is not only ready to act now, but has already acted. With foresight and concern, the Congress passed an omnibus rivers and harbors bill in 1956 which authorized a public-works program that would have brought, and would now bring, not only employment opportunities, but vast economic benefits to all segments of our country. The President vetoed this bill.

In 1956, Congress enacted a far-reaching highway construction program, the largest highway program in the history of the world. It was designed to interconnect all of our principal cities within 13 years, with magnificent multilane interstate and defense highways adequate to the traffic needs of 1975. Only 2 years later it stands in grave danger of being slowed down and stretched out from the planned 13 years to 24 years. Instead of proposing an acceleration of this vital program of highway improvement which could now be used to stimulate our sagging economy, the administration proposes to slow it down even further by diverting $68 million per year from the highway trust fund to other purposes.

President Eisenhower's atoms for peace speech, which was delivered to the United Nations in 1953, is, I believe, generally considered to be his greatest. I surely so regard it. Congress has sought to translate this commendable program into action by maintaining our leadership in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Eisenhower administration has fought these proposals consistently and, unfortunately, thus far it has fought them successfully. The result is that the United States which led in harnessing the strength of the atom is now losing its leadership to other nations in the vital field of large-scale nuclear power production.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been urging for several years projects to develop nuclear-powered rockets. Our pleas have fallen on deaf ears and the lack of effort has been shrouded in a cloak of secrecy ostensibly for security considerations. The money Congress appropriated for this project has not been spent. Is it any wonder we are behind?

The same fate has befallen our efforts to bring about an atomic airplane. Funds have been cut back, programs have been rolled back and stretched out.

Rollback. Cutback. Stretchout. Just wait until November and the American people will add another word to administration jargon—strikeout.

During the summer of 1957, the all-powerful Bureau of the Budget dispatched a letter to each Department of the Government which stated in part as follows:

"The President has requested that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rates of commitments, obligations and expenditures for fiscal 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957."

This meant that there was an arbitrary dollar ceiling imposed on defense expenditures no matter what action the Congress might have taken.

More recently a subcommmittee of the Senate, after full hearings, outlined 17 areas in which decisive action is needed if we are to hope to regain lost time in the field of missiles and rockets. But we have not had the decisive action we need. The Congress can recommend missile production but it lacks the power to make a contract to implement the recommendation.

In this distraught world, free nations look to the United States of America for leadership and inspiration, for initiative and imagination, for boldness and action. Instead they find vaccilation, timidity, indecision.

Through all of this the most eloquent voices, the most penetrating vision, the most logical analyses, the newness, the imagination, the boldness and the hope have principally come from the Senate of the United States. I would have to name but a few of many examples to illustrate my point.

Even so, ours is a forbidding outlook. But what would it be without the Congress to stir the country and the Government away from complacency toward concern, from fiction to reality, from nothing to something?

Our efforts have not been without fruit. The American people have now been awakened to their danger, and the voice of the people from North to South, East to West, demands action. Action. Action. This they will have, if not immediately, ultimately.

After the election next November there will not be, in my opinion, enough seats on the Democratic side to accommodate the new Democratic Congressmen.

And I think it overwhelmingly likely that the Democratic Party will be called back to power and responsibility in 1960. For this we must prepare. And to prepare for so great a privilege is to act responsibly today, tomorrow, and always—opposing on principle and supporting on principle, standing firm and alert, ready to oppose that which is wrong, willing to support that which is right.

Address of the Majority Leader, Hon. John W. McCormack, to the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include with pleasure the ringing American address made by our distinguished colleague and majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, at the banquet of the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on the evening of February 23, 1958.

Worthy Master McGillen; his excellency, Most Rev. Raymond P. Millinger, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Chicago; right reverend and very reverend monsignori; reverend fathers; and one whom I deeply admire and the knowledge of whose honorable and trustworthy service is not confined to the limits of Chicago, but have spread throughout the United States, and I refer to Mayor Daley of Chicago; national commander of the American Legion, John S. Gleason; distinguished guests, and officers and members of the Marquette Province of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus:

If I read the mind of Bishop Hillinger correctly I know that he will always treasure the fact that this class of 800 new members inducted this afternoon was named in his honor, and that this splendid banquet is a special tribute to him.

I am so happy to be with you this evening. I appreciate very much the invitation extended to me by Worthy Master McGillen, through my dear and valued friend and colleague, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who is held in high esteem by all of his colleagues.

