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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

in the mails without prepayment of postage, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10843. An act to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 5809. An act to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor; and

H. R. 8795. An act to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

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. 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 of 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; and

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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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.; and

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; to the Committee on Public Works.

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 in the mails without prepayment of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10843. An act to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet today, during the session of the Senate.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may be detained this afternoon in the Appropriations Committee, in connection with the marking up of appropriations bills. I desire to make a statement in regard to the Presidential disability constitutional amendment which doubtless the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will submit this afternoon. In case I am detained in the Appropriations Committee in connection with the marking up of appropriation bills, I ask unanimous consent that my statement may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Later in the day, I hope to discuss the matter further.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Representative to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service Officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Arab Republic;

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; and

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Education Exchange.

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

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Marion C. Matthes, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Mississippi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Don A. Tabbert, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roy McKinney Amos, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the northern district of Indiana for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harold Sexton, of Oregon, to be United States Marshal for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John S. Battle, of Virginia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh,

of Indiana, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert G. Storey, of Texas, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, I should like to observe that Mr. Storey is the dean of the Law School of Southern Methodist University, and is a former president of the American Bar Association. He is one of the most outstanding Americans, and he is a Texan in whom all of us take great pride.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Senate has by voice vote confirmed the President's nominations to the Commission on Civil Rights.

Two of the nominees I know personally and hold in high esteem. The other nominees I do not know.

Regardless of that, however, I am opposed to the confirmation of the nominees of the President to this Commission because I consider the creation of such a body to be unwise and unnecessary, a useless expenditure of the taxpayers' money and a futile political gesture which will be unproductive of any tangible benefit to the Nation.

I am further opposed to the confirmation of these nominees, Mr. President, because I am convinced that the activities of such a Commission will divide people of this Nation at a time when it needs unity more than ever before and that nothing it can do can settle any of the problems which by their very nature direct themselves to solution at the local level.

Mr. President, had a vote been taken on the motion to confirm the President's nominees to the Commission on Civil Rights, I would have voted against confirmation and I wish the RECORD to so show.

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said:

Mr. President, the civil-rights bill which was passed in 1957 contained a provision for the establishment of a Civil Rights Commission. The President has now appointed the members of the Commission.

In my opinion, the civil-rights bill which was passed in 1957 was unnecessary, unwise, and unconstitutional, as I stated before the Senate last year.

I do not know all the members who have been appointed to the Commission; but I know some of them, and they are able and distinguished Americans.

However, the Commission is unnecessary and unwise. I believe that it cannot accomplish any good, and that it may result in great harm.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to be on record as opposing the confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Commission.

PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING JULY 4, 1958, AS A DAY OF REDEDICATION TO THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF FREE CITIZENSHIP

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a joint resolution that has been sent to me by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which I should like to have read at this time. It will take but a moment.

On behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce a joint resolution, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Whereas, in the international crisis confronting the nation, it is important that the American people, in a spirit of gratitude and rededication, review the foundations of human freedom, renew their faith in freedom and respond to the challenge of freedom: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and hereby is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation, calling upon the people of the United States to make the observance of Independence Day, July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship, with appropriate nationwide ceremonies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are introducing the joint resolution in accordance with the stated purposes of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, of which they are members. The Commission plans a nonpartisan ceremony on July 4th as a day of national rededication to the obligations of citizenship. This joint resolution would carry out that purpose. The Senator from Wyoming cannot be present today, and in his behalf I have sent the joint resolution to the desk. I ask that it stay there until further notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and will lie on the table.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MUNDT), was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I shall ask permission that in that connection, statements be limited to five minutes, in view of the fact that many Members desire to pay tributes to the two Presidents Roosevelt—Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the limitation on statements be 5 minutes, instead of the usual 3 minutes.

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

TRIBUTES TO PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are meeting today on an anniversary that could take place nowhere except in America.

This is the commemoration of the inaugurals of two men who were similar in name, but were dissimilar in their politics.

It is the 25th anniversary of the inauguration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is the 53d anniversary of the inauguration of President Theodore Roosevelt.

It would be difficult to find two men more wedded to their political beliefs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a Democrat—proudly, and without apology. Theodore Roosevelt was a Republican—proudly, and without apology.

But both were men of strength—and both were men with an unbounded confidence in the future of America.

This is a nation of strong convictions. We produce political leaders who state their principles with force and with effectiveness.

Sometimes we are misunderstood in other parts of the world where political differences become so strong that they transcend the national interest. The impression arises—on occasion—that we are too divided for our full impact to be felt.

Sometimes others do not realize that we Americans have inherited all the traditions of our country—and they are traditions of strength.

Theodore Roosevelt—like Franklin Roosevelt—believed in the conservation and wise use of our natural resources. This was reflected in the Presidential terms of both.

Theodore Roosevelt—like Franklin Roosevelt—believed in free enterprise, against the encroachment of monopoly. They both acted according to their convictions.

Theodore Roosevelt—like Franklin Roosevelt—believed that this Nation should be able to defend itself against aggression. The result was a strong Military Establishment which could back the policies of America.

But, Mr. President, the basic tie that brought them together in terms of history was their conviction that this Nation should speak always with the voice

of strength. And it had no other voice while the two Roosevelts were in charge.

As a Democrat, I take a great deal of pride in paying tribute to Theodore Roosevelt on this anniversary. He is a part of the heritage of America.

Our Nation has always been capable of finding unity in dissent. It has managed to sustain differences between our own people without permitting those differences to sap our strength and our will to prosper and survive.

Perhaps that quality is best symbolized by the fact that today we can commemorate two leaders, of two different parties, who faced tremendous problems clear-eyed and unafraid.

I do not believe any of us will ever forget the day 25 years ago when our Nation was beset by problems. On the steps of this Capitol, a bold, courageous man took the oath of office.

Then he turned to a Nation battered by depression, weakened by unemployment, sapped of confidence; and in a clear and clarion voice which many of us heard, he said:

> We have nothing to fear but fear, itself.

The Nation arose to the challenge. It adopted courses that were strong, but prudent; courses that ultimately got the job done.

Today, we again face problems. They need not send us into any panic or hysteria. But they should impel us to adopt a course of action that is prudent and that will get the job done.

We need not be prophets of gloom and doom, in order to act. We need merely have faith in our country—as did both the Roosevelts—and accept the task that is before us in very much the same spirit of confidence in which these two great men accepted the tasks that confronted them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, today marks the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's inauguration as the 26th President of the United States. Next October 27, Americans will observe the 100th anniversary of the birth of this remarkable man.

As one reviews the life of Teddy Roosevelt—as he was affectionately known to all—one is deeply impressed, not only by the enormous contribution which he made to his country, but also by an element of timelessness in certain of his words. They serve as a source of inspiration to every American.

> We know there are dangers ahead—

Theodore Roosevelt said:

> as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but, stout of heart, we see, across the dangers, the great future that lies beyond, and we rejoice as a giant refreshed, as a strong man, girt for the race. * * * The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. * * * There are in store for our people, and for the causes we uphold, grander triumphs than have ever yet been scored.

Thus Theodore Roosevelt speaks to us all.

His accomplishments as political leader, statesman, and Chief Executive were epoch making. The personality which charmed his contemporaries with its gaiety, warmth, and vigor—and dazzled them by the diversity of his interests and his instinct for action—was the very stuff of which legends are made.

But I think richer in meaning to us—and to all men struggling to achieve or to maintain free institutions—is the man who demonstrated in his own life this basic truth of free government: That surpassing public service requires only ordinary abilities raised to extraordinary power by those personal qualities that constitute character, and by the fire in the heart to give and to serve.

For us in the United States, the challenge of the present is to live America's answer to the question dividing the world: Whether man has the capacity, under God, to govern himself, and to use the liberty that is his to build a civilization that shall endure. As Theodore Roosevelt himself said:

> The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent.

"Great" is an adjective we sometimes use too loosely. But as we pay tribute on this day to Teddy Roosevelt as citizen, patriot, and President, we find it is indeed the only word that can fittingly describe the man and his achievements.

The hard core of his character was manifested at an early age. In his childhood, the future President was weakly and asthmatic, incapable of much exertion either in study or in play. Consequently, his international eminence, at the age of 50, in athletics, politics, economics, ranching, soldiering, literature, and public administration is fully as marvelous as the rise of Lincoln from the brambles of obscurity.

From early boyhood, Teddy Roosevelt was fired with ambition to be a mighty hunter. But, lacking the essential vigor and endurance, he set himself to acquiring them. He rode, swam, hiked, boxed, and practiced calisthenics until he had conquered his asthma and transformed himself into a model of youthful strength and energy.

In 1876 he entered Harvard, where he soon distinguished himself as an athlete and as a student. Soon after his graduation from college, he joined the New York Republican Association in 1881, and was subsequently elected to the lower house of the State legislature, where he served for 3 years. In 1884 his wife died in childbirth, and it was then that Theodore Roosevelt turned to the solace of the western ranges.

On the banks of the Little Missouri in the Badlands of North Dakota, he built a log house and applied himself to ranching, writing, and hunting the grizzly bear and buffalo. He remained in the West for 2 years.

Refreshed, he returned East. He ran as a reform candidate for mayor of New York and was defeated. He remarried and settled down in Washington as Civil Service Commissioner under Presidents Benjamin Harrison and Grover Cleveland. He then returned to New York as president of the police board. In April of 1897, Theodore Roosevelt was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy by President William McKinley.

Roosevelt played a significant part in the turbulent history of those days, as war with Spain became imminent. Soon after the battleship *Maine* blew up at Havana, he resigned his office to get into the fight himself. He organized and trained the famed Rough Riders, a wonderful assortment of ranch hands, college boys, Indians, preachers, and former bad men. As their lieutenant colonel, Teddy Roosevelt led them in the charge against the Spanish defenses outside Santiago, and further distinguished himself at Las Guasimas. His men loved him, for he shared their hardships and was ever the true chieftain.

When the war ended victoriously, Roosevelt returned home. and was subsequently elected Governor of New York, and served in this high office with characteristic vigor and determination. In the summer of 1900, he became the Republican candidate for Vice President. On September 6, 1901, President McKinley was shot by an assassin in Buffalo, N. Y., and died 8 days later. Thus did Theodore Roosevelt, at the age of 42, become President of the United States.

The youngest President in American history lost little time in asserting himself as the Nation's leader.

In his first message to Congress, he recommended registration to prevent immigration of anarchists; outlined his views on the necessity of controlling great corporations; recommended the creation of a department of commerce and industries; and urged the establishment of Government reclamation and irrigation works.

But certainly the most historic event during his first term was the definite decision to construct an Isthmian canal at Panama, the removal of the obstacles in the way of building the canal, and the actual beginning of the giant undertaking, which involved an expenditure of $300 million.

He also resolutely fought for peace. Adhering to his motto of carrying a big stick, he warned the Germans away from Venezuela. He also sent United States forces to Santo Domingo to cut off European attempts to collect debts.

In March of 1905, Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated for his second term as President. By appealing directly to the Emperors of Japan and Russia, he brought together representatives of the warring nations and the Portsmouth Treaty resulted. For this and other acts in the cause of peace, Theodore Roosevelt was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906. In an effort to head off history's First World War, he sent the Great White Fleet—16 gleaming battleships—around the world as an unmistakable sign that the United States was a world power capable of protecting its interests anywhere.

Teddy Roosevelt left the White House at the age of 50, with his beloved America firmly on course in the 20th century as the world's greatest Free Republic and a source of inspiration to free people everywhere.

His achievements are his monuments. Today, as we honor him, it is appropriate that we recall his words:

> Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity and hardihood—the virtues that made America. The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price,

safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, today is the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's inauguration as President of the United States, and on next October 27 we will celebrate the centennial of the birth of that truly great American. Though the latter date will be the occasion of a widespread celebration, it seems appropriate for us in the Senate Chamber to recall this anniversary also.

This applies to all of us in our respect for, and in some instances our friendship with, this great American. I personally feel the loss deeply and am grateful for the happy memories of our close friendship. I was always a welcome guest both at his home, Sagamore Hill, when he was there, and at the White House when he was there. In fact, I was told at the former that there was always a bedroom ready for me whenever I could come, and I took advantage of this hospitality from time to time, so that we might talk intimately on private and public matters.

To give an illustration, when Theodore Roosevelt was considering running for President on the so-called Bull Moose ticket he consulted me about it, and he later asked me to be his campaign manager in New England. I had to reply that I had just pledged my support to Woodrow Wilson. During the succeeding campaign, though I supported Wilson, I never told of this incident.

As a child Theodore Roosevelt was far from physically robust. But, with the determination which was to characterize him all his later life, he set about building a strong body. So, when in 1876 he entered Harvard College, he participated in athletics, particularly boxing. He applied himself also to the intellectual side of the college to the extent that he made Phi Beta Kappa. While at Harvard he began to write his first book The Naval War of 1312, which he finished soon after graduation, and which is still a classic in naval history.

After leaving college he entered politics and was elected to the New York Assembly. There he exhibited courage in fighting corruption and gave the promise of a bright political career. In February 1884, personal tragedy struck when both his mother and his wife died within a few hours of each other. The next 2 years he spent living the vigorous life of a ranchman in the Dakota countryside.

After an unsuccessful campaign as candidate for mayor of New York City in 1886, he was appointed in 1889 by President Harrison as a member of the United States Civil Service Commission, in which position he vigorously promoted the merit system. In 1895 he took over the presidency of the Board of Police Commissioners of New York City. In this office, although he was not able to accomplish as much as he had hoped, his ability to turn his daily routine into news brought public attention to a focus on the then existing graft and corruption.

Back in Washington in 1896 he served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, but after serving only for a few months he resigned to take up active service in the field. With Leonard Wood he organized the so-called Rough Riders, a volunteer cavalry regiment, wherein he served first as lieutenant colonel and later as colonel.

After returning from Cuba in the fall of 1898, and with this dramatic record behind him, Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York, in which post he served with honesty and courage. Having been "kicked upstairs" to the Vice Presidency by the party bosses in 1900, and as a result of the assassination of President McKinley, on September 14, 1901, he became the youngest President in American history.

As President he is probably best remembered for the building of the Panama Canal, the strengthening of the Navy, the regulation of big business, the Peace of Portsmouth, the settlement of the coal strike, and the initiation of forestry and conservation policies.

Only 50 years old when he left the White House in 1909, his love of activity and adventure found an outlet in a hunting trip in east Africa followed by a tour of Europe. Back in the United States he devoted himself for 2 years to writing and speaking.

In 1912 he reentered the political arena, and when he failed to secure the Republican nomination for President, he became the candidate of the Progressive Party, but was defeated in the three-way contest that followed.

In October 1913, he set forth on his last major expedition, to explore the interior of Brazil. There he contracted a fever from which he never fully recovered. On January 6, 1919, he died peacefully in his sleep.

Probably the greatest disappointment of his life, aside from the loss of loved members of his family, was his inability to lead a military force in France. He consulted me about this when I was staying at Sagamore Hill and asked me if I would take it up with President Wilson. I did so in a talk at the White House, but the President was responsive only to the extent that he promised to take the matter up with his generals. So, I felt obliged to report to my friend that I had little hope of a favorable decision.

Theodore Roosevelt's life was characterized by boundless energy and desire for activity; by his versatility as statesman, author, soldier, hunter, historian, and naturalist; by loyalty and courage of a high order; by the warmth of his family relationships; and by an almost fierce patriotism.

We do well to keep his memory green by memorial exercises such as these here today.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I feel greatly honored that I am able to stand in the United States Senate today and say a few words of tribute to the memory of a great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I think, however, that Franklin Roosevelt always will be something more than a memory to Americans. He and his New Deal are a part of America—a proud and vital part.

All I can say is this: I wish we had him back.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, many tributes are being paid today to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. On this 53d anniversary of his inauguration, I should like to join in these tributes.

New York State is proud, indeed, to have given such a man as Teddy Roosevelt to the Nation's service. Here was a fabulous personality. Here was a man who provided the Nation with vigorous, courageous leadership when it sorely needed such leadership. "I preach the gospel of hope," Theodore Roosevelt cried—and the Nation responded.

Theodore Roosevelt was only 42 years of age when he became President of the United States after William McKinley was assassinated. He was 46 when he was elected President in his own right. He was out of office at 50. In this span of time, he set the whole tone of the dynamic and progressive America, the world-leading America this Nation has become in the 20th century.

He was a strong executive, and a controversial one. His accomplishments were enormous. At the same time, I hail his indomitable spirit, his eye to the future, his unshakable faith in American destiny. Let us, each one of us, seek to face the problems of today in the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt. For only thus can we be worthy of his great heritage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished majority leader in participating in this memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On this 25th anniversary of his inauguration the situation is in some respects somewhat similar to that which existed on March 3, 1933. Then a depression afflicted the Nation. Now there is a recession in being. Then there were 100 days during which action was taken. I hope that in this era, likewise, action will be taken when necessary.

As the majority leader stated, probably the one statement which characterized F. D. R. more than any other was his statement in his inaugural address to the effect that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself.

I wish also to express my admiration for the lady who was at his side, who furnished such good advice, and who is continuing to uphold the great principles for which he stood—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

I join also with my friends on the minority side, and with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] in paying tribute to Theodore Roosevelt. As I listened to the senior Senator from Rhode Island, I felt that I was listening to history in the making, because I am sure that some of the things he said about Theodore Roosevelt in this Chamber this afternoon had not been made public before.

We in the West have a great admiration, liking, and respect for Theodore Roosevelt, because for a while he was one of us, living in the Dakota Territory, close to the Montana line. In the State of Montana we know that he was responsible for the creation of the Moiese Bison range, which is still in existence,

and which still keeps alive a herd in excess of 300 bison.

We know also that in the Southwest he was responsible for the creation of the Roosevelt Dam, the first large reclamation project in the history of the United States.

In the field of conservation development, and in the field of forest research, President Theodore Roosevelt was a notable contributor to the welfare and the benefit of his country. It was during his tenure of office that the United States Forest Service, one of the great civil agencies of the Federal Government was established.

He was the President who put into effect in the United States the first pure food law.

He was the President who put into effect the first law bringing about Federal inspection of slaughterhouses.

There are many similarities between Franklin D. Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt. Both had physical disabilities which they overcame through sheer courage and determination. They were both from New York. They both served as Governor of that State. Both served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Both served as President of the United States. There were differences, it is true, but despite the fact that one was a Republican and the other was a Democrat, we can say that, first and last, they were both Americans.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to join my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in paying tribute in these memorial exercises to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, but in my remarks I shall refer especially to the late great President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. President, today we memorialize the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's only inauguration as President of the United States.

This was on March 4, 1905. I can recall that in the fall following my graduation from Princeton University in 1901, we heard the tragic news of the assassination of President McKinley in Buffalo. Theodore Roosevelt, who was then the Vice President, was immediately sworn in as President. He served 3 years filling the remainder of President McKinley's term. He was President, therefore, for these 3 years and 4 years more—making 7 years in all. He was succeeded, as we all know, by William Howard Taft in 1908—the father of our late beloved Bob Taft.

In 1912 I was living in Colorado. I supported Teddy Roosevelt in the Republican Convention at Denver in that year. Taft won the nomination and Teddy started the Bull Moose Party. In the three-party contest that year Woodrow Wilson, after winning the Democratic nomination at the Baltimore convention, was elected President. World War I followed and Teddy with his four sons immediately volunteered.

Many years later in 1938, Teddy's son, Theodore, Jr., and I were members of the Glen Frank Republican Program Committee, appointed by the Republican National Committee. Our own BILL KNOWLAND was a member of that committee with us. Teddy, Jr., and I represented the Atlantic seaboard, and BILL KNOWLAND, of course, was from the Pacific. Since being in Washington my wife and I have come to know intimately the indomitable Alice Longworth, known to us as Lady Alice, the oldest child of Teddy, Sr. So the Teddy Roosevelt family have been very near and dear to us through many thrilling years.

The achievements for which Theodore Roosevelt is ranged among the greatest of our Presidents are based upon his prophetic vision of America's destiny. It was under his leadership that this Nation began to assume a greater role in world affairs. A major theme of his inaugural address of March 4, 1905, was that "much has been given to us and much will rightfully be expected of us. Power means responsibility and danger. We have become a great Nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relations with other nations of the earth." It was at this time he made his immortal statement, "Tread softly but carry a big stick."

Mr. President, it is this same sense of international responsibility which now weighs heavily upon us. In order to maintain freedom against tyranny, we are called upon to support a broad and costly military and economic aid program throughout the Free World.

I believe that this program is true to Theodore Roosevelt's vision of United States leadership. Certainly he, who always advocated a strong defense organization, would have endorsed the necessity for military assistance. I am equally sure that, were he alive today, he would be one of the strongest supporters of economic aid and technical assistance. In fact, the whole mutual security program is a logical outgrowth of the philosophy expressed in his inaugural address of 53 years ago:

> Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words but in our deeds that we are earnestly desirous of securing their good will by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of their rights. But justice and generosity in a nation, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong.

Mr. President, in more recent years my love and enthusiasm for Theodore Roosevelt have been enlarged and uplifted by a warm personal friend, the great biographer of Theodore Roosevelt, Herman Hagedorn. Herman Hagedorn has devoted a large part of his life to the perpetuation of the memory of Theodore Roosevelt and the carrying out of his highest ideals. I am, indeed, happy to pay him this tribute.

Mr. President, I am deeply grateful that during my life I have had the high privilege of knowing five such great American Presidents as Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and now Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, just a quarter of a century ago, March 4, 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States. In the campaign for his election, I took an active part in Montana. We sent a solid delegation to the national convention to work for his nomination. In the campaign which followed, the Democrats of Montana were unanimous in working for his election. Today we are proud to have an opportunity to pay a much-deserved tribute to his memory as a friend of the common man—one of the greatest political leaders this country has ever had.

In the course of my remarks, I also want to pay tribute to another Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, who, a generation before, had battled Wall Street monopolists in an effort to give the American people honest Government.

Franklin D. Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, at a moment when our country was tottering on the brink of economic ruin. Our economy was prostrate. Fifteen millions of American were unemployed. Their families, and millions more, were in distress. Great industrial plants across the country were closed or their production schedules severely curtailed. The great copper mines of my State were closed. Urgent and angry demands were being made for relief and for economic action. Banks were closing by the thousands in all parts of the Nation. Farmers sometimes could not sell their produce for enough to pay the freight to market. All agriculture was bankrupt. Small-business men were going into bankruptcy by thousands. The whole country was in a state of panic.

Our economic system had broken down. Great wrongs and evils had developed under which large groups of our population were being exploited. Monopolistic practices permitted the few to enrich themselves at the expense of the many.

It was through vigorous, farsighted, and constructive action that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was able to lead America out of the depths of the great depression.

Franklin D. Roosevelt repeatedly pointed out that big business in the United States had completely ignored its social responsibilities. It had ignored its obligation to build a workable economic system in its greedy quest for higher and higher profits, and greater and greater economic power.

Every reform that Franklin Roosevelt proposed and carried through was met by bitter protests from those who had been beneficiaries of unchallenged monopolistic practices. They fought every law which would restrict their exploitation of the mass of citizens. They cared not if the people of the Nation were impoverished and millions bankrupted. They were out to establish themselves as the economic royalty of America. Both Franklin D. and Theodore Roosevelt called them the malefactors of great wealth.

Despite all opposition, under the courageous leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, this Nation pulled out of its worst depression and started to move ahead. Under his leadership, Congress enacted a whole series of laws which went a long way toward redesigning our economic system and providing safeguards for the common man. We provided a program for the stabilization of agriculture and restoration of the purchasing power of

the farmers. We enacted laws using the full power of Government to protect small-business men, investors, and consumer from fraud and exploitation, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission Act. The banking laws were overhauled and a system of deposit insurance provided. We put the unemployed to work through the WPA and PWA.

At Franklin D. Roosevelt's insistence, we gave Federal recognition to labor's right to bargain collectively. We enacted his unemployment compensation program and provided a vast social-security program so our elder citizens might retire in dignity, with money to buy the necessities of life.

Under Franklin Roosevelt, we started developing the natural resources of this Nation for the benefit of all the people. The Tennessee Valley Authority was established. The South was emancipated to develop economically. The great Bonneville Power Administration was started and it provided low cost power for a light metals industry in the Northwest, creating thousands of jobs.

Many other western resources were developed through reclamation and other economic programs of this great President—unquestionably one of our very greatest Presidents. The South and the West were freed from the control of eastern capitalists and allowed to grow and develop economic muscles of their own.

As one commentator has said: "Franklin D. Roosevelt moved the real Capital of the United States from Wall Street to Washington."

Mr. President, before I knew this day was to be devoted to addresses commemorating the administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt, I requested that some research be done for me on the parallels in the policies of these two great men.

Theodore Roosevelt, although nominally a Republican, was alarmed by the shortsightedness of growing monopolies in his era. He was alarmed by the exploitation of natural resources for selfish gain. He fought the power trust when it attempted to capture the water resources of the Nation. He fathered the Reclamation Act. He was first to advocate the policy, developed by Gifford Pinchot and Frederick Newell, that our great rivers should be developed from headwaters to mouth on a unified plan by a single agency—an arm of government.

Mr. President, 2 years ago, and again last year, I sponsored a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 35, to provide for a fitting commemoration of the founding of the national conservation movement. The event would have commemorated the 50th anniversary of the National Conference of State Governors on Conservation Problems, which was called in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt. Although he was nominally called a Republican, I have always regarded "T. R." as a Democrat in his basic policies.

It was my great honor to be joined by 65 other Members of the United States Senate in the proposal which I offered to provide for a conservation 50th anniversary year in 1958. This joint resolution passed this body without a dissenting vote.

In the House of Representatives the resolution to commemorate this great conservation movement started by Theodore Roosevelt was repeatedly delayed. Finally, the opposition to it came out in the open. Selfish interests, led by the private electric power industry, wanted no anniversary events which might direct national attention to Theodore Roosevelt's policies of resource development for the public good. Fearful of the consequences of killing the resolution outright, the opposition delayed and then amended Senate Joint Resolution 35 a half-dozen times to make it ineffective. They cut funds for the year-long conservation effort to a paltry $20,000. The power companies exposed their part in the emasculation of the resolution by getting into the House report language forbidding the Anniversary Commission to have any part in a public versus private power debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks the draft of a statement I have prepared in the form of an analysis of Theodore Roosevelt's policies in regard to three subjects. The three are recreation, conservation of resources generally, and conservation and development of water resources, including electric power, for the people's benefit. I wish there were time to read the statement, but I do not desire to deny the floor to other Senators who would honor either Theodore Roosevelt or Franklin D. Roosevelt here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one cannot study the policies of Theodore Roosevelt in the recreation, conservation, and water resource fields without being struck with the fact that Franklin D. Roosevelt, 25 years later, gave effect and substance to the very policies which Teddy Roosevelt vigorously advocated.

For example, Teddy Roosevelt knew the real source of agitation for States rights over water resources development in the public domain. In 1910, he called it fairly comic for eastern capitalists to be howling about States rights. He pointed out that what the people behind the States rights furor really wanted was the right to exploit the waterpower resources of Western States and drain the profits off to their New York banks.

If he thought their pleas were fairly comic 50 years ago, T. R. would probably regard today's power trust propaganda as an absolute farce.

That is what it is—pure farce. The Hells Canyon Dam stretch of the Snake River is not being developed in partnership. It has been given away by the present administration to a Maine corporation, to underdevelop and exploit for private profit.

Mr. President, the emasculation of Senate Joint Resolution 35 in the House to prevent discussion of Theodore Roosevelt's policies was significant of our times.

In the twenties, the Nation forgot the policies and the warnings of Theodore Roosevelt against greedy, profit- and power-seeking private interests. Responsibilities to the common man were forgotten. Responsibility for a sound economic system was forgotten in the race to get rich quick.

The great depression resulted.

In the 5 years just past, we have forgotten the teachings of both Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt. We apparently forgot what tight money, a Cabinet composed of corporation executives, a prostrate agriculture, and excessive profit taking could do to the economy. We started giving away natural resources. We have all but stopped western resources development with slowdowns and a "no new starts" policy. We stopped expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority in compliance with a scheme blueprinted by Adolph Wenzell of the First Boston Corp. It was a scheme for private power interests eventually to take over this self-liquidating public agency.

We have yielded to the guidance of the same type of big-business thinking, big-business Cabinet, and big-business domination of Government that has brought tragedy on the Nation before.

It is well for the Senate, and for the whole Nation, to take this day to meditate about the policies of the two Roosevelts.

Theodore Roosevelt foresaw what the stifling hand of profit-greedy monopolists would do to our country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt rescued the Nation from the awful consequences of a decade of control by irresponsible monopolists, and saved our democracy for the common man.

Both were great Presidents in the Democratic tradition. If my Republican friends disagree with that—I use a capital "D"—I remind them that history records few things more clearly than that Teddy Roosevelt was nominated Vice President because Boss Platt and Mark Hannah did not want him to be Governor of New York for another term. Their party was trying to shelve this Democratic-acting party member when they accidentally started him on his way to the White House.

This Nation needs another man today, poured in the Roosevelt mold, who can bring administrative decision-making back from New York to Washington, and administer the Government for the common man.

EXHIBIT 1

To my very great disappointment, the House of Representatives has delayed and amended Senate Joint Resolution 35 which was intended to stimulate a yearlong anniversary of policies established by Theodore Roosevelt, so that it is no longer useful to take the resolution to conference and endeavor to enact it.

The resolution set aside 1958 for an anniversary of the founding of the national conservation movement, dating it from the 1908 Conference of Governors on Conservation called by President Theodore Roosevelt.

The House of Representatives limited the proposed anniversary Commission's funds to $20,000—wholly inadequate for the purpose and unworthy of the event it was to commemorate. Six other amendments emasculated the resolution further. The report on the resolution provided that the Commission

could not in any event participate in discussion of public development of hydroelectric resources as against private development.

The latter admonition was, of course, a complete giveaway of the forces that emasculated the joint resolution.

Selfish private interests want no events that will review and remind the public of Theodore Roosevelt's battles against the power trust and other monopolists.

For the benefit of those Americans who want an unexpurgated review of Theodore Roosevelt's policies in the resources field, I requested my assistants to gather representative quotations from his papers on three subjects: Conservation of resources for recreation, conservation generally, and conservation of water and power resources.

The quotations are a complete explanation why no conservation anniversary year, reaching back into the Teddy Roosevelt era, was desired by those who helped emasculate Senate Joint Resolution 35.

T. R. ON RECREATION RESOURCES

Two statements by Theodore Roosevelt on the subject of recreation resources as an aspect of conservation tell the story of his views.

The first is an excerpt from his autobiography describing a visit to Yosemite with the great woodsman and naturalist, John Muir, which has poetry of description hard to surpass. It reads:

"When first I visited California, it was my good fortune to see the 'big trees,' the Sequoias, and then to travel down into the Yosemite, with John Muir. Of course, of all people in the world he was the one with whom it was best worthwhile thus to see the Yosemite. * * * John Muir met me with a couple of packers and two mules to carry our tent, bedding, and food for a 3 days' trip. The first night was clear, and we lay down in the darkening aisles of the great Sequoia grove. The majestic trunks, beautiful in color and in symmetry, rose around us like the pillars of a mightier cathedral than ever was conceived even by the fervor of the Middle Ages. * * * The second night we camped in a snowstorm, on the edge of a grove of mighty silver fir; and the next day we went down into the wonderland of the valley itself. I shall always be glad that I was in the Yosemite with John Muir and in the Yellowstone with John Burroughs." (Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, pp. 311–312.)

Other concepts of the Rough Rider's thinking grew while he was President, but long before he came to the White House Roosevelt had learned in the woods of Maine and on the plains of North Dakota the value of the mighty cathedrals of nature in the recreation of the human spirit. The idea of the importance of outdoor recreation for physical, spiritual, and mental health was as much a part of him when he became President as were his ideas of integrity and public service. Thus we see him including in his first annual message to the Congress a description of the need to "set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole" the forest reserves and some of "the flower-clad meadows of our mountains."

"In cases where natural conditions have been restored for a few years, vegetation has again carpeted the ground, birds and deer are coming back, and hundreds of persons, especially from the immediate neighborhood, come each summer to enjoy the privilege of camping. Some at least of the forest reserves should afford perpetual protection to the native fauna and flora, safe havens of refuge to our rapidly diminishing wild animals of the larger kinds, and free camping grounds for the ever-increasing numbers of the men and women who have learned to find rest, health, and recreation in the splendid forests and flower-clad meadows of our mountains. The forest reserves should be set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole and not sacrificed to the short-sighted greed of a few." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.)

T. R. AS A CONSERVATIONIST

Roosevelt describes the beginning of his work in the field of conservation in his autobiography while discussing his service as Governor of New York. He says:

"In addition to labor legislation, I was able to do a good deal for forest preservation and the protection of our wildlife. All that later I strove for in the Nation in connection with conservation was foreshadowed by what I strove to obtain for New York when I was governor; and I was already working in connection with Gifford Pinchot and Newell. I secured better administration, and some improvement in the laws themselves. The improvement in administration, and in the character of the game and forest wardens, was secured partly as the result of a conference in the executive chamber which I held wih 40 of the best guides and woodsmen of the Adirondacks." (Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, p. 284.)

This was the beginning of his active work for conservation, and it is interesting to note that already the names of Gifford Pinchot and Frederick Newell are mentioned, the two men closest to him for years in the conservation field.

Frederick Haynes Newell was hydrographer for the United States Geological Survey between 1890 and 1902, and its chief engineer from 1902 to 1907, following which he served as its director for 7 years until 1914. Roosevelt describes him as a model public servant, and credits him with the inception of the plan for the Reclamation Service, which became the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Every item of the whole great plan of reclamation now in effect was undertaken between 1902 and 1906. By the spring of 1909 the work was an assured success, and the Government had become fully committed to its continuance. The work of reclamation was at first under the United States Geological Survey, of which Charles D. Walcott was at that time director. In the spring of 1908 the United States Reclamation Service was established to carry it on, under the direction of Frederick Haynes Newell, to whom the inception of the plan was due. Newell's single-minded devotion to this great task, the constructive imagination which enabled him to conceive it, and the executive power and high character through which he and his assistant, Arthur P. Davis, built up a model service—all these have made him a model servant. The final proof of his merit is supplied by the character and records of the men who later assailed him." (Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, p. 388.)

Roosevelt started his term as President, probably thanks primarily to his work with Pinchot and Newell, with a complete realization of the basic element of resource conservation, the importance of forests to land and water conservation, and stated it briefly for all the Nation to see in his first annual message to Congress.

"The forests are natural reservoirs. By restraining the streams in flood and replenishing them in drought they make possible the use of waters otherwise wasted. They prevent the soil from washing, and so protect the storage reservoirs from filling up with silt. Forest conservation is, therefore, an essential condition of water conservation." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.)

Starting with this basic awareness Roosevelt devoted a great share of his tremendous energies to putting through the changes which he saw were necessary to effectuate even the most fundamental resource conservation policies; thus the Reclamation Service began its work with enactment of the act of 1902, and for the first time the Government foresters and the national forests were placed under the jurisdiction of the same department of Government when the Forest Service was set up as an agency of the Department of Agriculture. Soil conservation received national attention for the first time, and the importance of our great river resources became widely recognized under the President's leadership. And as his own grasp of the subject broadened and deepened with experience he stated and restated the issue for the Nation and its leaders, like the great educator he was. Thus we see the superb summary of the problem in his seventh annual message to Congress. Speaking of conservation as the fundamental problem he describes the reward of foresight for the Nation and warns, "But there must be the look ahead; there must be a realization of the fact that to waste, to destroy our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land" can only result in bringing disaster on our children.

"The conservation of our natural resources and their proper use constitute the fundamental problem which underlies almost every other problem of our national life. We must maintain for our civilization the adequate material basis without which that civilization cannot exist. We must show foresight; we must look ahead. As a Nation we not only enjoy a wonderful measure of present prosperity but if this prosperity is used aright it is an earnest of future success such as no other nation will have. The reward of foresight for this Nation is great and easily foretold. But there must be the look ahead; there must be a realization of the fact that to waste, to destroy our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed. For the last few years, through several agencies, the Government has been endeavoring to get our people to look ahead and to substitute a planned and orderly development of our resources in place of a haphazard striving for immediate profit." (Seventh annual message to Congress, December 3, 1907.)

The achievements of T. R. in the field of conservation were not accomplished without opposition. He himself describes this opposition in his seventh annual message to Congress and says of it, "This opposition is, I think, dying away."

Speaking of the work of the Reclamation Service:

"There has been, of course, opposition to this work; opposition from some interested men who desire to exhaust the land for their own immediate profit without regard to the welfare of the next generation, and opposition from honest and well-meaning men who did not fully understand the subject or who did not look far enough ahead. This opposition is, I think, dying away, and our people are understanding that it would be utterly wrong to allow a few individuals to exhaust for their own temporary personal profit the resources which ought to be developed through use so as to be conserved for the permanent common advantage of the people as a whole." (Seventh annual message to Congress, December 3, 1907.)

It is difficult to believe that T. R. actually believed that opposition would ever completely die, for surely no one knew better than he that there will always be selfish, greedy, and shortsighted men and corporations who would trade the long-run national interest for their own temporary personal profit. As long as there are great resources like Hells Canyon still unexploited there will be self-serving interests like the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation, anxious to seize them for inadequate development, which is the worst kind of waste. As long as there are trees standing in the national forests

and parks we shall have to be on our guard lest they be plundered, as the notorious Al Serena mining claim is now being stripped—not of minerals—but of timber. This is merely part of the perpetual struggle of democratic government, and each generation must win it anew, for once one of these battles is irrevocably lost, the damage may not be reparable for centuries.

T. R. gave special consideration to this type of resource in his last annual message, describing them as the resources which can be improved in the process of wise use. Those who think that the inadequate development of Hells Canyon can be excused on the basis of economy or immediacy should reconsider their judgment in the light of these statements from the lips of the greatest Republican President of the past 97 years.

"If there is any one duty which more than another we owe it to our children and our children's children to perform at once, it is to save the forests of this country, for they constitute the first and most important element in the conservation of the natural resources of the country. There are of course two kinds of natural resources. One is the kind which can only be used as part of a process of exhaustion; this is true of mines, natural oil and gas wells, and the like. The other, and of course ultimately by far the most important, includes the resources which can be improved in the process of wise use; the soil, the rivers, and the forests come under this head. Any really civilized nation will so use all of these three great national assets that the nation will have their benefit in the future. Just as a farmer, after all his life making his living from his farm, will, if he is an expert farmer, leave it as an asset of increased value to his son, so we should leave our national domain to our children, increased in value and not worn out." (Eighth annual message to Congress, December 8, 1908.)

With barely a year to serve in his second term, Theodore Roosevelt had become so convinced of the historic importance of the new conservation movement that he determined to call a conference of the State governors to dramatize the subject. For a description of this conference, its purpose, and its achievements, I want to include here a brief excerpt from the writings of Roosevelt's chief forester, Gifford Pinchot.

"The Governor's Conference on Conservation was the first of its kind—the first not only in America, but in the world. It may well be regarded by future historians as a turning point in human history. Because it introduced to mankind the newly formulated policy of the conservation of natural resources, it exerted and continues to exert a vital influence on the United States. * * * It spread far and wide the new proposition that the purpose of conservation is the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time." (Gifford Pinchot, Breaking New Ground.)

After 50 years it is easy to evaluate Roosevelt's inauguration of the conservation movement as his greatest work, but in closing my remarks on T. R.'s conservation policies today, I want to refer to an analysis made in The Progressive, by Robert La Follette, in March 1909. This is a truly remarkable analysis, for it is no cool, considered estimate made in the clear light of history's perspective. This is the snap judgment of one of the combatants in the fray while the battle was in a temporary lull, but no historian has stated it better or analyzed it more clearly, and no one is likely to.

SENATOR ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, IN THE PROGRESSIVE, MARCH 1909 (IMMEDIATELY AFTER T. R. STEPPED DOWN FROM OFFICE)

"Roosevelt steps from the stage gracefully. He has ruled his party to a large extent against its will. He has played a large part in the world's work, for the past 7 years. The activities of his remarkably forceful personality have been so manifold that it will be long before his true rating will be fixed in the opinion of the race. He is said to think that the three great things done by him are the undertaking of the construction of the Panama Canal and its rapid and successful carrying forward, the making of peace between Russia and Japan, and the sending around the world of the fleet.

"These are important things, but many will be slow to think them his greatest services.

"And, then, there is the great and statesmanlike movement for the conservation of our national resources, into which Roosevelt so energetically threw himself at a time when the Nation as a whole knew not that we are ruining and bankrupting ourselves as fast as we can. This is probably the greatest thing that Roosevelt did, undoubtedly. This globe is the capital stock of the race.

"It is just so much coal and oil and gas. This may be economized or wasted. The same thing is true of phosphates and other mineral resources. Our water resources are immense and we are only just beginning to use them. Our forests have been destroyed; they must be restored. Our soils are being depleted; they must be built up and conserved.

"These questions are not of this day only or this generation. They belong all to the future. Their consideration requires that high moral tone which regards the earth as the home of prosperity to whom we owe a sacred duty.

"This immense idea Roosevelt, with high statesmanship, dinned into the ears of the Nation until the Nation heeded. He held it so high that it attracted the attention of the neighboring nations of the continent, and will so spread and intensify that we will soon see the world's conferences devoted to it.

"Nothing can be greater or finer than this. It is so great and so fine that when the historian of the future shall speak of Theodore Roosevelt he is likely to say that he did many notable things, among them that of inaugurating the movement which finally resulted in the square deal, but that his greatest work was inspiring and actually beginning a world movement for staying terrestrial waste and saving for the human race the things upon which, and upon which, alone, a great and peaceful and progressive and happy race life can be founded.

"What statesman in all history has done anything calling for so wide a view and for a purpose more lofty?"

Last week population experts predicted that in the year 2050 the world population will be 7 billion people. I wondered where the resources were coming from to support them and their economy. Surely if they are able to survive at all, it will be only because of an intensification of the conservation movement started by Theodore Roosevelt, and how true the words of Robert LaFollette will ring then.

T. R. ON THE CONSERVATION OF WATER AND POWER

In discussing Theodore Roosevelt's views toward the conservation of our water and power resources it must be noted first that he was not dogmatic in any sense, nor was he swayed by the shibboleths which the propagandists of today toss so freely upon the winds. Perhaps it was because his mind was uncluttered by emotional phrases and phoney slogans that he was so able to think clearly and incisively in solving the problems with which he dealt. In any event, that he brought to his work a free and open mind he demonstrated in his second annual message as governor to the Legislature of the State of New York on January 3, 1900.

THE STATE AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

"It has become more and more evident of late years that the State will have to act in its collective capacity as regards certain subjects which we have been accustomed to treat as matters affecting the private citizen only, and that furthermore, it must exercise an increasing and more rigorous control over other matters which it is not desirable that it should directly manage. It is neither possible nor desirable to lay down a general hard-and-fast rule as to what this control should be in all cases. There is no possible reason in pure logic why a city, for instance, should supply its inhabitants with water, and allow private companies to supply them with gas, any more than there is why the General Government should take charge of the delivery of letters but not of telegrams. On the other hand, pure logic has a very restricted application to actual social and civic life, and there is no possible reason for changing from one system to the other simply because the change would make our political system in theory more symmetrical." (Second annual message as Governor to the Legislature of the State of New York, January 3, 1900.)