Like yourself, I listened to the excellent address of Americanism delivered by our brother knight, National Commander Gleason. I thoroughly agree with him when he said that, "It is too bad, without regard to religion, that every American could not witness the exemplification of the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus with its ringing ritual and message of patriotism and Americanism."

Mr. Toastmaster, as I walk through the Halls of the Capitol, or along the streets of a city, and see young men and young ladies, or parents walking with their children, I often ask myself the question, "What kind of a world will they live in? Will it be a world of peace? Will they enjoy the form of government we have? Just what kind of world faces them?"

And the answer immediately comes to me that the world they will live in will depend on what we do today; the manner in which those in the position of leadership perform their trust and their duty to the American people. For a sound leadership is necessary—a leadership of vision and courage.

As public opinion in a democracy is a powerful factor in forming governmental policy and action, it is imperative that our people be informed as fully as our national interest will permit.

If public opinion is formed as a result of emotional reactions, it could contribute to harmful results. If the people are informed and public opinion is sound, it will contribute constructively to the best interest of our country.

In the world today there are a number of basic considerations that confront us, and which we must face with courage. Some of them appear to me to be (1) the world is undergoing one of the most, if not the most, trying and challenging periods in the history of man; (2) there is no such thing now, or in the future, as military isolation; (3) that vicious and inhuman forces are determined upon world revolution and conquest; (4) that their ultimate goal is the United States of America; (5) that, from a military angle, the only thing the Communist leaders in the Kremlin respect is what they fear, and that is military power and strength greater than they themselves possess; (6) in this period of emergency, when neither war nor peace exists, it is vitally important that our leadership do those things that we can do and should do in the national interest of our country; (7) that while it is vitally necessary that we be strong from a military angle, it is also imperative that we be strong from a spiritual angle; (8) that if we are to err in our judgment, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness; (9) that we must recognize that military strength is relative in nature, and that the military strength and power of our country must be considered in relation to the military strength and power of the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union is the present source of our danger.

For today, confronting us, are the forces of dictatorship in most vicious form, dedicated to world conquest, determined to dominate not only the body but the will and the spirit of man, by force and through fear to compel that spirit to forget its belief and faith in God and His law, or to be remodeled in the likeness of atheistic communism.

To some this is a period of frustration, of confusion, of fear, and of defeat. To others it is a period of faith and confidence in ultimate victory.

It is to millions of persons through the world, possessing deep and active faith, actuated by God's word, willing to make all necessary sacrifices, who will give the necessary strength and leadership that will bring about ultimate victory. The conflict in the world today might well be termed the war of love versus hate.

But, no matter how dark the situation might become, deep faith by individuals and nations may well be the sustaining influence between victory and defeat.

There is no place where what I have just said could be more effectively expressed than to the members of the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus, the patriotic chapter of our great order.

For faith is affirmative, not negative. Possessing faith we fight for the spiritual truths and ideals we believe in, and in the world of today when we do that, we are most effectively combating atheistic communism. When we fight affirmatively, with God and His law as the origin of our thoughts and actions, dangerously sinister as it is, communism becomes "the lesser involved in the greater."

We are more effectively combating communism when we fight to put into active operation the spiritual truths and ideals in which we believe. For when we confine ourselves to fighting against something, we are on the defensive, and no war has ever been won strictly through defensive thinking or tactics. It, therefore, follows that, while it is necessary and imperative that our country be militarily strong, it is also necessary and imperative that our people be spiritually strong.

We hear and live again the clarion call of men and women who want freedom, "where law ceases, tyranny starts" or, as Patrick Henry said, "give me liberty or give me death." We are living again the days of the martyrs. We need again the spirit of the crusaders. For there are many martyrs in the world of today, and there are many Patrick Henrys as well. What has happened in Hungary, a little over a year ago, is powerful evidence of this fact.

The desire for liberty is not manmade, but comes to mankind from God himself through his natural law.

The spirit of those who fought and died for liberty in Hungary is not dead today. Who knows when in Poland, East Germany or elsewhere, in the future, there will be others who will be martyrs on the altars of religion and liberty.

The history of man shows that dictators come across the horizon of time, and suppress temporarily the God-given desire for liberty, but history also shows that they can never destroy that desire, and in the world of today that is and will be a powerful factor in our favor.

When the Hungary uprising took place, we had no policy to capitalize it. From our angle it is important in the event of an uprising in Poland, East Germany, or elsewhere that, unlike Hungry, we have a policy of an affirmative nature in their hopes and efforts for independence and freedom.