Certainly those are not the words of a man who would be confused today by the cries of socialism and free enterprise which so often make the rafters of this Chamber ring. And because he could approach these problems with logic rather than emotion he could see that the Federal Government had a vital task to perform in the development of our rivers; this he spelled out in his first message to the Congress in December 1901, just after he became President.

"The forests alone cannot, however, fully regulate and conserve the waters of the arid region. Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the flood waters. Their construction has been conclusively shown to be an undertaking too vast for private effort. Nor can it be best accomplished by the individual States acting alone. Far-reaching interstate problems are involved; and the resources of single States would often be inadequate. It is properly a national function, at least in some of its features. It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for water storage as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid region by engineering works of another kind. The storing of the floods in reservoirs at the headwaters of our rivers is but an enlargement of our present policy of river control, under which levees are built on the lower reaches of the same stream.

"The Government should construct and maintain these reservoirs as it does other public works. Where their purpose is to regulate the flow of streams, the water should be turned freely into the channels in the dry season to take the same course under the same laws as the natural flow." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1901.)

Having decided that the Government should construct and maintain these reservoirs as it does other public works, Roosevelt was, of course, faced immediately with the problem of who should profit from the water power which these developments could make available. A half century ago he faced up to this issue with the same forthrightness that he demonstrated at every time of decision throughout his career. At this time the electric industry was still in its early infancy; power companies were thought of as merchants of illumination; yet even then Roosevelt, with Pinchot and some of his colleagues, was beginning to see the future significance of the electric industry on our civilization.

So when the Congress passed a bill to allow a private dam to be constructed at Muscle Shoals by N. F. Thompson and Associates, Theodore Roosevelt sent it back to the Hill with a very clear veto message dedicated to the rather simple proposition that if the Government is called upon to improve a stream for navigation it should sell the power developed to help pay the cost.

MUSCLE SHOALS VETO MESSAGE—EXCERPT

"The recent development of the application of waterpower to the production of electricity available for use at considerable distances has revealed an element of substantial value in streams which the Government is or is liable to be called upon to improve for purposes of navigation, and this value, in my judgment, should be properly utilized to defray the cost of the improvement. Wherever the Government constructs a dam and lock for the purpose of navigation there is a waterfall of great value. It does not seem right or just that this element of local value should be given away to private individuals of the vicinage, and at the same time the people of the whole country should be taxed for the local improvement.

"It seems clear that justice to the taxpayers of the country demands that when the Government is or may be called upon to improve a stream the improvement should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable. * * * I think it is desirable * * * that a general policy appropriate to the new conditions caused by the advance in electrical science should be adopted under which these valuable rights will not be practically given away, but will be disposed of after full competition in such a way as shall best conserve the public interest." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 36, p. 3071 (Mar. 4, 1903).)

Several comments are in order at this point. In the first place, President Roosevelt's veto of this bill preserved the Muscle Shoals resource so that 30 years later it could become the primary resource around which the TVA battle raged; it is exceedingly appropriate that Theodore Roosevelt, the man who breathed life into the principles of conservation, should have been so instrumental in making possible, long after his death, the development which showed the whole world the way to best apply those same principles in a river basin.

Secondly, if it was the first Roosevelt who saved the resource for the future, it was the second Roosevelt who signed the bill putting it to work for all the people of the Nation, some 30 years later. The Democratic Roosevelt and the Republican Roosevelt, leading our Nation a quarter of a century apart, could hardly have been closer together than they were on the issue of conservation and resource development.

Thirdly, I pause long enough to ask what has happened to the ideas of Theodore Roosevelt in his own party? Was it the party of the great conservationist President which proposed the principle of so-called partnership as the proper way to develop our river resources? Was it Theodore Roosevelt's party which proposed the John Day Dam partnership scheme for the great Lower Columbia River project, asking that the power companies be allowed to install the generators in the Government's dam—and on the excuse that this would save the taxpayers money? If anyone has any question as to where Theodore Roosevelt would have stood on partnership, let him reread the Muscle Shoals veto message, because T. R. couldn't have stated it any clearer if he had been discussing John Day Dam itself.

In his autobiography, Theodore Roosevelt tells of his decision that the public should retain title to the waterpower sites of the Nation not already lost to private ownership.

"The work of the Bureau of Corporations as to waterpower was equally striking. In addition to bringing the concentration of waterpower control first prominently to public attention, through material furnished for my message in my veto of the James River Dam bill, the work of the Bureau showed that 10 great interests and their allies held nearly 60 percent of the developed waterpower of the United States. Says Commissioner Smith: 'Perhaps the most important thing in the whole work was its clear demonstration of the fact that the only effective place to control waterpower in the public interest is at the power sites; that as to powers now owned by the public it is absolutely essential that the public shall retain title.'" (Autobiography, p. 410.)

Similarly he tells of the fight of the waterpower interests against his administration's position that the developer of any site should pay the Government an annual rental for the use of the public resource and the administration maintenance of the position requiring payment.

"Up to the time the national forests were put under the charge of the Forest Service, the Interior Department had made no effort to establish public regulation and control of waterpower. Upon the transfer, the Service immediately began its fight to handle the power resources of the national forests so as to prevent speculation and monopoly and to yield a fair return to the Government. On May 1, 1906, an act was passed granting the use of certain power sites in southern California to the Edison Electric Power Co., which act, at the suggestion of the Service, limited the period of the permit to 40 years, and required the payment of an annual rental by the company, the same conditions which were thereafter adopted by the Service as the basis for all permits for power development. Then began a vigorous fight against the position of the Service by the water-power interests. The right to charge for waterpower development was, however, sustained by the Attorney General" (Autobiography, p. 394).

Thus did Roosevelt's thinking develop and with it the principles which have become our laws. Roosevelt describes this development and struggle himself in a statement which also spells out the principle of stewardship by the executive departments of our resources. I want to direct the attention of my good friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, to this statement, because it is only a short step from the principle of stewardship by the Executive of the public welfare to the principle of stewardship by this generation of our natural resources for future generations. No one has been as consistent in spelling out this principle as the Senator from Oregon. He should enjoy reading Theodore Roosevelt's statement of the stewardship principle.

"The idea that the Executive is the steward of the public welfare was first formulated and given practical effect in the Forest Service by its law officer, George Woodruff. * * *

"This theory of stewardship in the interest of the public was well illustrated by the establishment of a waterpower policy. Until the Forest Service changed the plan, waterpowers on the navigable streams, on the public domain, and in the national forests were given away for nothing, and substantially without question, to whoever asked for them. At last, under the principle that public property should be paid for and should not be permanently granted away when such permanent grant is avoidable, the Forest Service established the policy of regulating the use of power in the national forests in the public interest and making a charge for value received. This was the beginning of the water policy now substantially accepted by the public, and doubtless soon to be enacted into law. But there was at the outset violent opposition to it on the part of the waterpower companies, and such representatives of their views in Congress as Messrs. Tawney and Bede.

"Many bills were introduced in Congress aimed, in one way or another, at relieving the power companies of control and payment. When these bills reached me I refused to sign them; and the injury to the public interest which would follow their passage was brought sharply to public attention in my message of February 26, 1908. The bills made no further progress." (Autobiography, p. 397.)

As his experience in these fields grew, Teddy Roosevelt came more and more to realize the great value of the resources involved in the development of our rivers, and he became increasingly more protective of them. At the same time he came to understand the need for comprehensive development plans for these resources if they were not to be wasted. Both these ideas, the great value of the waterpower resources and the need for comprehensive development were mentioned in Roosevelt's seventh annual message to Congress.

"Moreover, the development of our waterways involves many other important water problems, all of which should be considered as part of the same general scheme. The Government dams should be used to produce hundreds of thousands of horsepower as an incident to improving navigation; for the annual value of the unused waterpower of the United States perhaps exceeds the annual value of the products of all our mines.

"I have appointed an inland waterways commission to study and outline a comprehensive scheme of development along all the lines indicated. Later I shall lay its report before the Congress." (Seventh annual message to Congress, December 3, 1907.)

It was the Inland Waterways Commission which brought Roosevelt's thinking on river development to full flower, with his message transmitting its report to the Congress. In one brief paragraph, Theodore Roosevelt spelled out the basic principle that each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such. For 50 years this has stood as the ultimate statement on comprehensive, integrated water resource development, and no one is likely to improve upon it in the future.

"Every stream should be used to its utmost. No stream can be so used unless such use is planned in advance. When such plans are made, we shall find that, instead of interfering, one use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such." (S. Doc. No. 325, 60th Cong., 1st sess.) (Message transmitting to Congress the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission, Feb. 26, 1908.)

But is the Eisenhower administration treating the Columbia River Basin as a single unit? Hardly so. It would be more accurate to say that it considers the basin not as a single river system but as a package of grab-bag presents, to be handed out indiscriminately to anyone who chooses to take a chance. Again, what has happened to the Republicanism of Teddy Roosevelt? Or what of the principles of even President Taft? It was Taft who took Roosevelt's principle of a basin being a single unit and carried it to its logical conclusion—that it would only introduce chaos into the picture to have multiple ownership of the projects in a single river basin.

"The lower river is being improved by a series of dams belonging to the Federal Government. This dam, situated in the upper reaches of the river, is, according to the report of the engineers, capable of becoming part of this general Federal improvement of navigation. To introduce a diversity of title into a series of dams which may become eventually a part of a single improvement directed at the same end would, in my opinion, be highly objectionable." (White River veto message by President Taft, August 6, 1912.)

Apparently the present administration cannot even agree with its more conservative forebears; for if there was ever a case which the White River veto described, it is Hells Canyon, where the dam in the upper reaches of the river is clearly capable of

becoming a part of the general Federal improvement, where the lower river is being improved by a series of dams belonging to the Federal Government—Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, and Ice Harbor. Why, the Eisenhower administration has not only turned its back on Theodore Roosevelt; it has apparently rejected William Howard Taft as too far to the left.

Roosevelt himself spelled out a few of the facts of life with regard to this river development in a Denver speech after his return from Africa a year after he left the White House. I would suggest that my colleagues read this excerpt from that speech carefully and consider how compatible Teddy Roosevelt's position is with the Hells Canyon giveaway.

"We should make it our duty to see that hereafter power sites are kept under control of the general government for the use of the people as a whole in a way which shall encourage development of the water power, but which shall not create a monopoly or permit the development to be antisocial; to be in any respect hostile to the public good.

"The Nation alone has the power to do this effectively, and it is for this reason that you will find those corporations which wish to gain improper advantage and to be freed from official control on the part of the public, doing all that they can to secure the substitution of State for National action.

"There is something fairly comic about the appeal made by many of these men in favor of State control, when you consider that the great corporations seeking these waterpower privileges in any given State are at least as apt to be owned outside the State as within.

"In this country nowadays, capital has a national and not a State use. The great corporations which are managed and largely owned in the older States are those which are most in evidence in developing and using the mines and waterpowers and forests of the new Territories and States from Alaska to Arizona.

"I have been genuinely amused during the past 2 months at having arguments presented to me on behalf of certain rich men in New York and Ohio, for instance, as to why Colorado and other Western States should manage their own waterpower sites.

"Now these men may be good citizens according to their own lights, but actually their special interests obscure their sense of public need; and as their object is to escape an efficient control exercised in the interest of all the people, they clamor to be put under the State, instead of under the Nation.

"If we are foolish enough to grant their requests, we shall have ourselves to blame when we wake up and find that we have permitted another privilege to entrench itself and another portion of what should be kept for the public good to be turned over to individuals for purposes of private enrichment." (Theodore Roosevelt, Denver speech, 1910.)

I think we should notice especially how Roosevelt disposed of the States rights arguments of his day; he knew well that selfish economic interests really lay behind the noble appeals for State control, and he considered them fairly comic in 1910. If they were fairly comic to T. R. in 1910, he would find some of the similar appeals of the past 20 years completely farcical. His speech delivered in 1910 exactly describes the Hells Canyon situation, where we have the Idaho Power Co., owned largely in the East, incorporated in Maine, exploiting through underdevelopment the resources of the West. It goes further than that, for Teddy Roosevelt described the product of that exploitation, electric power, will be sold to the people of the West and the profits will then be shipped back East to the big stockholders. I think that is what the economists mean when they say we in the West have an extractive economy—our economic resources are extracted from us by eastern interests and shipped right out of the area.

In the Rainy River Dam veto message of 1908 we see how T. R.'s understanding of the electric industry's place in our society was growing. "Already," he says, "the evils of monopoly are becoming manifest."

RAINY RIVER DAM VETO

"We are now at the beginning of great development in waterpower. Its use through electrical transmission is entering more and more largely into every element of the daily life of the people. Already the evils of monopoly are becoming manifest; already the experience of the past shows the necessity of caution in making unrestricted grants of this great power.

"The present policy pursued in making these grants is unwise in giving away the property of the people in the flowing waters to individuals or organizations practically unknown, and granting in perpetuity these valuable privileges in advance of the formulation of definite plans as to their use. In some cases the grantees apparently have little or no financial or other ability to utilize the gift, and have sought it merely because it could be had for the asking.

"In place of the present haphazard policy of permanently alienating valuable public property we should substitute a definite policy along the following lines:

"First. There should be a limited or carefully guarded grant in the nature of an option or opportunity afforded within reasonable time for development of plans and for execution of the project.

"Second. Such a grant of concession should be accompanied in the act making the grant by a provision expressly making it the duty of the designated official to annul the grant if the work is not begun or plans are not carried out in accordance with the authority granted.

"Third. It should also be the duty of some designated official to see to it that in approving the plans the maximum development of the navigation and power is assured, or at least that in making the plans these may not be so developed as ultimately to interfere with the better utilization of the water or complete development of the power.

"Fourth. There should be a license fee or charge which, though small or nominal at the outset, can in the future be adjusted so as to secure a control in the interest of the public.

"Fifth. Provision should be made for the termination of the grant or privilege at a definite time, leaving to future generations the power or authority to renew or extend the concession in accordance with the conditions which may prevail at that time." (42d CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pt. 5, 4698, April 13, 1908.)

It is also worthy of note that here, in 1908, T. R. laid out clearly and concisely the basic principles of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920. That act and the Federal Power Act which followed it provided all the necessary means for carrying out Theodore Roosevelt's policies completely in the public interest. Only the men who administer the act could destroy its effectiveness to the extent we see in the FPC license for the underdevelopment of Hells Canyon.

Again we see in the James River veto message of the following year the growing awareness of the dangers inherent in the electric power monopoly problem, as he says, "The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience."

JAMES RIVER VETO

(T. R. message returning without approval bill to authorize private construction of a dam and water-power development in James River, Mo., due to insufficient protection of the public interest. He quotes from his letter of March 18, 1908, to the Senate Committee on Commerce concerning bills granting water rights which said that he would "sign no bills hereafter which do not provide specifically for the right to fix and make a charge and for a definite limitation in time of the rights conferred." He argues that the National Government has power to impose conditions since it has power to deny use of navigable streams, and continues:)

"Believing that the National Government has this power, I am convinced that its power ought to be exercised. The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. A single generation will see the exhaustion of our natural resources of oil and gas and such a rise in the price of coal as will make the price of electrically transmitted waterpower a controlling factor in transportation, in manufacturing, and in household lighting and heating. Our waterpower alone, if fully developed and wisely used, is probably sufficient for our present transportation, industrial, municipal, and domestic needs. Most of it is undeveloped and is still in National or State control.

"To give away, without conditions, this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly. If we are guilty of it, our children will be forced to pay an annual return upon a capitalization based upon the highest prices which 'the traffic will bear.' They will find themselves face to face with powerful interests intrenched behind the doctrine of 'vested rights' and strengthened by every defense which money can buy and the ingenuity of able corporation lawyers can devise. Long before that time they may and very probably will have become a consolidated interest, controlled from the great financial centers, dictating the terms upon which the citizen can conduct his business or earn his livelihood, and not amenable to the wholesome check of local opinion.

"The great corporations are acting with foresight, singleness of purpose, and vigor to control the waterpowers of the country. They pay no attention to State boundaries and are not interested in the constitutional law affecting navigable streams except as it affords what has been aptly called a 'twilight zone,' where they may find a convenient refuge from any regulation whatever by the public, whether through the National or State Government." (43d CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, 978, January 15, 1909.)

(He concludes with repetition of policy statement in Rainy River veto message.)

And how clearly Roosevelt saw the electric industry development of the future, the increasing consolidation of the industry and its control from the great financial centers. Roosevelt and Pinchot saw this development in its blossom time; today, 50 years later, we have only to look and we shall see the fruit hanging heavy on the bough.

To speak of the work of Theodore Roosevelt in the field of conservation is to speak of his alter ego, Gifford Pinchot, who justly shares with him the pinnacle position in the history of the conservation movement. I have called Roosevelt the Godfather of Conservation, because although he did not sire it he raised it, gave it status, and endowed it with spiritual fervor. Gifford Pinchot was the father of the movement, and no one was quicker to acknowledge it than Theodore Roosevelt. "Gifford Pinchot," he wrote, "is the man to whom the Nation owes most for what has been accomplished as regards the preservation of the natural resources of our country."

"Gifford Pinchot is the man to whom the Nation owes most for what has been accomplished as regards the preservation of the natural resources of our country. He led, and indeed during its most vital period embodied, the fight for the preservation

through use of our forests. He played one of the leading parts in the effort to make the National Government the chief of instrument in developing the irrigation of the arid West. He was the foremost leader in the great struggle to coordinate all our social and governmental forces in the effort to secure the adoption of a rational and far-seeing policy for securing the conservation of all our national resources. He was already in the Government service as head of the Forestry Bureau when I became President; he continued throughout my term, not only as head of the forest service, but as the moving and directing spirit in most of the conservation work, and as counsellor and assistant on most of the other work connected with the internal affairs of the country. Taking into account the varied nature of the work he did, its vital importance to the Nation and the fact that as regards much of it he was practically breaking new ground, and taking into account also his tireless energy and activity, his fearlessness, his complete disinterestedness, his single-minded devotion to the interests of the plain people, and his extraordinary efficiency, I believe it is but just to say that among the many, many public officials who under my administration rendered literally invaluable service to the people of the United States, he, on the whole, stood first. A few months after I left the presidency he was removed from office by President Taft." (Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, p. 385.)

It is interesting to imagine that Gifford Pinchot himself probably cherished this statement of Roosevelt's autobiography as the highest praise he ever received. At least we know that when he came to write his own autobiography and history of the conservation movement he chose for its title a brief excerpt from this statement of Roosevelt's, Breaking New Ground.

Because of the identity of thought between these two men on all aspects of the field of conservation and power development, I believe it is perfectly proper to close this discussion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt's thinking with respect to power development with an excerpt from Pinchot's writing after T. R.'s death. We have no statement of the thinking on the problem during his last 6 years after the completion of his autobiography, but we can be certain that had he survived to be elected President in 1920 we should have had many words on the subject from him, and that they would have been close in thought to those of his great friend and advisor Gifford Pinchot when, as Governor of Pennsylvania in 1925, he transmitted to the general assembly the report of the giant power survey board. By this time Pinchot was, as Roosevelt would have been, fully aware of the impact of electricity on our economy and our society. I commend this statement to the careful reading of any thoughtful person who would consider in these trying times where our society is going and where we would have it go, for much of Pinchot's description of the situation he saw developing is truer today by far than it was when he wrote it.

"THE ELECTRIC MONOPOLY

"(Governor Pinchot's message of transmittal of the report of the giant power survey board to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania (February, 1925))

"It is almost impossible to imagine the force and intimacy with which such a monopoly will touch and affect, for good or evil, the life of every citizen. The time is fully in sight when every household operation from heating and cooking to sweeping and sewing will be performed by the aid of electrical power; when every article on the average man's breakfast table—every item of his clothing—every piece of his furniture—every tool of his trade—that he himself did not produce, will have been manufactured or transported by electric power; when the home, the farm, and the factory will be electrically lighted, heated, and operated; when from morning to night, from the cradle to the grave, electric service will enter at every moment and from every direction into the daily life of every man, woman, and child in America.

"We complain, and with justice, that the cost of food doubles between the farmer who grows it, and the housewife who buys it. But if the cost of electric current only doubled between the generating station and the householder's meter the present rates would be cut into small pieces. Producers of electric current commonly sell it to large consumers for a fifth of a tenth of the price they charge to the head of a family, and for much less than the small industrial consumer pays. It is the small user, the average consumer, to whom the companies charge their highest rates.

"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 time. If uncontrolled, 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.

"In the near future electric energy and its products will be as essential, as ever present, and as pervasive as the air we breathe. The unregulated domination of such a necessity of life would give to the holders of it a degree of personal, economic, and political power over the average citizen which no free peope could suffer and survive.

"The very existence, for example, of industries upon which the prosperity of Pennsylvania is based might be endangered by discrimination in favor of other States. This is no fanciful illustration, for the industries of Switzerland are suffering now from just such discrimination by Swiss power companies in favor of German, French, and Italian manufacturers.

"The situation is almost magical in its boundless possibilities for good or evil. On the good side, it is as though a beneficent power were about to shower upon us gifts of unimaginable beauty and worth. On the bad side, it is as though an enchanted evil spider were hastening to spread his web over the whole of the United States and to control and live upon the life of our people.

"No such profound change in economic life is possible without profound changes in law and government. It is the part of statesmanship by foresight to make these changes easy, and to take such account of the mistakes of the past that we shall neither pervert the possibilities nor disappoint the legitimate hopes with which we enter the new era of electricity.

"The greatest economic question

"What the new civilization to which giant power is leading will actually become no man can yet foretell. Steam brought about the centralization of industry, a decline in country life, the decay of many small communities, and the weakening of family ties. Giant power may bring about the decentralization of industry, the restoration of country life, and the upbuilding of the small communities and of the family. In this hope of the future lies the possibility of new freedom and great spiritual enrichment of individual life.

"Men can use steam power only where it is generated. That is why steam has concentrated vast numbers of people in industrial cities. In a steam-driven civilization the worker must go to the power, but in an electrically driven civilization the power will be delivered to the worker. Steam makes slums. Electricity can replace them with garden cities.

"Next to a supply of natural resources sufficient to feed, clothe, and shelter our people, this is the greatest of the economic questions which face the human race. I do not raise it. It has raised itself. But having forced itself upon us, there is but one course we can properly pursue: That is to look it squarely in the face, estimate its possibilities for good or evil, and address ourselves like men to the vast problem of adjusting the growing power of electricity to the growing needs of humanity, remembering that in any solution fit to last and capable of lasting the public good must always come first. Giant power is the best answer to this gigantic problem that has yet been proposed.

"This much is certain—that if we control it instead of permitting it to control us, the coming electrical development will form the basis for a civilization safer, happier, freer, and fuller of opportunity than any the world has ever known.

"No subject has come before you at this session, nor will any come, that holds within it so vital and far-reaching an influence as this over the daily life of the present and future men, women, and children of Pennsylvania and of the whole United States. For good or evil, for economic freedom or industrial bondage, this change is upon us. What it shall bring depends upon ourselves. Of a truth we are in the valley of decision.

"As Pennsylvania and the Nation deal with electric power so shall we and our descendants be free men, masters of our own destinies and our own souls, or we shall be the helpless servants of the most widespread, far-reaching, and penetrating monopoly ever known. Either we must control electric power, or its masters and owners will control us."

Today control of the electric industry is increasingly concentrated by the great financial houses of New York, by mushrooming interconnections between systems and by joint construction of mammoth generating facilities. The industry's political activity is concentrated, at least in Washington through the National Association of Electric Co's. and its propaganda activities involving millions of dollars of the rate-payers' money each year are directed through the centralized channels of the Electric Companies' Advertising Program (ECAP) and the Public Information Program (PIP), while in a thousand places across the Nation the political and economic pressure of the individual companies is applied to create conformity with their ideas.

I want to close by reading two brief excerpts from this Pinchot statement; he said:

"Nothing like this gigantic monopoly has ever appeared in the history of the world. Nothing has ever been imagined before than 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 time. If uncontrolled, 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.

"As Pennsylvania and the Nation deal with electric power so shall we and our descendants be free men, masters of our own destinies and our own souls, or we shall be the helpless servants of the most widespread, far-reaching, and penetrating monopoly ever known. Either we must control electric power, or its masters and owners will control us."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this year especially we pay tribute to Theodore Roosevelt. I have always admired him as a man, and respected him for his courage as a soldier, and as a public official, who had the energy, the ability, and the imagination to antici-

pate the problems of the future, and to act with intelligence and in a forceful manner to solve those problems for the benefit of the citizens of our great country in a way that benefited them. He looked wisely far ahead. With characteristic candor he offered his answers to important questions before they really became problems, and thus made it possible for those of us who came after him to benefit from his public-spirited foresight.

Others have spoken of his life. I first met him when my father took me to the White House to meet him. He shook my hand with his well known vigor, made me feel at home in his presence, and gave me a stimulus toward public life that I have never forgotten; nor did I forget it in my later meetings with him.

His autobiography and other books written about him have added to my admiration for him. I have known his sons as college mates, and one of his daughters as a friend. We have much to benefit from his life. When we bear in mind the things he stood for we will ourselves act more wisely, more courageously, and more in the best interests of all our citizens.

I am glad to join briefly in this tribute to him in the year which marks the hundredth anniversary of his birth.

THE TWO ROOSEVELTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today we honor the inauguration of two great American Presidents who bore the same name Roosevelt. One was a great Republican, Theodore Roosevelt; the other a great Democrat, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is the 53d anniversary of Teddy Roosevelt's inauguration, the 25th anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's inauguration.

In a sense, despite their different party affiliations, it is proper and fitting that they be honored simultaneously—for many of the same reasons. Temperamentally and ideologically, they were alike.

Both looked forward—not backward.

Both had the capacity to arouse their Nation to its best efforts.

Both were capable of leading their people in days of crisis.

Both were true conservatives in the sense of preserving the Constitutional cornerstones that keep us free, the natural resources that keep us strong, and the economic institutions that keep us prosperous.

Both were true liberals and nontraditionalists—unafraid of the future, unafraid of new ideas and unafraid of criticism.

Both men understood the meaning of the 20th century.

And both were men who knew how to keep their country strong at home and abroad.

In domestic policies, Teddy Roosevelt was the great champion of conservation of our natural resources. It was he who inaugurated our forest-conservation program, our reclamation program, and related public development of water for irrigation. It was he who championed the principle of comprehensive river development. It was he who set aside for future Federal multipurpose development such sites as Hells Canyon.

Franklin Roosevelt carried on where this first great Roosevelt left off. Under F. D. R., the great truths enunciated by Teddy Roosevelt were written into the Federal Power Act. F. D. R.'s dedication to these great truths built Grand Coulee and Bonneville in the West, and TVA in the South. Dedication to these truths reclaimed vast areas of arid land, and saved millions of acres from flooding. The application by F. D. R. of these great truths provided low-cost power which has stimulated the creation of new industry, new jobs and new wealth by private enterprise.

In economic matters, Teddy Roosevelt was a great progressive who believed that both organized labor and business had great contributions to make to our society. He fought trusts and monopoly and greed. He declared that big business must be made more an agent for social good. Some of the economic programs he supported called for prohibition of child labor, minimum wage standards, the 8-hour day, and social insurance. In many ways, he was ahead of his times.

F. D. R. shared Teddy Roosevelt's belief in the dignity of man and the people's ability to lift themselves by their own efforts. He provided the leadership that enabled them to recover from a great depression without impairing their individual liberties or economic freedoms. History will record him as the modern savior of capitalism. Many of his programs today are permanent institutions utilized and praised by those who once were their greatest critics.

In foreign policy, Teddy Roosevelt discerned some permanently useful principles.

Speak softly—

He said—

but carry a big stick.

Franklin Roosevelt lived by this philosophy as he led his Nation through treacherous times.

Teddy Roosevelt followed scientific thought with eager understanding. At Harvard, he won honorable mention in natural sciences. Before the age of science was fully upon us, he demonstrated capacity to understand it.

A generation later, Franklin Roosevelt demonstrated remarkable foresight in the field of science. When the atomic bomb proposal was laid before him, he conceived its implications and met the challenge. Not that he was unmindful of the gamble. For when he agreed to support the top-secret program to the extent of some $2 billion, he is reported to have said: "Either this will be the greatest thing that happened to mankind, or else we will have the darndest Congressional investigation in history if it fails."

Neither Roosevelt was a man of faint heart. Teddy Roosevelt rallied his people in 1902 with these words:

This country has never yet been called upon to meet a crisis in war or a crisis in peace to which it did not eventually prove equal. I believe in the future—not in a spirit which will sit down and look for the future to work itself out, but with a determination to do its part in making the future what it can and shall be made.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said it in a simpler way in his first inauguration speech:

We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Again, F. D. R. warned us:

The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Today, as we honor these two great Americans, let the result be renewed faith in our future, renewed determination to surmount mighty obstacles, and renewed courage to face the unknown.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, THE BUILDER

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, 53 years ago, on March 4, 1905, Theodore Roosevelt, known affectionately as "Teddy," was inaugurated President of the United States in his own right. He had first become President, the youngest man ever to assume that high office, when he was not yet 43 years of age, upon the death of President McKinley.

Theodore Roosevelt was a builder. He built up his own weak physique until he became known as one of the most physically strenuous of all our Presidents. We of North Dakota like to think that his robust health was a result of the years he spent as a cattle rancher in the Dakota badlands. In fact, he once said:

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

In recent years, his ranch house has been moved from Elkhorn Ranch to the Capitol grounds in Bismarck, N. Dak.

He was a builder in his philosophy of government. He himself as an individualist with great willpower and determination. He inspired the American people with the same zeal for individual aspirations and for the expansion of the Nation, always with the rights of the individual paramount.

He is symbolized in the minds of all Americans as "Teddy, the trust buster," and by his motto in foreign affairs, "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

President Theodore Roosevelt started his public career in the New York State Assembly. His next bid for public office was when he was a candidate for election to be mayor of New York City. In this he failed. Later he was a member of the United States Civil Service Commission. That tour of duty alerted him to the problems of Federal employees, and the experience proved valuable when he became President.

When he returned to New York City as president of the New York Police Board, one of his first acts was to give wholehearted support to the merit system. In that he was activated, no doubt, by his experience as a member of the Civil Service Commission.

Theodore Roosevelt's next public service came when he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy, under President McKinley. Here, again, he demonstrated his capacity for building. It was during that time that he instituted

Naval target practice, and gave to Commodore George Dewey his famous instruction to capture Manila in the event of war with Spain.

His most famous activity during the Spanish-American War was the organization of the United States Volunteer Cavalry, familiarly known as the Rough Riders. A great many of the volunteers in the Rough Riders were cowboys from the Dakotas and other Western States. He, himself, led the famous charge up Kettle Hill, at San Juan; and for his valor he achieved the rank of colonel.

Back in New York State, Theodore Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York. At once he showed himself to be a reformer and one who believed in self-reliant individualism. As Governor, he fought the spoils system, and achieved taxation of corporation franchises—a prelude to his trustbusting activities on the national scene.

In his first message to Congress, when he became President, Theodore Roosevelt urged control of huge concentrations of capital, but in such a way as not to interfere with the unbounded prosperity of of the Nation. At his insistence, court proceedings were brought under the Sherman Antitrust Act, and many holding corporations were dissolved.

It was largely due to the farsighted efforts of Theodore Roosevelt that construction of the Panama Canal was begun. He fostered the building up of the merchant marine. His Square Deal and political acumen improved the position of the United States, both domestically and in foreign relations.

Measures for the welfare and improvement of the American people which were enacted under the Theodore Roosevelt administration include such important ones as the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, and the Meat Inspection Act of 1907, both important to the health of our citizens.

Also enacted under President Theodore Roosevelt were several laws improving the conditions of labor, such as the first limitation-of-hours legislation for rail carriers—1907—a Railroad Employee Compensation Act—1908—and a Compensation Act for Government employees.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt was the first, the foremost, and, by far, the most powerful advocator of Federal programs dealing with soil and water conservation. Undoubtedly, his years of outdoor life gave him a keener insight into this great need than that of any other President of the United States. Largely because of his long years of tireless work and great enthusiasm for these programs, Congress, while he was President, passed the first basic Reclamation Act in 1902. This law to this day is the basis of all our reclamation laws.

In foreign affairs, he followed his policy of speaking softly, but carrying the big stick of adequate defense. He discouraged the aggressive German attitude toward Venezuela, and made an impressive display of American strength by sending the fleet around the world. He successfully intervened to bring about a settlement of the Russo-Japanese war. World War I found him ready again to go into battle for what he deemed a worthy cause. In fact, he tried to organize a division, but met with the disapproval of President Wilson.

Always the builder and the explorer, Theodore Roosevelt opened new worlds to many people. These roads led to freedom from exploitation of the weak by the powerful. To new vistas of our West and the reclamation of lands for the people's use, and to the protection of the workingman. These roads led, too, to the exploration of the River of Doubt, in Brazil—a river now known as Rio Roosevelt. His exploration there resulted in opening up new territories.

On this 53d anniversary date of his inauguration, it is fitting for the American people to pay tribute to President Theodore Roosevelt, the man, the leader, the builder, the true American, whose thoughts and deeds were always of the individual and the people of this great Nation. North Dakota is particularly proud to join in this tribute.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, rise today to pay tribute to two great Americans who bore the name of Roosevelt.

It was 53 years ago today that Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated for his first full term as President; and it was just a quarter of a century ago that, for the first time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office as President.

These two Presidents had much more in common than the magic name they shared.

Both knew physical handicaps heavy enough to stop most men, and both fought through to a triumph of spirit over flesh.

Both loved life, with a buoyant vitality that communicated itself to lesser men, making their lives, too, more exciting and their dreams more audacious.

Both came to the Nation's highest office in an hour of national peril—not the peril of the foreign foe, against whom patriots unite without hesitation, relieved that the die is cast; but the peril within, of failure and self-doubt, that paralyze the will.

When Theodore Roosevelt came to the White House, public confidence in the Government was low. A half century of exploitation of the resources of the country by men who did not hesitate to corrupt the Government to gain their own ends had made men doubt that the great Government of the United States really belonged to the people. The workers, the farmers, and the small-business men believed, with good reason, that they had been barred from opportunity to share equally in the bountiful life they had made on the new continent.

Theodore Roosevelt changed all that. He purified and revivified the Government, and restored men's confidence that the Government could be a powerful tool for the people's ends. He began the slow, but vital, process of conserving and replenishing the Nation's great store of natural resources. As much as any man, he understood that the Presidency is a place of moral leadership—as he put it, a bully pulpit. Thus he set the tone of public and private life.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt came to the White House, many men doubted that the American experiment in free government and free enterprise could survive. Sixteen million men stalked the drab streets of a country brought to its knees by depression. With productive capacity beyond that achieved by any other people in history, the American people could not feed, clothe, or house one-third of their number beyond the bare level of subsistence.

The clear, confident voice of Franklin Roosevelt rang through the land that blustery March day. What man who heard them will ever forget the words: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself"? From that moment, confidence began to flow through the Nation, like the blood of life. Franklin Roosevelt preserved the free-enterprise system, and once more put government to work for all the people.

Today, we commemorate the two great men who bore the name of Roosevelt, and in so doing we pay tribute to the best that is in us all.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT POINTED THE WAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as a Senator from a State which has benefited immeasurably from the farsighted policies advocated and put into operation by Theodore Roosevelt, it is appropriate for me to join in the observance of the 53d anniversary of his inauguration as President of the United States. I wish to point how continuing are the progressive programs which he instituted while he was Chief Executive of our Nation.

There is an extraordinary relationship between Theodore Roosevelt and California. Even today, the population of our State includes a number of enthusiastic Bull-Moosers whom I respect deeply, some of whom I am fortunate to call my friends. A substantial number of my colleagues with much longer service in this body than mine, recall fondly, I am sure, one of the illustrious predecessors of the present Senators from California who in 1912 was a founder of the Progressive Party of Theodore Roosevelt, and who was the great Teddy's running-mate as candidate for the Vice Presidency in that year—the late, great Hiram W. Johnson, who for many of the last years of his life sat in the front row in this Chamber.

In 1912, Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram W. Johnson led a nationwide political crusade. In the Republican National Convention that year, charges of fraud underscored the fermenting cleavages among leaders and the rank and file of my party. Accusations that they were bought and paid for were hurled against some convention delegates. Bitter fights took place between rival delegations from several States. Thus was born the Progressive Party. "We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord," said T. R. And across the country, men of stature and of prominence rallied to the Bull Moose banner which, years later, Hiram Johnson referred to as "the most glorious political experiment" of our country. That year, the normal Republican strength in America divided between the Republican ticket and the Progressive ticket; and the Democratic Party prevailed. With the passing of time, most of the Progressives came back into the Republican fold.

Teddy Roosevelt preached and practiced an unerring conviction that a political party must ever be responsive to the needs of the people and that only when it discharges honorably its obligation to serve the people will it merit, and receive, the people's faith. The same basic philosophy must continue to be our Republican creed.

Perhaps the westward course of our population, the urge for new frontiers, and the demand for living space, would have brought California ultimately and inevitably to the outstanding position it now occupies. But I am certain that our growth would have been slower and our present bounty probably not so great had not this man of vision and action served our Nation and had the opportunity to institute various reforms and initiate forward-looking measures which have played a great part in our development.

Others will recall Teddy Roosevelt's service to the Nation in a variety of roles. I need not remark at length on the way he fought corruption in politics, fostered the merit system in civil service, sponsored food and drug regulation, attacked monopolies and arrogant aggregations of wealth which were undermining the public welfare, and won the Nobel peace prize.

As a native Californian, as a descendant of pioneers who joined the westward migration over a century ago, I am thankful that Theodore Roosevelt laid the foundation for our system of reclamation and irrigation and power, that he brought into being the national forests and national monuments which are a priceless resource, and that he turned back land thieves and plunderers of our natural resources.

California is an imposing example of what the preservation and carefully planned utilization of natural resources can mean to subsequent generations. The thriving and diversified agriculture of our State never would have reached its present vigor without water from irrigation and reclamation projects constructed under the formula established by the law Theodore Roosevelt fathered. Our State today has more than one-tenth of the Federally-owned real estate in the United States which is devoted to forests and wildlife. In California, 19,142,000 acres are held for recreational uses, watershed protection, bird and game refuges, and as a foundation for our significant lumbering and mining industries.

Theodore Roosevelt thoroughly appreciated the worth and importance of California's rugged and unique terrain and tremendous natural resources.

Reclamation projects benefiting California were among the earliest set in motion under Theodore Roosevelt's sponsorship. The first of these were interstate developments, thus showing how orderly regional planning can advance the welfare of America. The Klamath project, serving homesteaders and settlers in both California and Oregon, was a direct result of his Reclamation Act, authorized as it was by Roosevelt's Secretary of the Interior in 1905. It was followed by the Orland project, authorized 2 years later. Another bi-State undertaking, the Yuma project, opening the door for development of the lower Colorado in both Arizona and California, was found feasible during the Roosevelt Administration, and the first money toward its construction was allocated in 1904.

These works were forerunners of such vast and vital engineering feats as Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal, and the Central Valley project, along with many others less spectacular but equally beneficial, constructed under the Roosevelt-sponsored Reclamation Act. We in California today are carrying on the precedents and practices which he established for the Nation through such development as the Trinity Division of the Central Valley project, currently under construction in accordance with the law which Congress passed 3 years ago.

Theodore Roosevelt, who inspired explosive growth in forestry affairs, moulded policies which benefited California through protection of our timber and watersheds. Following his reorganization of Federal agencies into the Forest Service in 1905, a speedy presidential proclamation created Plumas National Forest in California, to be followed by many more stretching the length of our State.

California also attracted his attention when our Government undertook to preserve for subsequent generations areas of purely scenic beauty and unusual geographical and geophysical attributes. Passage of the National Monuments Act in 1908 set aside Muir Woods and Pinnacles National Monuments in California.

In many ways, California's very prosperity and economic health are founded on national policies all identified with Theodore Roosevelt, the father of reclamation, the ardent advocate of conservation. By these ceremonies today, we demonstrate anew that along with all America, California believes in and adheres to his philosophy. We will continue his battle to achieve his goals of meeting and serving the needs of all the people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON THE 53D ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

This year the entire Nation will observe the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. Today, however, we commemorate in conjunction with this centennial observance the 53d anniversary of his inauguration as President of the United States.

Since few men have served the high office of the Presidency with more energy, decision, foresight, devotion, and honesty than Theodore Roosevelt, it is fitting that we pause on this day to pay our respect to this outstanding American.

Some have said that Theodore Roosevelt represented an era. Mr. President, I believe that this is gross understatement. He did much more than represent an era, he created one. Few men in the history of our great Nation had more vision, imagination, and insight than Theodore Roosevelt. At a moment when the entire world and even many Americans underestimated the potential role which the United States was to play in the affairs of the world, Theodore Roosevelt peered into the future, recognized the many great challenges which would confront this Nation in a shrinking world and one increasingly enmeshed in the web of power politics, and set into motion the pattern of domestic and international policy which was to prepare America for the great role it was to play. As he himself said: "Our Nation is that one among all the nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years. We enjoy exceptional advantages, and are menaced by exceptional dangers; and all signs indicate that we shall either fail greatly or succeed greatly. * * * Here is the task, and I have got to do it."

History bears witness to the fact that Theodore Roosevelt did indeed accomplish the task.

At home and abroad he labored to achieve a necessary goal: to establish the power and responsibility of the United States Government for the preservation of democracy. On the domestic front he brought the full weight of the Government to bear upon both the robber barons and the extreme labor agitators both of whose activities were akin to anarchy. In both cases the United States Government became the supreme protector of the just rights of all. Although Theodore Roosevelt was the first American President to undertake successfully an antitrust suit, and although he was the first President to mediate between management and labor, he nonetheless insisted that extreme positions by either management or labor could not be tolerated. As he once said: "I wish the labor people absolutely to understand that I set my face like flint against violence and lawlessness of any kind on their part, just as much as against arrogant greed by the rich." With this philosophy, Theodore Roosevelt undertook to preserve the democratic rights of all Americans and made the United States Government an effective instrument of this policy.

On the international scene Theodore Roosevelt set out to promote United States self-interest in world peace and world order, and as his term of office ended, America had emerged to a position of world leadership, had concretely demonstrated its intent to protect its interests against all predatory powers, and had embarked upon a role which it has played ever since in the realm of international relations: the preservation of liberty by peaceful means if possible, by force if necessary.

Through his efforts the Monroe Doctrine, cornerstone of American foreign policy, was implemented, and European powers were deterred from encroaching in Latin and South America and the Caribbean. As a result of his action the way was cleared for the construction of an American canal to connect two of the world's great oceans and to make possible the adequate protection of both our seacoasts by the power of an improved United States Navy. As a result of his intervention a war between Russia and Japan was concluded, and America directly shook off its mantle of strict neutrality and entered the international scene with prestige as its position demanded. And, of course, little need be said of the Great White Fleet which officially inaugurated the United States as a significant member of the community of nations and which gained for America the respect and recognition it highly deserved.