In viewing the world situation as it now exists, we must assess our weaknesses as well as our strengths. We must also assess the strength as well as the weaknesses of the Soviet Union. To do otherwise would mean that we are living in a dream world. It is quite clear through our Strategic Air Command and, if necessary, its ability to reach its targets with its weapons of destruction, that we are offensively powerful from a military angle, and that such offensive power might also act as a deterrent to attack, surprise or otherwise, as long as our intercontinental bombers can reach their targets in the Soviet Union.

While we have other powerful weapons and means of attack and defense, it is our Strategic Air Command that is our primary power.

On January 21, 1958, the Committee on Appropriations (in a report to the Congress) in discussing the overall superiority we still have said, "This superiority is explained largely by our great power in the Strategic Air Command. Our chief difficulty arises out of the fact that in the citical areas of space satellites and ballistic missiles, we are generally behind the U. S. S. R."

In the field of ballistic missiles it is the overwhelming opinion of competent officials and military men that we are behind the Soviet Union and, in this connection, I again quote from the same committee report: "We live in an age of ever-increasing danger. In military strength the Soviet Union has been progressing more rapidly than the United States, which immediately after World World War II was vastly superior, militarily, to the Soviet Union."

At the present time, the Soviet Union has perfected, with accuracy, and production, the intermediary ballistic missile, with a range of from 700 to 1,000 miles. We have not, as yet, perfected this missile, though we are on the road to doing so, but it will still take some time. In this field, we are behind the Soviet Union.

But, the real danger is in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and while the Soviets have not as yet perfected this terrible means of destruction so that they can hit targets with sufficient accuracy, they are far ahead of us.

In addition, it is known, like ourselves, that they are exploring means of intercepting intercontinental bombers, so that if perfected on their part, very few, if any, of our bombers could reach targets in the Soviet Union.

There are many other important activities that I could discuss—very important—such as biological, chemical and psychological warfare—the strength and power of our Army and Navy compared with the strength of the Soviets, but at this particular time and on this occasion, I confine my remarks to what appears to me to be the immediate danger that confronts us, effective ballistic missiles, capable of being fired from one continent to another—coupled with the Soviet defense against our intercontinental bombers.

In our case, due to the fact that the President has, and I consider it unfortunately so, on several occasions, notified the world, which includes the Kremlin, that we would not be the aggressor, which means that we would not engage in a surprise attack, that we must be prepared on all aspects of modern warfare. Personally, I feel it was unwise to let the world, particularly the potential enemy, know of our full thoughts and intentions. Let them do some guessing! The time could arrive when, for our own safety, we might have to move quickly and unexpectedly.

The main point I want to convey to you is that if the Soviet Union perfects the intercontinental ballistic missile before we do, and perfects a defense against our bombers—for a period of time, unless we at least catch up quickly—they will have a decided advantage over us.

In other words, unless we move quickly, there is likely to develop in the reasonably near future, a situation where the Soviets could hit American targets, and very few, if any, of our powerful bombers could get through to targets in the Soviet Union.

If that time should arrive, and many competent persons and military men I have talked with feel it can, then the question is "Will the Soviet leaders permit us to catch up with them?" As far as I am concerned, I do not believe that they will.

It is vitally important that we always be in position where we can reach targets in the Soviet Union—that is as long as the Kremlin adheres to dictator communism, carrying with it the avowed determination to dominate the world.

The question naturally addresses itself to you as well as to me, "Why are we behind the Soviets in these fields of science and technology?" There are a number of factors. In 1954, a subcommittee with which I served investigated the whole field of mili-

tary research and development. If our recommendations had been followed, we would not be in the position we are today.

It is pretty clear that the main reason for our present predicament is due to management, which means leadership, on the governmental level. In support of this statement I quote from a letter, now public, written by Dr. Frederick L. Hobde, chairman of the Army scientific advisory panel, and president of Purdue University, to the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, dated October 30, 1957, a unanimous report of the panel, consisting of over 50 outstanding Americans, in which they said, in part: "The problem before the Nation is not simply one of money, or even men—these we have in substantial amounts and that which we do not have can be provided. Whatever failures there may be, they are primarily those of management—in which we have a share—which resulted in delays in decision making and confusion in the direction of our technological forces. Despite rapidly developing pressures for immediate reorganization, a thorough diagnosis of our management ills must be made before remedies are prescribed."