Yes, Theodore Roosevelt did not represent an era, he created one. He contributed enlightened and decisive leadership at a time when America most needed it, at a moment when our Nation was on the threshold of change from adolescence to maturity. His

leadership set the pattern which America was to follow and which was to prepare her for the greatest of all challenges: leadership of the entire Free World. We may well constantly remind ourselves of his qualities as a leader in these days of tension. We may well learn from his example as we attempt to meet the complex challenges of our times. His courage, his vision, his honesty, his resoluteness and self-command, and his fearless and energetic devotion to duty make up a most invaluable legacy left to us by Theodore Roosevelt. This great American, 53 years after he took office, remains in our day as he was in his own day, a great inspiration to all freedom-loving people.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think it is a singularly welcome coincidence that the Senate today commemorates milestones in the lives of two great American Presidents. These are the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, and the 32d President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There is not time now to eulogize these men in detailed connection with their many achievements. However, I believe there is a very striking and fortunate parallel between their careers, particularly in the realm of conservation of our natural resources.

Theodore Roosevelt was the first great conservationist to lead the Government of the United States. I believe that long after every single person presently a Member of the Senate is gone, Americans will revere Teddy Roosevelt because he set aside the great wildernesses and upland reserves which we know as national forests.

I feel particularly conscious of this achievement because my own State of Oregon contains national forests of greatest value anywhere in the Nation. Neighboring States, such as Idaho, Montana, and Washington, also contain great national forests, from which our people get lumber, where farmers have grazing meadows, where there is mining activity and watershed protection, and where much wildlife, birds, and fisheries in the Western United States have protection.

Several years ago I wrote a brochure for the Public Affairs Committee entitled "Our Natural Resources—and Their Conservation." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point that brief portion of the pamphlet which refers to the heroic effort of Theodore Roosevelt and his great forester, Gifford Pinchot, to set aside upland reserves, which today all Americans know as national forests, and which 40 million or 50 million Americans visit each year in order to have recreation and get inspiration in the great American outdoors.

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

THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT BEGINS

The destruction of these two living things—one a frail bird, the other a 1,000-pound beast—dramatized to Americans the wasting of their resources far more vividly than could be the despoiling of such inanimate objects as trees and sod.

In this atmosphere, the conservation movement was born. The American Bison Society had been formed to save and rebuild the scattered remnants of that species. The first great national park (Yellowstone) was set aside as early as 1872, although the National Park Service itself was not created until 1916. The power of the President of the United States to set aside public domains as forest reserves dates back to 1891.

Many elements united to make conservation a reality in the United States. The gifted naturalist, John Muir, had been trying to educate people to the protection of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and of the Yosemite's plumed waterfalls before it was too late. E. H. Harriman, the railroad magnate, had given financial backing to some of Muir's ideas. Gifford Pinchot, a graduate of Yale, had become America's first professional forester. He was arguing that forestry could not be separated from soil erosion and flood control, because a permanent cover of trees was the most effective way to retard waters coursing off the mountains. This thesis seems commonplace today, but, at the start of Pinchot's career, it was highly controversial.

Such men as Pinchot found their leader in Theodore Roosevelt, 26th President of the United States. The President was fascinated by the outdoors. He had hunted and tramped through the States of the West, and for a time he had been a cattle rancher. He listened carefully when Pinchot told him that the continued survival of America's wildlife, forests, and rivers involved one central problem—conservation. Otherwise, Pinchot warned, the United States might find itself short of raw materials and supplies at an earlier stage in its history than any other great nation.

SETTING ASIDE OUR VAST NATIONAL FOREST RESERVES

President Roosevelt sponsored the White House conference of 1907, which resulted in the establishment of departments of conservation within many State administrations. More important, the President put his prestige and popularity behind Pinchot's recommendation that most of the remaining forested uplands belonging to the United States Government be reserved for all time. Under Federal supervision, they then might be developed for what Pinchot called multiple use. He emphasized such uses as grazing of domestic cattle and sheep, selective lumbering, watershed control, preservation of wildlife, and wilderness recreation like fishing, camping, and hiking. If the forests were managed properly, they might provide all these benefits and still endure permanently. Logging operations, for example, would be patrolled by forest rangers. Only mature trees could be cut, and the total volume of lumber felled would have to be kept approximately in balance with the new growth.

Today, we know these vast reserves as national forests. They cover a total of 161 million acres in continental United States. This is larger than all of France and nearly equal in size to the State of Texas. When we consider that only 1 acre is about the extent of a standard football field, we get some idea of the dimensions of the national forests. There are 150 separate national forests. Although 84 percent of the country's national-forest acreage lies within the States of the Far West, these reserves dot the Nation from coast to coast. Some are in the beautiful White Mountains of New Hampshire, some in the southern Appalachians, while others guard the distant shorelines of California and Oregon with great timbered capes and headlands.

Because of the fame of Old Faithful Geyser, of Mount Rainier, more Americans probably are aware of national parks than of national forests. National parks, moreover, are exclusively dedicated to recreation and travel, whereas the forests also can be devoted to reservoirs, mines, logging camps, and even sawmills—so long as these functions do not impair what Pinchot described as the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run. But because they blanket at least a dozen times as much land as the national parks, the forests undoubtedly are more significant to conservation generally. People in such busy western cities as Denver, Portland, and Seattle, for example, depend upon national forest watersheds for a pure and ample drinking supply. In addition, the establishment of the national forests provoked one of the bitterest controversies of American political history. Many timber operators regarded these public reserves as a peril to employment and free enterprise. They wanted the western solitudes left wide open to ax and saw. Western politicians were induced to denounce Theodore Roosevelt and Pinchot as reckless theorists, who were catering to bird watchers and dreamers and poets.

WHEN THE COLORFUL RANGER GOT HIS START

Of equal importance with the creation of the national forests was the fact that the United States Forest Service was established in the Department of Agriculture to administer the reserves. Thus came into existence the organization which undoubtedly has occupied a larger role than any other Government agency in the conservation and prudent use of the resources of the United States. For almost half a century the United States forest ranger in his green shirt and broad-brimmed hat has been a symbol of stamping out fires, of patrolling grassy uplands against erosion, and of reseeding groves which have been clear cut.

The original instructions sent by President Roosevelt's Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, to the first Chief of the Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, set the tone for the organization's future responsibilities:

"In the administration of the forest reserves it must be clearly borne in mind that all the land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies. All the resources of the forest reserves are for use, and this use must be brought about in a thoroughly prompt and businesslike manner, under such restrictions only as will insure the permanence of these resources. * * * The continued prosperity of the agricultural, lumbering, mining, and livestock interests is directly dependent upon a permanent and accessible supply of water, wood, and forage."

Out of this beginning have come not only Government efforts in the realm of conservation but also many of the national citizens' organizations concerned with the problem. The Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Audubon Societies, the Roadside Councils—these are a few of the groups which try to mobilize Americans to prevent raids on the resources still remaining in public custody.

Practically everybody has followed some of the controversies in this field. Conservationists protested the plan of commercial lumber operators to open up 225,000 acres of the famous rain forest in the Olympic National Park to logging. They fought off the proposal that a reservoir flood out some of the most picturesque gorges of the Dinosaur National Monument. They demanded that the Three Sisters wilderness area be kept to its present boundaries—and not reduced for tree-cutting purposes. They tried hard, but in vain, to prevent the Defense Department from taking over part of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge for an artillery range. They opposed suggestions that hunting rules be relaxed to permit longer hours of shooting at dusk, when wildfowl are settling on their ponds and marshes. They have criticized plans to blockade with dams some of the waters of our loveliest national parks.

A number of these controversies have reached the floor of Congress and made spectacular headlines. In 1954, a bill was introduced to allow large lumber companies to

exchange some of their own land, under certain conditions, for choice acreage inside the national forests. Virtually all conservation organizations were against the bill, which was defeated in the House of Representatives after a tense debate by a vote of 226 to 161. That same year a bill to grant increased national-forest grazing privileges to private stockmen was tabled in the House after adoption by the Senate. In this instance, too, emphatic opposition by conservation groups was undoubtedly the decisive factor. They insisted that 18,000 ranchers did not deserve rights superior to those of millions of recreationists.

SOME OF OUR ORIGINAL PUBLIC DOMAIN SURVIVES

The original domain which belonged to our Government as a result of exploration and conquest and treaties, is now only a fraction of what it once was. Yet, it still comprises an impressive and far-reaching realm. This is how it is divided:

	Acres
National parks and monuments	14,000,000
National forests	161,000,000
Public-domain grazing districts	[1] 160,000,000
Indian reservations	56,000,000
National defense areas	14,000,000
Wildlife refuges	10,000,000
Total	415,000,000

[1] Includes Federal timberlands which have reverted to the Government through violation of railroad land-grant terms.

As our demands become greater and more complex, debate continually centers upon the future of these lands and the resources which they harbor. Such pressures are intense in a nation that is producing more goods, for defense as well as for normal peacetime uses, than any other country in the world. President Franklin D. Roosevelt called America the arsenal of democracy, and his description still holds true.

I recall camping in a mountain meadow in the rugged Wallowa Range of Oregon with a lean forest ranger named Grady Miller. Lodge-pole pines dotted the thick grass. Granite peaks loomed like fangs overhead. We washed our tin plates and cups at a creek where migratory salmon once had spawned—from the distant mouth of the Columbia River, 750 miles away. The fish runs long since were gone, blocked off by pollution and unscreened irrigation ditches in the valleys far below. With pensive eyes, the ranger looked down the foaming staircase of the creek toward salt water.

"Civilization and fish don't mix," said he.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Theodore Roosevelt also said, in a message to Congress on February 26, 1908, and these words should be important to every American who cherishes our water resources:

Every stream should be used to its utmost. No stream can be so used unless such use is planned in advance. When such plans are made, we shall find that, instead of interfering, one use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.

That doctrine which Theodore Roosevelt set out was carried to fruition by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he became President of the United States, in such great projects as Grand Coulee, the Tennessee Valley, Bonneville, and many other huge undertakings on the mighty rivers of this country. Those rivers were put to work for all the people. All the resources of each of the rivers were considered as a unit. Thus waterpower, reclamation, flood control, fisheries propagation, and all other use possibilities of those surging waterways were utilized for all the people.

As I have emphasized, while it is significant that Theodore Roosevelt set aside the national forests, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President he created the Civilian Conservation Corps, which took young men who were in despair because of unemployment off the streets of great cities and put them to work in the forest areas, building footpaths, campgrounds, lean-to's, and other facilities. Thus, while Theodore Roosevelt set aside and saved the national forests, it was during the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that those forests were made to serve the fullest utilization by all the people.

There is one other characteristic or trait of these two great leaders which they had in common. Both had reserves of strength of character to overcome grave physical handicaps. As the minority leader emphasized earlier, Theodore Roosevelt was a sickly young man, but he went into the Dakotas and elsewhere in the magnificent American outdoors and regained his health, to rise to political leadership in this country.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in 1922, when then nearing 40 years old, was overcome by polio. He could not walk. He could not rise from his chair. He could not move across the room. Mrs. Neuberger and I recently saw the moving play Sunrise at Campobello, which emphasizes those 2 years in his career, when he conquered the effects of polio and returned to prominence again, to some extent in 1924, in the Nation.

I wonder how many Americans, during the time when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was leading us against the great depression and later against the forces of international gangsterism, thought of the fact that this great leader, the only one to have been elected President of the United States four times, was not able to rise from his White House desk without crutches, braces, or being assisted by his family or staff?

It seems to me that commemoration is not only a monument to Franklin D. Roosevelt, but it is a monument to the character and depth of understanding of the Nation which elevated him to leadership.

Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from American Forests magazine of February 1958, which highlights some of the further achievements of President Theodore Roosevelt in the field of conservation.

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

FIFTY YEARS OF CONSERVATION

Historians who attempt to downgrade former President Theodore Roosevelt to the ranks of the near-great got short shift from Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress, in the first of a series of six lectures sponsored by Resources for the Future on Natural Resources Conservation in the United States—History and Prospects. Topic of the first in the series at Washington's Cosmos Club last month was "Fifty Years of Conservation Thought and Action" and Mr. Griffith was the principal speaker.

"The age found the man," Dr. Griffith said in speaking of the first Roosevelt era. "It is currently fashionable in academic circles to belittle the achievements of Theodore Roosevelt. Most historians would now downgrade him to the ranks of the mere near-great. No longer does the monument of Mount Rushmore with its Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt represent even the popular verdict, not to mention the considered judgment of our scholarly elite. The glamor of the other, later, Roosevelt, with his hospitality to ideas and eggheads, the world stage on which he played his part; the scholarly leadership of Woodrow Wilson; the political drama of Andrew Jackson, even the achievements of a Polk are preferred. Yet, there are values and a type of greatness which a scholarly icicle can never know; there is a type of leadership which a detached positivist can altogether miss. The greatness of Theodore Roosevelt lay, not in a list of specific administrative acts, or a catalog of laws enacted under his sponsorship, substantial though both of these were. His greatness was a kind of sursum corda (lift up your hearts), the activizing of a nation's conscience, the dramatizing of a nation's unfinished business, the energizing of much of the moral public leadership of his day—and of the next 50 years—by the impact of his personality. Harold Ickes, Henry Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, yes, even Franklin Roosevelt, have given generous credit to this dynamic of their formative years. In no field was this more true than of conservation."

An approving Cosmos Club audience that included many of the leading conservationists in America heard Dr. Griffith develop his thesis that the energizing force of T. R. aided by the necessary expertise of Gifford Pinchot, impressed on the public conscience once and for all the values in land, water, forest "never again to be lost." Thus conservation, that was given another tremendous booster shot years later by a second Roosevelt, has flowered and matured despite a persistent pluralism—geographic and economic—that has blocked many efforts at a more national and integrated approach to the subject. At the same time, it is this geographic pluralism that "has been the lifeblood of multiple-purpose river basin development—though often tying such development into knots of internal contradiction. Both types of pluralism have found "expression in institutional counterparts, in Federal bureaus with special interest clienteles, in regional authorities and administrations in Congressional committees.

"Most of the abortive moves to transfer certain resource functions to the States have been largely inspired by local economic interests," Dr. Griffith said, "though usually defended on constitutional grounds. Localism for many years blurred the effectiveness of national administration, as the populace and their representatives in Congress rallied to the support of those whose habitual way of making a living regardless was threatened by administered conservatism. National planning has made headway, but at least in part as it has forced divergent local interests to face their problems together. Finally there has been the dilemma of the spiritual versus the material, perhaps never more plainly articulated than by Theodore Roosevelt, but expressing itself more intensely today as the shortcomings of urbanism become increasingly apparent."

While there are many interwoven strands in the conservation pattern, Dr. Griffith believes that the national movement has gradually flowered and today finds us "a more mature people" with our "hierarchy of values rearranged somewhat, and for the better." To unite science and conscience would seem

to present the chief challenge to the movement in the years ahead, he concluded.

Did other participants on the program agree that 1958 finds conservation matured as compared to 1908 (the governors' conference)? Two of three other speakers agreed in general that this is true. Dr. Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan, agreed that today "planning" is no longer a dirty word. However, one aspect of conservation which deserves more emphasis than it commonly receives is "thrift in consumption," Dean Dana said. We are still an exceedingly wasteful nation, he said, citing that "the greatest drain on natural resources comes not so much from the increase in population as from the constantly rising standard of living. During the last 50 years, our consumption of nearly every product of the land has been greater than during all the previous years in our history. No one regrets that what was a luxury for the father has become a necessity for the son; but does that necessity require a prodigality in use that leads to unnecessary waste? Could we not live comfortably without consigning so much material to the trash burner and the dump heap? Growing 2 trees where 1 grew before is no more effective in meeting our needs than is making 1 tree do the work of 2. Science is helping greatly in this direction by developing new uses, new materials, and new processes which permit the more economical use of natural resources, but personal restraint in limiting our consumption to our real needs would constitute an important contribution to the same end, perhaps with desirable moral as well as physical results."

While "planning" may no longer be a dirty word, on the other hand, an appraisal of relative values and the allocation of uses to specific pieces of land is becoming more difficult, Dean Dana said. We are still a conspicuously wasteful people, he again stressed, although today "our prodigality is more evident in the consumption of finished products than in the harvesting of raw materials. The apparently never-ending increase in population and in standards of living raises new problems and intensifies old ones. These can be solved only by research on an ever-widening scale and by prompt and widespread application of the results. Whether progress in the next 50 years will be more substantial than in the last 50 depends on our ability, in Dr. Griffith's happy phrase, to unite 'science and conscience.' "

A third speaker, Henry C. Hart, assistant professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, said as the world and America have filled up with people, resources have tended to lose their fixed limits both as to place and subject but the need to consider their interrelationship has increased. TVA is no lonely experiment as some would choose to regard it, Professor Hart reminded his audience. India has copied it directly and the same is true elsewhere—an indication that there was more to the American conservation tradition than husbanding the resources of our homeland.

Professor Hart indicated that he for one was not too greatly concerned over the fact that conservation has enjoyed comparatively little direct Presidential leadership. The reason for this is the fact that conservation no longer expresses a self-justifying purpose because resources have become means to ends as diverse as growing proteins. Theodore Roosevelt's conservation crusade stood concerted and largely independent; Franklin Roosevelt's conservation programs were means to recovery and victory as well as to restoring a natural harmony, he pointed out.

"It is not necessarily a backward step that the Council of Economic Advisers and the National Security Resources Board replaced the National Resources Planning Board," Professor Hart said. "More and more we have been conserving for something that seems more nearly ultimate."

Conservationists of today, Professor Hart stressed, should regard themselves not so much as crusaders as researchers and teachers in dozens of new and exacting sciences which present entirely too broad a panorama for any one man to completely comprehend. Twenty years ago there was a proposal for a Department of Conservation. Now we aim at staffing the President and the Congress better to see the connections among the necessarily separate programs. There is no Armageddon, but a lot of brush fires on pollution, power, flood control, wilderness areas, military versus economic uses of the atomic nucleus.

A fourth speaker, Prof. Samuel P. Hays, assistant professor of history, University of Iowa, had reservations as to whether conservation has matured—at least along the lines laid down by such leaders as Roosevelt, W. J. McGee, and others. These men were "intensely optimistic * * * in their abundant faith in technology as the key to human progress," he stressed, and while it persisted in the 1930's under the leadership of such men as Morris L. Cooke and David E. Lilienthal, it has now been supplanted by the Malthusian pessimism of Vogt's Road to Survival and Osborn's Our Plundered Planet. These later day prophets stress the enormous problem of population growth and the world's limited food supply. Technology is not enough; the pressure of population itself must be reduced, they contend.

"The conservation movement, then has not progressed in one direction from beginnings to maturity," Professor Hays said. "Instead, it has radically altered its course. It has shifted from an open, optimistic hopeful movement to a more rigid, pessimistic one, deeply affected by a fear for human survival."

Whether this is indeed maturation is open to debate, he believes. Professor Hays also challenged what he called the "mythology of conservation" which he claims has often clothed conservation in spurious garb that has thoroughly garbled needed programs of planned development and exploitation, in which Teddy Roosevelt believed, and presented them as greedy grabs for land. As a result, an observer can choose between the values in many such cases only with the greatest of difficulty, Mr. Hays said, and to "simplify the choice by invoking the mythology of the moral battle between public and private interest is to distort the issue.

"No such juggling of symbols can obliterate the fundamental conflict between preservation and development as perennial and competing public values," he said in pointing to one prominent irrigation leader who complained during the fight over the dam in Dinosaur Monument that "we are conservationists too."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 1 year ago today the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, devoted an hour or so of their proceedings to the occasion of the 168th anniversary of the meeting of the First Congress. At that time there were delivered lauditory speeches about Alexander Hamilton, since such commemorative addresses were a part of the program of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

I think it is very fitting today, on the 169th anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and the 53d anniversary of the Presidential inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt, that we are having a series of speeches reflecting upon his life and his achievements.

Mr. President, as one of the two members of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission representing the United States Senate, I should like to take this opportunity to address a few comments with regard to, and in support of, the joint resolution which was introduced earlier today by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], on behalf of himself, my worthy colleague on the Commission, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself.

It is, indeed, fitting and proper that this joint resolution, calling for a rededication of the American people to the responsibilities of free citizenship, should be introduced on this, the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's Presidential inauguration and the 169th anniversary of the first meeting of the United States Congress. For it is in no way a rhetorical extravagance to state that there have been few men, if any, in our great American history who were more resolutely dedicated to the responsibilities of free citizenship than was Theodore Roosevelt. T. R.'s determined belief in free citizenship and its attendant responsibilities was vividly displayed by his courageous action with the immortal Rough Riders in Cuba. T. R. left the comfort and prestige of his position as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy to assume the deputy command of the hardy Rough Riders, who so gallantly aided the Cuban patriots in overthrowing the oppressing and autocratic rule of the Spanish Empire.

The Cuban episode is only one of many exploits which clearly exhibited Roosevelt's unshakable belief in the essential superiority of free government. He was acutely conscious of the toil, hardship, and struggle which had preceded the institution of our American democracy, and he further recognized the continuing efforts and sacrifices which are necessary to insure its preservation.

Fifty-three years have now elapsed since Theodore Roosevelt's Presidential inauguration, and in this half-century period the United States has made outstanding gains as a nation. Our progress in the areas of science, technology, and industrial productivity have provided us with the highest standard of living in the history of the world. The United States has, in the past 50 years, emerged as the recognized leader of the free world nations. Unfortunately, our spiritual and social advancement has not kept pace with our material achievements. We have, on occasion, been blinded by the brilliance of our own technological accomplishments, thereby losing sight of the essential greatness of this Nation. This country's true greatness lies in the fact that it is a Nation governed by laws and not by men; and the laws by which we are governed are the product of the free and thoughtful expressions of the free men whom they govern.

With the formation of the United States from the Original Thirteen Colonies, the world witnessed the beginning of the greatest social experiment ever known to man—a Nation firmly dedicated to the proposition that men could

live together and prosper together as a nation under God, free from the oppressive dictates and uncontrolled authority of an autocrat. There can be little doubt that at this stage the experiment has been a magnificent success. This success has been no mere happenstance, or occurrence of good fortune. Our achievements to date have resulted from the dogged determination and untiring efforts of men like Theodore Roosevelt who are resolutely dedicated to the rightness of free citizenship.

Our belief in the capacity of man under God to govern himself is being seriously challenged by an alien philosophy that would have all men become subservient to the wishes and desires of a selfish few. We are truly in a struggle for survival. The fate of this Nation, indeed, the fate of the entire free world, rests with us. It is almost totally dependent upon the stature of free citizenship in the United States. Theodore Roosevelt, while President of the United States, prophetically announced, "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent."

American patriotism has, in some quarters, been looked upon as passé. It has, I feel, too often been confused with chauvinism. To me, American patriotism includes a firm belief in the dignity of the individual, an unfaltering confidence in the capacity of free men to govern themselves, combined with a resolute faith in the future of our great Nation. If this type of thought and sentiment is to be looked upon as passé, I fear, then, that it is inevitable that our very way of life will soon become passé. So great is the challenge to our way of life that if freedom and liberty are to be preserved, it is not enough that we have a handful of dedicated men, we must have an entire Nation of dedicated men.

This, Mr. President, is the purpose of the Presidential message proclaiming July 4, 1958, as a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship. It will set the stage for a nationwide festival of freedom—a day when each of us may engage in a serious self-appraisal to determine if we are shouldering our fair share of the burdens and obligations attendant upon free citizenship. I urge, therefore, that the 85th Congress give early and favorable consideration to the joint resolution which has been introduced by the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for himself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and me.

The Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Committee in my own State of South Dakota under the able leadership of Kenneth Kellar of Lead, S. Dak., is already making elaborate plans for a great patriotic observance to be held at the Shrine of Democracy, Mount Rushmore, on the Fourth of July this year. With the carved heads of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt serving as a remindful backdrop, I feel certain that this will be a most moving and inspirational assemblage.

The cooperation of the centennial committees in both North and South Dakota has been magnificient. It is no surprise that they have joined so readily and enthusiastically in the Theodore Roosevelt centennial observance, for T. R. was a man greatly revered by the people of Dakota. In 1884, following the death of his beloved wife, Alice, T. R. came West to seek solace in the rugged vastness of the North Dakota Territory. His individualistic spirit soon won for him the respect and admiration of the pioneer stock who had settled the Dakota Territory. He was our friend, a kindred spirit, and his memory will long serve as an inspiration to the people of Dakota. He has been correctly called by many biographers the most typically western of any of our great American Presidents.

Mr. President, I can think of no finer tribute to the memory of the great Theodore Roosevelt, whom we are memorializing here today, than for the entire citizenry of the Nation, which he loved so deeply, to rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of free citizenship, for which he was such a stentorian advocate.

In conclusion, I should like to thank all my colleagues who are participating in this memorialization. Your cooperation and efforts are most deeply appreciated by the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as a western Senator, I am happy to add my tribute today to that great American, Theodore Rooesvelt, whose centenary is being observed this year. Theodore Roosevelt was the first President to recognize fully the great potential of the Western United States.

His belief in the West had its origin in the Badlands of North Dakota where he spent part of his boyhood; and it was strengthened by the knowledge that America's frontier was limitless and its resources boundless—needing only encouragement from the Federal Government. It was during his administration that legislation for the first reclamation project was introduced by Representative Francis G. Newlands, a Nevada Democrat, transforming arid wastes into rich agricultural lands.

His love of nature and the outdoors was manifested by his insistence that our vast forests and mineral wealth be protected from the depredation of greedy men. In fact, Theodore Roosevelt's driving force had as its motivation an unshakable belief in the greatest good for the greatest number.

During his administration, Theodore Roosevelt was roundly criticized as a visionary, as a progressive bent solely on overturning the status quo.

With this background in mind, it seems all the more appropriate that the 100th anniversary of the birth of this courageous President should be observed on the 25th anniversary of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Beyond the fact of their name, there are many striking similarities between Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt.

Theodore Roosevelt instituted what was termed "the Square Deal," and he was subjected to the same hues and cries that dogged Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal a quarter of a century later.

Actually, Franklin Roosevelt breathed new life into national policies that had lain dormant during 12 years of Republican rule before him. Franklin Roosevelt rejuvenated many of Theodore Roosevelt's ideas, particularly in the areas involving the public interest as opposed to the entrenched interest of a few.

All of us here today can remember the depression of the early 1930's and how Franklin Delano Roosevelt met the challenge head on. Few of us here today can remember the depression of 1907, but history tells us that Theodore Roosevelt employed the same boldness and the same leadership in guiding our country out of the economic mire into which it had fallen.

So I say, in conclusion, that today is a signal occasion to commemorate the deeds of two outstanding Americans, one a Republican, the other a Democrat. At the risk of seeming partisan, I should like to point out that Theodore Roosevelt, in terms of today's evaluations, was in reality a Democrat.

Party labels aside, however, both Roosevelts left their indelible stamp on the character of America, and in honoring them today we are honoring the country they so faithfully served.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the magic of March 4 has long since passed from our active history. One may say that it does not belong to our present—nor to our future. No longer does the date mark the peaceful succession of the most popular leader of the most powerful nation on the face of the earth as the vote of the majority expresses the consent of the governed.

March 4, 1958—this day—is the silver anniversary of the last Inaugural Day that graced the month of March. It passed with the coming of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But it is a day and a date that America should never, must never forget, and will never forget.

We say this with no sense of partisanship, but a high sense of Americanism. For we gladly recall another March 4, and another Roosevelt—Theodore—who left his mark, too, on his country, his times, and our world.

To each Roosevelt was granted only one March 4 inaugural. But between them, they left on the first half of this 20th century an impress which will mark all the centuries that may be given to mankind to reside upon this earth.

Only once did a Roosevelt surrender the reins of the Presidency when he well might have held them. He turned them over in the very Halls of this Senate on a day made too stormy by the snow and winds of that March 4, 1909. Theodore Roosevelt turned the office to the man of his choice, William Howard Taft.

Just as certainly he determined the President who took office on March 4, 1913—Woodrow Wilson. So Theodore Roosevelt's influence may be well said to have covered the 8 tremendous years of the Wilson era.

Ever and anon the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt strides these aisles when voices are raised for the conservation of our natural resources.

The great La Follette, of Wisconsin, said of him:

When the historian of the future shall speak of Theodore Roosevelt, he is likely to say that he did many notable things but that his greatest work was inspiring and actually beginning a world movement to stay territorial waste and saving for the human race the things on which alone a peaceful, progressive, and happy life can be founded.

If the first Roosevelt safeguarded the material possessions of our land, the last Roosevelt fortified the spiritual powers of America.

We do not distrust the future of essential democracy—

Declared Franklin Delano Roosevelt at high noon of March 4, 1933—

We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity.

Roosevelt aimed at the assurance of a rounded and permanent national life. He called for faith and courage in the people, and said the only thing we had to fear was fear itself.

Beyond all carping partisanship we realize today that the dreams and determination of Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave to our economy such strength and bulwarks as to provide insurance that the despairs of 1932 need never be repeated.

But it is not enough that we possess the laws that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a part of our protection. There is something more than laws that we need. It is a leadership of vision and vitality, close enough to the bread and butter problems of the average home to understand the dangers and to undertake the solutions which are the responsibility of leadership.

This March 4 finds the reins and responsibilities not in the hands of either Roosevelt. The obligation of this day and the opportunity of this hour is in our keeping. The blame or the fame will be of our making.

Responsibility implies accountability. It is the ability to respond, to measure up to the obligations we have dared to assume. If we—anywhere—lose that sense of responsibility, we shall merely be going through the forms of democratic government. We shall have lost its force. We shall have lost its fire. We shall have lost the inspiration of the ideals of America, and we shall have no ideals with which, in our turn, to inspire. Indeed we shall have no ideals with which to preserve the present, let alone prosper the future.

The present era which is in our keeping we like to describe as the atomic age. Its achievements dwarf all the discoveries of all the centuries. It is well to recall that it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, more than any other single man, who led us practically by his own hand into our pioneer days of atomic leadership. He alone made the decision to spend $2 billion to acquire atomic knowledge ahead of our enemies.

Historians will have many chapters to write of the accomplishments of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I shall dwell only on this chapter and only for a moment.

For his encouragement to the scientists, for his courage in attacking the unpredictable, for his character that did not retreat from the unknown, for his conviction and consistency that would brook no denial and no delay, this is a glorious chapter.

As the historian puts it, practically before anybody could blink, a vast organization had been created, and the best military, engineering, and scientific brains in the country applied themselves to a problem without parallel in magnitude and complexity. The whole world of technology was turned upside down, yet in the utmost secrecy, the miracle of the atom was solved and its power beyond all reckoning was harnessed to the commands of man.

This is the atomic age that is in our keeping. The challenge is great. Yet the formula is simple. It is the formula of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was his philosophy—"to make life better for the average man, woman, and child."

If we carry that philosophy to the world stage where the spell of Franklin Delano Roosevelt still casts its shine rather than its shadow, the atomic age can realize the blessings of prosperity and peace that constitute its truest promise to men, women, and children everywhere beneath God's heaven.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's inauguration as President of the United States.

When Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office on March 4, 1905, for the term to which he had been elected, he was at the height of his physical and intellectual strength and vigor. In word and deed he placed before the American people an example of patriotism which did not hesitate to glorify our national ideals and to proclaim love of our country and our flag.

More than any other American of our history, Theodore Roosevelt exemplified the qualities of heart and mind which built the greatness of our Republic. He stands out as an exponent of self-reliance, energy, courage and faith. His life of adventure and achievement should be studied by the youth of our land because it gives a better understanding of what it means to be an American.

His oft-repeated advice to young Americans should be remembered and appreciated. It was this:

Do the best you can, where you are, with what you have.

The duties and responsibilities of citizenship were real to him, and he sought to impress upon all Americans the importance of taking part in government and in politics.

He warned against the dangers that could destroy America in terms that apply with equal force today. He said:

The things that will destroy America are: prosperity at any price; peace at any price; safety first instead of duty first; the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

Theodore Roosevelt brought to the public service the highest standards of honor, integrity, and decency. As a fighter for the principles in which he believed, he found his greatest joy when the going was tough, when the odds were heavily weighted against him.

He battled for a strong nation, fully aware of its responsibilities in world affairs, prepared, confident, and unafraid.

In his inaugural address he stated the position of the United States in its relations with other nations of the earth. He declared:

We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid.

No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject of insolent aggression.

In this centennial year of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt we can best serve our country and our flag by rededication to the ideals to which this great American gave a lifetime of loyal, courageous, and patriotic support.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, today we mark two anniversaries that have particular significance to those of us from the West. On this day 53 years ago, Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States. On this day a quarter of a century ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was sworn in as President of the United States. Between these two events, America came of age. Modern American liberalism was born in the administration of one Roosevelt, and came to maturity in the administration of another.

When Theodore Roosevelt took office, our Nation was sunk in the moral abyss which had followed the winning of the Civil War. That tragic conflict had erased from the Nation the moral obloquy of slavery, but the high promise of that victory had not been realized. The Reconstruction Era and the years following it had seen the mores of jungle law economics given the acceptance of Holy Writ. That period had seen the utter disappearance of any concept of the public interest as a goal to be pursued by government or by private individuals. The resources of the Nation, both natural and human, were put at the disposal of the barons of industry to seize and to exploit. The idea of regulation, or public protection for the natural wealth of the Nation was anathema.

Then Theodore Roosevelt came upon the scene. Roosevelt had been Governor of New York. He had been police commissioner of New York City. But Theodore Roosevelt's frame of reference extended far beyond the sidewalks of New York. He was spirtually a westerner. He knew the vast spaces of the arid West. He knew the cattleman, the sheepherder, the prospector, the sunburned man of the plains and the mountains. He knew the incalculable riches which the West held in store for a people with the imagination and vigor to unlock nature's storehouse. When he came to office, he labored to make that promise a reality.

Theodore Roosevelt knew that our great West was potentially so rich as to make mild indeed the dreams of the Conquistadors who had sought the

Golden Cities of Cibola. He knew that the key to this wealth was the water of the West, the forests of the mountain States, the dry but fertile soil of the Plains States. Under Theodore Roosevelt, the reclamation of these areas, the wise, comprehensive use of these resources, not to enrich single individuals or giant trusts, but to enrich the life of a whole nation became, for the first time, the declared public policy of the United States. In Theodore Roosevelt's administration, the great system of national forests took shape, the gospel of sustained yield began to replace the idea of plundering the forests for today's profit and letting tomorrow take care of itself.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who first gave voice to what we today accept as a truism; the idea that a great river basin must be developed as a unit, that the headwaters of our rivers and the tidewaters of their estuaries are to be used together. It was Theodore Roosevelt who taught us again the lesson of untold ages, that the heedless waste of natural resources was a certain form of national suicide.

A quarter of a century after Theodore Roosevelt left the White House, another Roosevelt became President. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, like Theodore Roosevelt, was a son of the East. A Governor of New York, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, too, knew the West and saw its potential wealth. His vision saw even beyond the use of water for irrigation and envisaged the construction of great hydroelectric dams to use the same water to create, not only food, but also energy. It was through F. D. R.'s vision that Grand Coulee Dam, and Bonneville Dam were built, that the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, that America turned again to the task of developing its potential, industrial as well as agricultural, in the underdeveloped areas of our country.

Franklin Roosevelt, standing in front of this building 25 years ago, began a period of imaginative and vigorous experimentation, within which an extension and broadening of Theodore Roosevelt's policies of reclamation and comprehensive development were an important factor. The idea of full utilization of our rivers, to which Theodore Roosevelt had given birth, came of age under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The yardstick of the public interest, laid away in a dusty closet for the 12 years preceding 1933, was brought out again, and once more applied to the acts of Government. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, like Theodore Roosevelt, transcended party, State, and economic background to wield the tools of popular government for the sake of all the people.

At the close of Theodore Roosevelt's administration, his ideas were laid away and he, himself, was driven out of the party he had led so well. Now we find he has been reclaimed by that party, and hailed again as one of its great leaders, as he truly is. This speaks well for the Republican Party. A party which comes to see true greatness in the rebels of a former day is learning from the past. Therefore, I look hopefully toward the day when Theodore Roosevelt's policies will be adopted as wholeheartedly as his name has been, by the party which he led to the White House a half a century ago.

ELIMINATION OF CLAIMS OF IMMUNITY FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A 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.

TRIBUTES TO PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, retrospective assessment of the myriad contributions of Theodore Roosevelt to the development and progress of the United States affords no conclusion other than that he was a man 50 years ahead of his time.

The sum total of all his virtues and abilities is that he was possessed of the vision to see the role of greatness which the future held for this Nation, and of the capacity to translate that vision into reality.

In no area was this more apparent than in his vigorous crusade for the conservation of natural resources. Wisely recognizing that continued exploitation and dissipation of the Nation's mineral, water, and timber resources would forever foreclose the attainment of its appointed destiny, he became the father of the great programs of conservation which now are an accepted and cherished part of the fabric of the American way of life.

The spark which he struck in 1905, in sponsoring and signing into law the act creating the United States Forest Service, is now burning brightly throughout the land.

I am happy to represent a State which, with its more than 23 million acres of privately owned timberlands under organized forest-fire protection, leads the Nation in such endeavors.

I am proud that Georgia has developed to the fullest extent the Roosevelt concept of conservation. In that light, I salute his memory on this significant anniversary occasion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am indeed glad to join in this memorial tribute commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. It is highly fitting that we honor the memory of this great man, whose devotion to duty and love of country have been an inspiration to every generation since his time.

Theodore Roosevelt possessed qualities of character which endeared him to the people of his own day. Nor has the strength of his personality diminished with the passing years. He was a man of remarkable courage. He possessed a deep sense of honor, loyalty, and patriotism—virtues which have characterized great men from the beginning of history.

Our country is indebted to Theodore Roosevelt for many things. His achievements were many and varied, and I shall not try to enumerate them here.

However, we love him today for the man that he was. We honor him for the statesmanship he displayed as the Nation's Chief Executive. We honor him for his courageous leadership in dealing both with international issue and domestic problems here at home.

We remember his vigorous enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. We recall his forceful leadership that saw the building of the Panama Canal. We can thank him for the great foresight he showed in conserving the Nation's natural resources.

Theodore Roosevelt's great personality made an indelible impression on the country at the time that he lived. His accomplishments made America a stronger Nation. And the good that he achieved reaches down to the present time. Truly, he was a great American.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] regarding the anniversary of the inaugurations of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt as Presidents of the United States.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

Today is a great day of celebration. It is the anniversary of the inaugurations of two great Roosevelts as President—the 53d year since the swearing in of Theodore Roosevelt as President in his own right, and the 25th anniversary of the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Both Roosevelts were builders. Both had deep concern for the proper utilization of the Nation's natural resources. Both had trouble with those who did not dream great dreams as they did.

The conservation of our natural resources caught the imagination of both Roosevelt I and Roosevelt II. Teddy Roosevelt's campaign as a trust buster served as a base later for many New Deal reforms of Franklin Roosevelt.

Each of these Roosevelts came to office after periods in which reactionaries had fought against extending vital services to the people. Like the flame of Mount Olympus, the light started by Theodore Roosevelt was rekindled by F. D. R. into a bright torch of freedom reaching out—not to a few, but to all the American people.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in keeping with the spirit of the occasion and the remarks which have been made in connection with it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to Theodore Roosevelt.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

It will be 100 years on October 27, 1958, since our beloved former President, Theodore

(Teddy) Roosevelt, was born. Yet, as remote as his birth date may seem, he in particular had knowledge of the importance that our military strength should play in preserving our national security.

We are all familiar with the courage, the boundless energy, the willpower, and perseverance, which characterized him, his brilliant mind, but most of all we should remember him for the ideals which he personified. As a member of the Civil Service Commission, for example, his vigorous promotion of the merit system won him praise, which was to be followed later by greater acclaim during his remarkable command of the Rough Riders in the Spanish-American War.

Teddy Roosevelt was only 42 years old when he became President of the United States following the assassination of President McKinley in 1901, and it is to Teddy Roosevelt's credit that his youth was no obstacle when he was elected by a large majority in 1904.

The words I now am quoting were said by Teddy Roosevelt more than 50 years ago when he referred to the Hague Conference in his message to the Congress in 1907. He said:

"No plan was even proposed which would have the assent of more than one first-class power outside of the United States. It is evident, therefore, that it is folly for this Nation to base any hope of securing peace on an international agreement as to the limitation of armaments."

Let us all remember Teddy Roosevelt as a great statesman, a soldier, a patriot, a symbol of clean politics and, above all, a man who crowded into the comparatively short span of 60 years an unbelievable number of thrills attached to the great adventure of just being a good American.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 53 years ago, on March 4, 1905, Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States; and October 27 next will be the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of our great American Presidents.

In these times when our Nation faces grave emergencies from the challenge of the Soviet Union we have great reason to pay tribute to one of the first Americans to fully understand the new demands the 20th century would make upon the American people. Theodore Roosevelt helped take us off the road of isolationism in developing a then new concept that the security and enlightened self-interest of the United States was irrevocably bound with that of other free people throughout the world.

In his inaugural address in 1905, Theodore Roosevelt stated basic principles so true and so applicable to the welfare of the American people that they could serve as major points in debate before this body in 1958. He said:

Much has been given to us and much will rightfully be expected of us. Power means responsibility and danger. We have become a great Nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relations with other nations of the earth.

No one point of our policy, foreign or domestic, is more important than this (adequate defense) to the honor and material welfare, and, above all, to the peace of our Nation in the future. Whether we desire it or not, we must henceforth recognize that we have international duties no less than international rights.

Mr. President, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission in New York City is doing an exceptional job in the national observance of this anniversary. As a Senator from the State of New York, and a Republican, I am honored to speak in praise of my fellow New Yorker, and fellow Republican, who made such a mark in the history of our country.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, 25 years ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt took his oath of office as President of the United States of America. The Nation, helpless to the point of despair, awaited that day with mounting anxiety and concern. Clouds of gloom hung low over the land. Financial paralysis gripped the country. Except for local attempts to create an economy of barter, economic ruin and misery was visible on every side. More than 13 million persons or 1 out of 4 able bodied workers, were out of work. The past administration remained frozen against direct Federal relief for the unemployed, and insisted on pushing the depression deeper into an economic morass by cutting Government expenditures in a fruitless effort to balance the budget. Factories stood ghostly silent, families lived in tarpaper shacks and hunted in the city dumps for food like dogs. Thousands of footloose children roamed up and down the land. Hunger marchers, bitter and ugly in their desperation, were parading the streets of the larger cities. Farmers formed milk strikes and mobbed judges and other law enforcement officers.

The leaders of finance, under patient and relentless questioning by Ferdinand Pecora, confessed to a Senate committee to flagrant and shameless breaches of everyday ethics. Each day brought new idols of finance and business tumbling down. During the last two weeks of February leaders of business when provided a forum before the Senate Finance Committee to offer their economic and political wisdom to the Nation abjectly admitted to a total bankruptcy of ideas. John W. Davis had nothing to offer "either of fact or theory." General Atterbury, with the Pennsylvania Railroad, saw nothing ahead except the bottom, and no way to avoid it. The elder statesman Bernard Baruch called for balancing the budget and cutting governmental expenditures to the bone. By the week prior to the inauguration, more than 20 States had suspended banking operations. The picture was very black, but the people hoped and trusted that it was the darkness that comes before a new dawn.

As the Nation waited, Franklin D. Roosevelt began his inspired and healing inaugural speech in these words:

I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper.