In further support of what I have said, I again quote from the Appropriations Committee report of a few weeks ago: "One of the most heard of complaints is the frustration of scientists and research people, generally arising from inability to get decisions on work to be done. Almost endless layers of review are encountered."

In the same report the committee said: "We live in the days of ever-increasing danger. In military strength the Soviet Union has been progressing more rapidly than the United States, which immediately after World War II was vastly superior, militarily, to the Soviet Union." And the committee further pointedly said: "We should press forward toward an operational capability in these fields, and in any other fields in which we are behind."

The further question addresses itself to you and to me and to other Americans is what should and what can be done. It seems clear to me that:

1. Our Government should determine the nature of the danger from the Soviet Union.

2. With that knowledge, what we must do to meet that danger.

3. Then for those in leadership in our Government, both executive and legislative, to organize our powers to meet the same.

As Dr. Hobde well said in his letter to Secretary Brucker, "We have the brains—we have the facilities," and as I say, the American people will make all necessary sacrifices.

It is a question of leadership on the top level in our Government, with the appointment of the best qualified men to key positions of decision making, and authority to carry out of these decisions, in coordinating brains and facilities and, in particular, the giving of direct leadership, if necessary, and strong action by the President himself. One thing is certain, we cannot afford any further delays in decision making, and in seeing that those decisions are carried out.

We cannot afford to live in a dream world, in the world of today with atheistic communism bent on world domination, with slavery, persecution, imprisonment, death, and even martyrdom resulting therefrom. We cannot afford to let the cooing of the Soviet leaders deceive us.

Based upon my own knowledge, the next 1½ to 2 years will be important years, of a far-reaching nature in the history of our country and of the future world. What we do within that period might well be the turning point in our favor. What we fail to do in that period might well be the turning point in favor of communism.

Coming back to what I said at the outset of my remarks, What kind of a world do you think the young American of today faces? What we do in the next 1½ or 2 years may well determine how your children's children are going to live.

Under no conditions can we afford to have the Soviet Union have a distinct and decided advantage over us in any field of modern warfare where they can attack us without fear of retaliation, even for a brief period of time. There is no need for this situation to exist if strong leadership exists and coordinates the brains and facilities of our country. We have great men and women in the field of science and technology and in other important fields, who, if put to work as a team, with decisions made on the high level and carried out effectively, can meet the situation. However, we cannot afford to delay because delay plays into the hands of the enemy. There already has been too much delay.

If these things take place, and with American public opinion aroused and insisting upon deeds and not mere words, I have every confidence of success, not only for ourselves, but particularly for our children and our children's children.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1958

Rev. Theodore Henry Palmquist, D. D., minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come: Become very real to us today in this important place. Thanks be to Thee for our goodly heritage, rich in memories of great character, sacrificial devotion, and large achievement. For the homes through which this heritage became our own, for our public schools, our churches; for great books, great music, and great art, we thank Thee. Keep alive in us, then, the excellent, the kindly, the wise; and where there are undedicated strengths, abilities going to waste, intelligence unattached to worthy aims, challenge those unused powers and capture them for the best—Thy best.

Upon our Nation let Thy grace rest. Trusted with great power, may we not misuse it. Living in a day of measureless opportunity, may we not fail our own best consciences, the men and nations that trust us, or Thee, our God. From the cause that shrinks from new truths, from the laziness that is content with half-truths, from the arrogance that thinks it knows all the truth, O God of truth deliver us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 3, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 4, 1958, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 969. An act to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; and

S. 1805. An act for the relief of Acme Bag & Burlap Co. and others.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1086. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River compact, and for related purposes; and

S. 1552. An act 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.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4634. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes" with respect to the incorporation of certain businesses;

H. R. 5033. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.;

H. R. 8476. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to extend the period of tax exemption of original lessees from 5 to 7 years;

H. R. 8482. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for public highway purposes;

H. R. 8483. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 8544. An act to provide for the restoration to tribal ownership of all vacant and undisposed-of ceded lands on certain Indian reservations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8958. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Indian land to the diocese of Superior, Superior, Wis., for church purposes, and to the town of Flambeau, Wis., for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 9461. An act to amend the joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended by the act of August 23, 1954, to permit the granting of patents in fee simple to certain occupiers of public lands;

H. R. 9501. An act to approve joint resolution 28 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1957, relating to the conditions and terms of right of purchase leases;

H. R. 9653. An act to provide that the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam;

H. R. 10320. An act to provide for additional charges to reflect certain costs in the acceptance of business reply cards, letters in business reply envelopes, and other matter under business reply labels for transmission