Then came those immortal words:

So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. Our difficulties concern only material things. Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply * * *. Primarily this is because rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods had failed through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure and have abdicated. The money-changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more nobler than mere monetary profit * * *. Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort * * *. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work * * *. We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed in their need. They have registered a mandate that they want to direct vigorous action. They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership.

Then came swift and decisive action. On March 5, President Roosevelt summoned the 73d Congress in special session to begin March 9. The same day he issued a proclamation effective March 6 declaring a national banking holiday and suspending all transactions in the financial world. On the first day of the special session Congress gave him emergency powers, in the Emergency Banking Relief Act. Thus began the first 100 days of the New Deal. On March 12 he made his first fireside chat to the Nation. On March 31 the Congress passed the act establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps, authorizing healthful and educational construction work for 250,000 jobless youths. By 1941 more than 2 million American boys had been graduated from the CCC. Then in May came the Federal Emergency Relief Act, which stopped the hunger marches, and put men to work; the Agriculture Adjustment Act, the first step to rejuvenate the farmer; the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and finally the Federal Securities Act.

In June came the creation of the United States Employment Service and the Home Owners Loan Corporation. On the final day of the special session the Congress passed the Federal Bank Deposit Insurance Act, Farm Credit Act, the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, and a National Industrial Recovery Act, the law creating the NRA and the PWA. Many of these acts were highly controversial, some of them were later struck down by the Supreme Court, but all of them were courageous attempts to deal affirmatively with the great depression. Later came other great landmarks of the New Deal. The Soil Conservation Act, the Rural Resettlement Act, the Rural Electrification Act, the act creating the National Youth Administration, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Social Security Act and many other legislative and administrative steps along the way to a more abundant and sound economy.

The Nation should make March 4, 1933, a day of national consecration. That day marked the end of the national despair and the beginning of a new way of life for all the people of America. It was a time of crisis, it was a time for

great ideas and great acts. Franklin D. Roosevelt met the challenge with a full measure of greatness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a copy of Franklin D. Roosevelt's inaugural address on March 4, 1933.

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

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1933

I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days.

In such a spirit on my part and on yours we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Values have shrunken to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply. Primarily this is because rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods have failed through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure, and have abdicated. Practices of the unscrupulous moneychangers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men.

True they have tried, but their efforts have been cast in the pattern of an outworn tradition. Faced by failure of credit they have proposed only the lending of more money. Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership, they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision, and when there is no vision the people perish.

The moneychangers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.

Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort. The joy and moral stimulation of work no longer must be forgotten in the mad chase of evanescent profits. These dark days will be worth all they cost us if they teach us that our true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow men.

Recognition of the falsity of material wealth as the standard of success goes hand in hand with the abandonment of the false belief that public office and high political position are to be valued only by the standards of pride of place and personal profit; and there must be an end to a conduct in banking and in business which too often has given to a sacred trust the likeness of callous and selfish wrongdoing. Small wonder that confidence languishes, for it thrives only on honesty, on honor, on the sacredness of obligations, on faithful protection, on unselfish performance; without them it cannot live.

Restoration calls, however, not for changes in ethics alone. This Nation asks for action, and action now.

Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution, endeavor to provide a better use of the land for those best fitted for the land. The task can be helped by definite efforts to raise the values of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities. It can be helped by preventing realistically the tragedy of the growing loss through foreclosure of our small homes and our farms. It can be helped by insistence that the Federal, State, and local governments act forthwith on the demand that their cost be drastically reduced. It can be helped by the unifying of relief activities which today are often scattered, uneconomical, and unequal. It can be helped by national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character. There are many ways in which it can be helped, but it can never be helped merely by talking about it. We must act and act quickly.

Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order: there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments, so that there will be an end to speculation with other people's money; and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency.

These are the lines of attack. I shall presently urge upon a new Congress, in special session, detailed measures for their fulfillment, and I shall seek the immediate assistance of the several States.

Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our own national house in order and making income balance outgo. Our international trade relations, though vastly important, are in point of time and necessity secondary to the establishment of a sound national economy. I favor as a practical policy the putting of first things first. I shall spare no effort to restore world trade by international economic readjustment, but the emergency at home cannot wait on that accomplishment.

The basic thought that guides these specific means of national recovery is not narrowly nationalistic. It is the insistence, as a first consideration, upon the interdependence of the various elements in and parts of the United States—a recognition of the old and permanently important manifestation of the American spirit of the pioneer. It is the way to recovery. It is the immediate way. It is the strongest assurance that the recovery will endure.

In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we cannot merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective. We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline, because it makes possible a leadership which aims at a larger good. This I propose to offer, pledging that the larger purposes will bind upon us all as a sacred obligation with a unity of duty hitherto evoked only in time of armed strife.

With this pledge taken, I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common problems.

Action in this image and to this end is feasible under the form of government which we have inherited from our ancestors. Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. That is why our constitutional system has proved itself the most superbly enduring political mechanism the modern world has produced. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter internal strife, of world relations.

It is to be hoped that the normal balance of executive and legislative authority may be wholly adequate to meet the unprecedented task before us. But it may be that an unprecedented demand and need for undelayed action may call for temporary departure from that normal balance of public procedure.

I am prepared under my constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. These measures, or such other measures as the Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom, I shall seek, within my constitutional authority, to bring to speedy adoption.

But in the event that the Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the national emergency is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.

For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and the devotion that befit the time. I can do no less.

We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stern performance of duty by old and young alike. We aim at the assurance of a rounded and permanent national life.

We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed. In their need they have registered a mandate that they want direct,

vigorous action. They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership. They have made me the present instrument of their wishes. In the spirit of the gift I take it.

In this dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it is indeed fitting that we should pause today to pay tribute to one of America's outstanding Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt. As a Senator from the great State of Wyoming, I hail him as an adopted son of the West where he spent several fruitful years of young manhood and honored the people of the western empire with his well-known work, The Winning of the West.

I should like to dwell briefly on a facet of his versatile career that some historians have acclaimed the wellspring for the most enduring achievement of his presidency. My reference is to the creation of our national forest reserves, which was always dear to the heart of Teddy Roosevelt.

With characteristic vigor and courage, he enthusiastically launched a program that withdrew from settlement and preserved for conservation purposes several million acres of forest lands. Under his aggressive leadership, the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities of 1906 were enacted. It is with pardonable pride that I mention the singular honor Theodore Roosevelt bestowed on my State when he established, on September 24, 1906, our first national monument, Devils Tower National Monument.

As steward of our abounding natural resources, Theodore Roosevelt, more than anyone else, has pointed the way to preserve our God-given riches for succeeding generations and thereby has won the lasting gratitude of the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the memorable occasion of today wherein we celebrate the great presidential records of two Roosevelts.

It was 53 years ago that Theodore Roosevelt, affectionately known as "Teddy" Roosevelt, became the 26th President of the United States. His record is an illustrious one, one which arouses a feeling of gratitude, appreciation, and patriotic fervor. He typified the vigorous, youthful, dynamic spirit of the young American Republic in each and every one of his actions, as well as in his private and public life.

I suppose we shall remember Theodore Roosevelt's administration for at least three great contributions to America's record in the world, America's public-service record, and the record here at home.

First, it was Theodore Roosevelt who established American prestige in the international councils by his great service in bringing to an end the war between the Japanese and the Russians, in the Portsmouth Conference of 1905.

It was the same Theodore Roosevelt who, as President of the United States, dispatched the American Fleet around the world in a cruise of good will and neighborliness, but at the same time establishing once and for all that America was a great world power, and particularly a sea power.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who earned for himself and his administration the record of being trust busters, champions of competitive enterprise, and arch enemies of the great combinations, trust, and monopolies.

He stood then, as he stands now, as a champion of the people. It was Theodore Roosevelt, supported by the great Governor of Pennsylvania, Gifford Pinchot, who carved out for himself in the pages of American history a reputation—and a deserved one—for being the exponent of sound conservation and protection of our natural resources.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who led the fight for an effective program of reforestation.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who called upon the people of America to protect their God-given natural resources from exploitation, and it was Theodore Roosevelt who pioneered in the field of reclamation, irrigation, and power development.

We remember these things because it was in this period of American history that there was a reawakening of the spirit of American democracy, a reawakening that was championed by a rugged, intelligent, courageous American, the 26th President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt.

Later there was another Roosevelt—Franklin D. Roosevelt. Franklin Roosevelt, in addressing a Jackson Day dinner in 1938, said:

> My father and grandfather were Democrats and I was born and brought up as a Democrat, but in 1904, when I cast my first vote for a President, I voted for the Republican candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, because I thought he was a better Democrat than the Democratic candidate.

It seems to me that that statement of the late and beloved President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, indicates the great community of interest and the many areas of similarity of policy and philosophy which existed, and continue to exist, between the progressive philosophy of a Theodore Roosevelt and the progressive liberalism of a Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is 25 years to this day—almost to this hour—since Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office as the 32d President of the United States. I ask Senators to cast their recollections back to that dark day 25 years ago, when our world seemed to be crashing about us, and when we looked with anxious hope to the new President. There are some in this Chamber who were even then Members of the Congress; there are some here who were then not yet grown. But all of us alike were caught in the paralyzing turmoil and the terror; and all of us shared the hope that this might be the dawn of a new day. Whether one was a businessman, a lawyer, a farmer, a worker, or a schoolboy, he could not escape the common disaster and the common fear. Who knew, or dared to think, what the next months or years would bring?

I remember the day—I can never forget it. I was at school in Denver, studying pharmacy to carry on with my father in our drug store in South Dakota. The depression had dealt harshly with us, as it did with the farmers of South Dakota and with all who lived among them and depended on their business. Long years of falling prices, of drought and dust, of debt and foreclosure had left us impoverished and bitter. Those who spent those awful years in industrial cities have their own memories of breadlines and soup-kitchens and apple-sellers on the streets. In the farm country we remember the crops rotting in the fields because it did not pay to send them to market; the farm strikes against low prices and bankruptcy; the farms abandoned to dust and debt; the sullen crowds that defied the law and stopped the foreclosure sales of farms and homes. Those of us who lived through that revolt in the farm country have no doubt that Franklin Roosevelt saved American capitalism and the American constitutional system, when they were very near to breaking down.

I cast my first vote for Franklin Roosevelt, and I worked very hard to help elect him. My father was an active Democrat before me, and we believed then—as I still do—that only the Democratic Party, with its roots in the working and farming people, can look after the interests of the people as they should be looked after. We had many converts that year, and we have had many more since. I am proud that 25 years later one of the finest and most promising of our young Democratic Representatives in Congress now represents my old home district in South Dakota. I refer to Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, a courageous, brilliant, and liberal Democrat.

Throughout the country in those days of early March the banks were closing, one by one and then State by State, from Louisiana to Michigan, locking in what remained of our drawn-down savings. Hours before the inauguration, the new Governor of New York, our great friend and former colleague, Herbert Lehman, by proclamation suspended the banks in the financial heart of the Nation, to preserve what assets remained. It is recorded that the outgoing President, in the ultimate gesture of impotence and despair, confessed: "We are at the end of our string. There is nothing more we can do."

Surely no President since Lincoln took office, faced so dark and desperate a prospect as faced Franklin Roosevelt. But he was not one to despair.

I remember his voice as it rang out under the gray sky that inauguration day in 1933—the voice that we were to know so well for so long—carried by radio to waiting, hoping ears in every corner of the United States.

For him it was, as he said, "a day of national consecration." He took note of the dark realities of the moment—the idle factories, the masses of unemployed, the improverished farmers, the bankrupt businesses. Then came those words that brought the first glimmer of awaited hope: "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unrea-

soning, unjustified terror that paralyzes."

"The people of the United States have not failed," he told us. "They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership. They have made me the present instrument of their wishes. This Nation asks for action, and action now."

Who can ever forget those words, and what they meant to us. As that great historian, my good friend, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., records: "Across the land the fog began to lift."

I remember that my father telephoned me from South Dakota that evening and rejoiced with me in the heartening words. It took a great event to justify a phone call from South Dakota to Colorado in those days, but we had much to celebrate, and to anticipate.

Yet I remember, too, that for some there were lingering doubts. Those were brave words, but for 3 long years we had heard many words, many promises. Could this be, perhaps, just another politician, another false prophet of better times that would never come?

II

The doubts did not survive the next day. Sunday evening the new President convened the people of the country before their radios in the first fireside chat. He told us of his decision to declare a bank holiday, promising strict supervision of all banking and credits and investment and an end to speculation with other people's money. He told us of the special session of Congress to enact measures to start the country back on the road to recovery. He told us things were going to be done.

The effect was miraculous. The country realized that at last its affairs were in the hands of a man who knew what to do—and would do it. The banks were no sounder on Monday than they had been on Saturday—but the Nation was. We did not understand banking; we did not realize the significance of an embargo, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, on the withdrawal of gold or silver. We did not even know when the banks would reopen, or what we would do in the meantime. We knew only that at last leadership had been restored to the Presidency. As that veteran, far-seeing reporter, Ernest Lindley, recalled, "It was action, like a streak of lightning out of a black sky."

Remember, too, that in those critical days, Republicans as well as Democrats joined in the superhuman efforts to put the country back on its feet. In those incredible 12 days when the banking system was shaken down and sorted out, Republican officials like Secretary Ogden Mills and Under Secretary Arthur Ballantine, of the Treasury, and the distinguished Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Eugene Meyer, worked side by side with the new administration. And the Banking Act of 1933, impossible as it may seem to us, was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law less than 6 hours after the President's message was received.

It is to be remembered also that this new Administration was a Government of many talents—a "multi-interest" Government, as Arthur Schlesinger called it—reflecting the varied interests of our pluralistic society. The Cabinet that took office that Saturday evening contained two Senators (originally there were three, but the great Thomas J. Walsh died before he could take office); two Republicans; a businessman; two veteran Wilsonian public servants; a conservationist; a social worker; a farm editor; and a former Governor. They were not all great, and some of them were later replaced. But they were men (and one woman) trained to the public service, who approached their formidable tasks from the point of view of the public interest. To them government was never the extension of private or parochial interests and attitudes into the positions of power and responsibility. No one ever raised about them questions of conflict of interest or of changing the cloak of private interests before assuming public responsibility. Their only business was the business of government.

III

The Congress that was convened in special session on March 9, 1933, was the "Congress of the 100 days." Reopening the banking system was its first concern, because the banks held the lifeblood of the economy. But there followed in quick succession a series of recovery and reform measures the like of which the country has never seen in a time so short. Legislation for the relief of farmers and for raising farm prices. Legislation for unemployment relief and public works. The Civilian Conservation Corps. The TVA. The HOLC, which saved homeowners from losing their homes. Deposit insurance, the SEC. The reform of banking. The National Recovery Act, including the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively through their chosen representatives. An Economy Act of unprecedented proportions, now long forgotten. And many others.

In recalling the achievements of this extraordinary 73d Congress, I do not suggest that all these measures proved wise or successful. There were many far-seeing warnings spoken in and out of Congress, some heeded, some not. Some of the acts did not survive scrutiny of the courts; some failed of their purpose; some were rewritten by the tests of time; some survive to this day. We need not again debate their merits. Where so much was attempted so quickly, it is no wonder that there were mistakes and failures. But even these cannot dim the grandeur of the design; to face the depression boldly in all its aspects and beat it back; to enlist the strength of the country and the resourcefulness of its people in a great, many-sided effort to revive, reorganize and reform the economy. The challenge was, as Franklin Roosevelt said, "to wage a war against the emergency as if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe." They knew their business and knew how to take care of it. This surely proves that democracy can meet crises.

I say for the record that the Commander in Chief in the fight against the foreign foes of depression and recession waged the conflict successfully and carried us to great victory.

"We must," he said, "move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective."

But the depression was a stubborn foe, and the reformation and reconstruction of the American economy proceeded slowly. When the Germans marched against Poland in 1939, employment had risen some 7 million above the low in 1933, but there were still 8 million seeking work. Had the war not interrupted, it might have taken half a decade more to complete the recovery. But in laying the foundation for defense against future depression, the country under Roosevelt took giant strides to make up for the time lost in the fat and foolish twenties. Social security; the rights of free labor unions to organize and bargain; minimum wages; the right of farmers to economic parity; the right of security for depositors, investors and homeowners; TVA and the great conservation and power programs—the great reforms and stabilizers built into the economy before the war are our legacy from Roosevelt. This legacy lies very near the heart of our economic strength, our best instrument in maintaining economic growth. It is still, and at this very moment, our best defense in preventing the spread of recession into depression. If he had not been remembered for anything else, Franklin Roosevelt's greatness could have rested on this.

IV

But when we think of Roosevelt today, it is perhaps most of all as the author and champion of the four freedoms, the architect of the United Nations, the President who succeeded in leading the United States out of its tradition of aloof isolation to world responsibility and leadership. He came to office 5 weeks after Adolph Hitler became Chancellor of the Third Reich; he died 3 weeks before Hitler committed suicide in total defeat. In himself, Franklin Roosevelt symbolized the triumph of vital democracy over a corrupt and evil despotism.

He was among the first to recognize that fascism in Europe and Asia would sooner or later threaten the peace and security of the United States. He saw that self-interest required the United States to give what support it could to the beleaguered British after the fall of France, and he sought to rouse his countrymen from their wishful dream that "it could not happen here."

In this respect his third inaugural was even more remarkable than his first. Nearly a year before the tragic and awful awakening at Pearl Harbor, he said to us:

> The life of a nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to live. There are men who doubt this. There are men who believe that democracy, as a form of government and a frame of life, is limited or measured by a kind of mystical fate—that for some unexplained reason, tyranny and slavery have become the surging wave of the future—and that freedom is an ebbing tide. But we Americans know that this is not

true. * * * That faith speaks to us in our daily lives. * * * It speaks to us in our counties, in our cities, in our towns, and in our villages. It speaks to us from other nations, from those across the seas—the enslaved, as well as the free. Sometimes we fail to hear or heed these voices of freedom because to us the privilege of our freedom is such an old, old story.

Within a year came the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the United States was embroiled in the greatest of wars to defend the privilege of our freedom. Roosevelt dedicated himself to winning the war and securing a just peace with an unsparing devotion that finally cost his life. In the cause of freedom, to him nothing seemed impossible—100,000 airplanes, the reconquest of the Pacific after shattering defeat, the invasion of Europe, the taming of atomic energy, the comity of the United Nations. Those of us who were privileged to serve under him on any of these great undertakings, in any capacity however modest, could not but feel the driving purpose that emanated from his leadership. Like Lincoln, he strove and suffered in the service of a great dream of humanity; and like Lincoln, he died in sight of his goal, never to know how far his dream was from fulfillment.

v

More than anything else in his vivid and colorful career, the courage of Franklin Roosevelt has meaning today for his countrymen. Our world demands courage. Lacking it, no matter what other virtues we possess, we are likely to go to pieces under today's pressure. Even those who did not agree with Franklin Roosevelt's policies admired his courage, and freedom-loving men around the world today need the kind of courage which was his.

There are many kinds of courage. Let us consider three: First, the courage of devotion to duty; second, the courage of beginning again after defeat; and third, the courage of the genuine humanitarian.

Those of us who had the great honor and privilege of working with Franklin Roosevelt in the years after 1940 knew at first hand of his devotion to duty. He came to the end of his second term with an unprecedented record of achievement. He knew that if he ran again he faced possible defeat. He knew that if he were elected again, he faced national problems and personal trials even more searching than those he had already known. He knew that whatever he did, he could add but little to his personal reputation. He was sure of his place in history as the spokesman for freedom and security in a perilous time. He knew that future generations would acclaim him as one of the greatest of social statesmen. He knew, in fact, that he was already an American immortal; he could not hope to add to that. There was no further prize for him to win save that of his own inner consciousness that he had not turned away from his duty; and so out of his courage and devotion to duty, Roosevelt carried on. There is a lesson in that steadfastness for all of us today.

There is a lesson, too, in the second kind of courage I mentioned—Franklin Roosevelt's courage in beginning again after defeat. Promising and active, with an exceptional record of achievement for a man only 40, an acknowledged leader of his party, candidate for the Vice Presidency in 1920, and with every anticipation of a brilliant future, he was stricken with a disease that seemed inevitably destined to prevent his further active participation in public affairs.

The courage that keeps a man steady when he faces an assassin's pistol may be instinctive, but not so the courage that steadies him as he faces threats to the ruin of his plans, the blasting of his hopes, and the frustration of everything he has worked for. That sort of courage is acquired, and it is not often acquired by happy experiences and easy triumphs. Roosevelt did not learn that courage at Groton or Harvard; men do not learn it by winning law cases, nor by being elected to office. Perhaps it was the shattering of his pride in his own strength that developed the resilience and daring which allowed Franklin Roosevelt to conceal behind his famous smile the traces of effort and pain which he frequently suffered. Time and again he was put on the spot, and time and again his buoyant humor and tremendous sense of popular feeling rescued him from lasting defeat. Through the courage of beginning again after defeat, Roosevelt could electrify the Nation in his first inaugural with words that symbolized his own life's philosophy: Today, more than ever, we need Roosevelt's courage of beginning again after defeat.

The third kind of courage for which I remember Franklin Roosevelt is the courage of a genuine humanitarian. One of the most indelible impressions that his personality has left upon us, was his concern for people. More than any other public official since Lincoln, Roosevelt really loved the American people. He deliberately stood for the human side of our economic and social problems. One of the "haves," he always sided with the "have-nots," and the fact that his college and business associates damned him as a traitor to his class, simply reinforced the moral strength of his position as a man who was willing to sacrifice his own privileges for the general good.

I think it is true to say that Roosevelt was a great human being. There are many who disagree fiercely with some of the things he did. Some doubtless are convinced that the whole direction of his policies was wrong. But there are few who, in fairness, will not admit that as a man he was prominent. Whatever his faults, he was bold, resolute, and unswerving of purpose. He was wholly identified with ideals, which he fought for unremittingly, and he became so identified with them that he had the courage to take risks politically and physically that few Presidents have been willing to take. The record of American achievement from 1933–1945 was a Roosevelt record no matter what else, because the President had the courage that he had. Because of his inherent faith in the dignity of human personality he gave the people hope, action, and self-respect.

Toward the end of this century, whether in the coal-mining districts of Pennsylvania or in the irrigated regions of New Mexico, a grandfather will tell his grandson how, when he was a boy, there was a President in Washington: he was born to luxury, and forsook leisure to wage a battle on behalf of the forgotten man; he was paralyzed, but was the most energetic fighter of the times; he came out of banking circles, and was the first to break the autocracy of the captains of finance, for, like Lincoln, he was a genuine friend of the common man. It took the courage of the humanitarian for Franklin Roosevelt to transfer his allegiance from privilege to people.

He wrote his own epitaph in his last words:

The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

vi

Fifty years ago, Woodrow Wilson wrote as a political scientist:

The President is at liberty, both in law and in conscience, to be as big a man as he can. His capacity will set the limit. The Constitution bids him speak, and times of stress and change must more and more thrust upon him the attitude of originator of policies.

Twenty-five years ago, Franklin Roosevelt said:

In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory.

The 28th and the 32d Presidents, in their greatness, fulfilled their conception of the Presidency. So did the 33d, Harry S Truman.

Yet where today is the leadership of frankness and vigor? It is perhaps our greatest weakness that, in a time of unprecedented peril, it is lacking.

Where under Roosevelt the country grew stronger and more united in national purpose, today it has been weakened and confused. After 5 years of the present administration, our defenses are weaker, our alliances are faltering, our prestige in the world is lower. Our economy is stumbling, our educational system is more inadequate, our liberties are less secure.

In national defense, of which General Eisenhower was supposed to be the master, in spite of expenditures of nearly $200 billion, we have lost to the Soviet Union that margin of technological superiority which was the margin of our security. There is no assurance that even extraordinary efforts can regain it—or even assurance that the extraordinary effort will be made.

President Eisenhower himself has told us that "there is no alternative to peace"; but in the all-important search for at least the beginnings of disarmament for peace, he has allowed United States policy to be ambiguous and futile. He has left the conduct of foreign affairs to a Secretary of State whose rigid postures and self-righteous moralisms have complicated relationships with our friends and complicated negotiations with our adversaries. He is pursuing a

foreign policy that follows a twisted course.

The President has misread the lessons of the Marshall plan and point 4 and has consistently subordinated economic and technical development to military aid. He underrates the strength and capacity of the United States economy. We are failing by default to meet the Soviet challenge in economic competition, an area in which we would surely have the advantage. The Indian five-year plan, on which the most important free nation in Asia depends, hangs in the balance for want of American dollars.

At the same time, and for the same reason, the administration neglects the needs of our own people for schools, housing, hospitals, and welfare services—yes, and for the development of our own resources.

The Department of Agriculture is in the hands of a man who stubbornly and dogmatically refuses to recognize the needs of American farmers.

In the face of economic recession, the President is waiting, Hoover-like, in vague confidence that it will get better after it gets worse.

As his leadership has been lacking in vigor, so has it been lacking in that frankness which is the prerequisite for popular understanding and support. The country has been denied both the facts and the gravity of our condition. These have had to be wrung by Congress from the President's own subordinates—and still the country does not know them all. Neither has the President acknowledged the trails of wrongdoing that have led deep into his administration.

The Constitution places on the President the responsibility and authority which are his alone. They cannot be alienated or delegated, by design or default. Congress cannot assume them, even if it wished, and I, for one, have no wish that it should. The Constitution, as Wilson said, summons the President to greatness. For myself, as a Senator, and for all Americans, I beg of the President to heed the summons. In these times of stress and change the people of the Nation will respond, to the utmost limits of their capacity, to the call of leadership. The danger is clear and present. The occasion is piled high with difficulties. I beg the President to respond—clearly, boldly, magnanimously. If he can summon the strength to lead, he will find an eager and dedicated following, as Franklin Roosevelt himself did 25 years ago.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today, the 25th anniversary of the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, it is fitting for the United States to take stock of itself and the times.

A great deal has happened in the past 25 years. Many changes have been made, wars have been fought, and new challenges have risen, both on earth and in the heavens, that are putting mankind to its greatest test.

When Franklin Roosevelt took the office of President, the United States was at one of the low points in its history. The policies of the New Deal unlocked the death grip of economic depression and restored the confidence of free men all over the world. In just a few years, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, democracy came from the depths of a depression to a place of respect and admiration throughout the world.

In many ways the problems of today are the same as 25 years ago.

There were breadlines and people were looking for a day's work for a day's ration on March 4, 1933.

There are breadlines and people are looking for a day's work for a day's ration today.

Heartless, power-mad dictators were pointing their fingers at the United States as a failure in democracy 25 years ago today.

Heartless, power-mad dictators are today pointing their fingers and shouting the same song.

On March 4, 1933, this Nation was in dire need of somebody showing the way to the potentials that awaited it. We needed leadership.

Today, this Nation is in dire need of somebody to show the way to the potentials that await it. We need leadership.

With the blessing of the Almighty, it is not too late for us to find the leadership we need so badly now.

If destiny will provide us with a leader who is bold, who is decisive, and who has imagination, then the problems of the space age will be greatly simplified.

It is that sort of leadership we must search for at a time when we have an apparent bankruptcy of courage and determination at the places it counts most.

The wheel has come a full turn.

Somehow, somewhere, we must find another Roosevelt.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 25 years ago one of the most farsighted Presidents in the history of our Nation assumed office. When Franklin D. Roosevelt was first inaugurated President, the United States was in one of the darkest hours of its peacetime history. Banks were going bankrupt, millions were unemployed, the stock market had crashed, and the spirit of the people was broken.

Out of the darkness, President Roosevelt declared, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Then the new President launched into programs to recover the Nation and put it back on the road to prosperity and productivity. President Roosevelt, like millions of other Americans, had listened to the promises of "prosperity just around the corner" which had emanated from the White House for 4 years during Republican policies. But around the corner were found only more promises. So then the American people elected Franklin D. Roosevelt to be President.

Today, as we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President, it is difficult to realize that the Republican chant of "Prosperity is just around the corner" is again with us. It is like a ghost that is returning from the beyond to haunt us.

But once again the words and deeds of Franklin D. Roosevelt are with us, to keep our Nation out of the depths of despair, abandonment, and deep depression. Again, today the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, for, again, today we have with us the programs that Roosevelt conceived and put into effect.

Were it not for the unemployment compensation program, the social security program, the Federal deposit insurance program, and the other programs inaugurated by Franklin D. Roosevelt, this country would today be in a tailspin no different than the one it was in 25 years ago, when Franklin D. Roosevelt first became President.

Today more than 5 million of our people are unemployed. Today 9 million of our people are drawing social security payments. It can readily be seen that if it were not for Franklin D. Roosevelt's social security program 14 million of our people would today be pounding the streets—without jobs and without incomes; the unemployed would now be in bread and soup lines; the aged would be starving, in cold and want; the unemployed youths would be gangsters; and the banks would be dry of deposits and savings.

Today we can thank God that Roosevelt lived and had the foresight to inaugurate the humanitarian and practical programs he did while he was President.

Today the Republican administration, under the first Republican President since President Hoover, is telling us, once again, that "prosperity is just around the corner" and that the upswing will come in March or in April or in May. This administration is forever saying, "Just wait a little longer." But, Mr. President, although March is now with us, the picture looks no brighter. But I can assure you, Mr. President, that if the upswing does come, it will be a result of the programs founded during the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and not the result of anything the present administration may do, for this is an administration of "stick your head in the sand" and do nothing.

With proper action associated with the great stabilizing programs created by Franklin D. Roosevelt's leadership, even the present Republican administration can return the Nation to full employment and full prosperity and full production. But even the best laid plans can be destroyed by consistent neglect and arrogance.

As we mark the 25th anniversary of the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States, every American should remember the spirit of the man who, despite his major physical handicap, led our Nation out of economic hell and laid the groundwork to keep us out of such despair forever.

We should remember, too, that Franklin D. Roosevelt used every power at his command to begin an all-out, national onslaught against one of the most dreaded diseases of our times. As a result of his initial efforts, today, at long last, we have a means for the prevention of infantile paralysis, which had stricken him and millions of others in this land.

For 25 years since he first became President, in this land there have been

those who have cursed him and everything he ever did, and who, in turn, now curse those who honor the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Personally, Mr. President, I shall forever be proud that I knew and served with Franklin D. Roosevelt. I am confident that one day the critics will have vanished, for every day, as history is being made, their criticisms are being vanquished by the acts and deeds of that man we honor today.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I am very proud to join with my colleagues in memoralizing the life and accomplishments of a great American, Theodore Roosevelt, on occasion of the 53d anniversary of his inauguration as President of the United States in his own right.

The life of Teddy Roosevelt is virtually a legend in American history. I doubt very seriously if any fiction writer could pattern a novel about his life without running the risk of having it called unbelievable. But, he was, indeed, a very real man with a vigor and exuberance of personality and action Americans loved and will never forget.

The contagion of his personality, his character and his boundless energy infected the entire American public. While the successes of his long career of public service were many and momentous, Theodore Roosevelt was revered as much for the ideals he personified as for his vast accomplishments. A devout sense of honor and integrity, a righteous spirit of loyalty and patriotism shaped the policies which guided our Nation's destiny under his direction.

America's heritage from this great man is rich indeed. The record of his illustrious career is a brilliant one which reflects unswerving obedience to his ideals and unbending devotion to his America.

I might say that I am privileged to know his grandson and namesake, Theodore Roosevelt III. He was stationed with the Army near my home city of Louisville, Ky., some years ago and married a Louisville girl. We were hopeful that this tie would bind him to living in Louisville. It was the community's great loss when he chose to move to the east, but we have not abandoned hope that some day he will return to our midst.

In closing, I should like to commend the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission for its excellent programing of activities to refresh the Nation's mind on Theodore Roosevelt's memorable contributions to our American way of life.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on this 25th anniversary of the elevation of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency, and the 53d anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's being sworn into that office, the people of my State pause with those in the rest of the Nation to pay tribute to the two Roosevelts.

Theodore Roosevelt was the first President after the War Between the States to really stir the imagination of the people of Texas and really cause them to rally behind his leadership. A young New Yorker converted into a Montana rancher, he came to San Antonio to organize the Rough Riders, and Texans joined up by legions and followed him up San Juan Hill.

Theodore Roosevelt's conservation policies benefited all the West, but it took the imagination of Franklin D. Roosevelt to create national forests where there was no public land. His administration bought worn-out, infertile, barren hillsides in east Texas, and named them Sam Houston National Forest, Davy Crockett National Forest, and other names dear to Texan hearts. The people in that area loved the names, but smiled at what they thought was F. D. R.'s folly. Today these east Texas national forests are beautiful pine forests, benefiting the people, the lumber mills, and also the counties and school districts which receive a share of the profits of the lumber cut, in lieu of taxes. Acre for acre, the lands in these forests are the most valuable lands in east Texas.

Mr. President, that farsighted act by the greatest humanitarian yet to occupy the White House in the 20th century was only a symbol of his whole 12-year policy of leadership for the people.

I hold in my hand a column written by Drew Pearson on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, published in 1955. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the article is entitled "World Has Changed Since F. D. R. Died." I shall read at this time the last paragraph of that fine article written about Franklin D. Roosevelt:

> When he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. * * * He knew war was inevitable, and began preparing for it. * * * When people were hungry he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. * * * Sometimes he made mistakes. The NRA he recognized as one of his mistakes. * * * Sometimes he did things that were illegal. When Hitler threatened England in 1940, after France fell, and the British lost most of their arms at Dunkirk, F. D. R. emptied our arsenals. In one bold stroke he sent all our arms to England. He knew what the political consequences would be if his gesture failed. For he acted without O. K. from Congress. But he also knew the consequences to the Free World if England fell. * * * He acted illegally. But he acted. And England was saved. * * * I remember in 1933 how poverty-stricken veterans came straggling into Washington, a few at a time. Herbert Hoover let them pile up—until an army of 20,000 was driven out of Washington by tanks and cavalry. * * * F. D. R. collected them as they came to Washington, a dozen at a time, took them to Fort Hunt, fed them, sent them back home to WPA officials to get jobs. * * * Veterans continued to straggle in during the early days of his administration, but he never let a bonus army pile up in the Nation's Capital. * * * That was one great difference between F. D. R. and some other Presidents who occupy or who have occupied the White House.

That was written 2 years ago.

When that dynamic voice called out, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," the American people recognized a leader. They thrilled to the challenge, "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

Mr. President, that leader has gone, but this generation has not gone, it remembers his words and deeds, and our rendezvous with destiny envelops every minute of our lives.

America needs leadership now to visualize for the people the perils and duties of this hour, and to call America again to greatness. America longs for leadership.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's greatest legacy to America is his example of bold, untimid leadership in the face of every danger. By what he did he has shown us what we can do.

Mr. President, despite the apparent vacuum, leadership will be found. The Franklin D. Roosevelt tradition will not die out in this land.

EXHIBIT 1

WORLD HAS CHANGED SINCE F. D. R. DIED

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—A lot of things have happened since that day 10 years ago when F. D. R. passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach. * * * And then his body came home—came back on a flag-draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President. * * * The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, F. D. R. hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again—then back to Washington to lie in the East Room of the White House—silent and alone * * *. But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers, seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he was working for them. And they knew they had lost a friend.

The little man who took his place, a humble man, was in SAM RAYBURN'S office late in the afternoon when he got a phone call to come to the White House immediately. White-faced and grim, he left. He knew what the call meant. * * * At the White House later Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States. The Cabinet stood by shocked and shaken. Miss Perkins, who had known F. D. R. since their early reform days in Albany, broke down and wept. Henry L. Stimson, a Republican who had served in three Cabinets and who once had battled against young F. D. R. in New York State, also wept—unabashed. * * * He had opposed Roosevelt on domestic issues, served in his Cabinet on national issues. * * * Henry Morgenthau looked 10 years older. * * * The new President, shaken, nervous, finally went home to his apartment, suddenly discovered he was hungry. * * * The icebox was empty, so a neighbor brought in roast beef and ice cream. Thus, after 12 years under one President, a new administration began to function.

TIME CHANGES

The funeral train that carried F. D. R. to Hyde Park was crowded with Cabinet members and old friends. They stayed awake most of the night. Outside as the train

passed were bonfires, people standing, waiting to pay homage to the last visible remains of their dead leader. All night through Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, New York, people stood along the tracks. * * * At Hyde Park the Cabinet and the Supreme Court stood on one side of the rose garden, opposite the grave. The new President stood on the other side. With him were Mike Riley of the Secret Service, Mrs. Truman—and Jimmie Byrnes. Jimmie, who had left Washington, supposedly for good, just 2 weeks before, had hastily flown back to board the funeral train. * * * Taps were blown. A West Point cadet handed Mrs. Roosevelt the flag which had been draped over her husband's bier. She bore up well. * * * The dead President was lowered into his grave.

That night as the special train rolled back to Washington, Harry Truman spent most of his time with three men—Jimmie Byrnes, Ed Pauley, George Allen. Of these, only Pauley, the California oilman, continues close to him. Byrnes, whom Truman appointed to the highest Cabinet post, has fought him bitterly, tried to carry South Carolina for Eisenhower. * * * George Allen, who was given high honor by Truman and a lush job in the RFC, is now Eisenhower's partner in the farm at Gettysburg and in a Howard Johnson restaurant.

CHURCHILL ERRED AT YALTA

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office, the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name. * * * In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory. He lived to defend himself * * *. Some years ago, before he came back as Prime Minister, Churchill confided to a friend that he wished he had passed on as Roosevelt did at the height of victory, at the glorious climax of the war. * * * However, he lived to enjoy other glories, lived to defend himself, and I for one am glad he did. * * * No one attacked Churchill for the mistakes he made at Yalta. They attacked the dead man who could not defend himself.

F. D. R. did not promote me to high office, did me no favors. He fired my father, a Republican appointed governor of the Virgin Islands by Hoover, and once in the heat of battle he called me a liar. * * * However, I rise to defend some of his great qualities * * * when he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. * * * He knew war was inevitable and began preparing for it. * * * When people were hungry he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. * * * Sometimes he made mistakes. The NRA he recognized as one of his mistakes. * * * Sometimes he did things that were illegal. When Hitler threatened England in 1940 after France fell, and the British lost most of their arms at Dunkirk, F. D. R. emptied our arsenals. In one bold stroke he sent all our arms to England. He knew what the political consequences would be if his gesture failed. For he acted without O. K. from Congress. But he also knew the consequences to the Free World if England fell. * * * He acted illegally. But he acted. England was saved. * * * I remember in 1932 how poverty-stricken veterans came straggling into Washington, a few at a time. Herbert Hoover let them pile up—until an army of 20,000 was driven out of Washington by tanks and cavalry. * * * F. D. R. collected them as they came to Washington, a dozen at a time, took them to Fort Hunt, fed them, sent them back home to WPA officials to get jobs. * * * Veterans continued to straggle in during the early days of his administration but he never let a bonus army pile up in the Nation's capital. * * * That was one great difference between F. D. R. and some other Presidents who occupy or have occupied the White House.

THE TWO ROOSEVELTS—A DOUBLE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today, March 4, 1958, marks a double anniversary for the United States. As part of the observation of the centenary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth, it is fitting that his inauguration as President should be celebrated.

Equally, the 25th anniversary of the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt is a signal occasion for our Nation.

They were related by blood. Perhaps even more, they were related in spirit and philosophy.

Both Roosevelts were hearty optimists and intrepid battlers for the causes in which they believed and in their devotion to the interests of the people of the country, especially when selfish or short-sighted groups were opposed to those interests.

As the Nation celebrates the 100th anniversary of T. R.'s birth, I think it worth noting that we seem to be getting an expurgated version of Theodore Roosevelt. For example, the Director of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission presented in the New York Times of October 17, 1957, a collection of excerpts from Roosevelt's writings supposedly designed to indicate his significance for the troubled mid-20th century. The quotations were pretty thin stuff for Theodore Roosevelt. Amazingly enough there was not a quotation or mention relating to Theodore Roosevelt's major themes, namely, conservation and anti-monopoly programs.

Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt were men of action with controversial philosophies. Both began their political careers in the New York State Legislature, not as party regulars, but as mavericks.

THE CONSERVATIONISTS

Both men were vigorous leaders and pointed the way to the future, building on the past, but never imprisoned by it.

Today many speeches are being made about both Roosevelts. I would comment on just three major characteristics and ideals these great Americans had in common.

Theodore Roosevelt, along with the great Gifford Pinchot, fathered the conservation movement in this country—and, indeed, gave it worldwide impetus. Irresponsible exploitation of forests, agricultural land, ranges, and streams was rampant at the close of the 19th century. Roosevelt and Pinchot blocked that kind of unthinking, unwise exploitation with an idea—and the energy and programs to put the idea into action.

For example, a major portion of T. R.'s eighth annual message to Congress dwelled upon the evil of deforestation and erosion in China, as an example of what could befall our rich land.

It will be recalled that in many speeches in the Senate in recent years I have talked about China—once a surplus-food China, once a China with heavy forests, once a China with deep topsoil. In each of those speeches I have warned that if we follow the Eisenhower course of action in the field of natural resources, we shall create a second China, on too many hundreds of thousands of acres of land in the United States, because the man now occupying the White House apparently has never caught even a glimpse of inspiration from a Teddy Roosevelt, a Pinchot, or a Franklin Roosevelt, in regard to the importance of any President of any party sitting in the White House at any time protecting the heritage of generations of Americans yet to come in their own natural resources.

Much that I have had to say about China as a sad precedent, comes directly from Teddy Roosevelt. In his eighth annual message to the Congress when he was President he had this to say:

> What has thus happened in northern China, what has happened in central Asia, in Palestine, in North Africa, in parts of the Mediterranean countries of Europe, will surely happen in our country if we do not exercise that wise forethought which should be one of the chief marks of any people calling itself civilized.

The entire passage is of such great interest I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the excerpt may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this discussion by Teddy Roosevelt in his eighth annual message is one of the best writings on the whole problem of conservation of our natural resources. It is a very sad thing, that following Franklin Roosevelt and a Truman, who but sought to implement and effectuate the sound conservation programs of Teddy Roosevelt, we should have now a Republican President who shows—to be most kind—such gross ignorance of the entire problem of conserving natural resources.

The kindest thing we can say about Dwight D. Eisenhower in this field is that he is simply ignorant about it. There is much circumstantial evidence that would justify one in saying that it cannot all be explained on the ground of ignorance.

However, I think the avarice, the dollar-grasping, the motivation of exploiting the heritage of the American people in God's gift to them of their natural resources, cannot be ascribed to the President himself, but to men—for whom he is completely responsible—namely, his underlings in the palace guard and the departments which are under the handmaidens or the tools of the great monopoly interests of the country, which are attempting to ravage the natural resources for a quick dollar under the Eisenhower administration.

Would that I could get President Eisenhower to read something besides western stories. Would that I could get the President to read a little of Teddy Roosevelt. It would dispel some of his ignorance. I can think of nothing for Dwight

D. Eisenhower to read better than Teddy Roosevelt's eighth annual message to the Congress of the United States on the subject of natural resources. It would be much better, I should think, for his own peace of mind, and certainly for the American people, if he would do something about it after reading it, by way of following the great conservationist philosophy of a truly great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt. Reading the great discussions by Teddy Roosevelt on the conservation of our natural resources would do much good.

Both Teddy Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt believed what was new for the time, although it is accepted today—that all aspects of conservation are interrelated. They dramatized the need for forest preservation and reforestation for soil conservation, flood control and recreation. They demonstrated that these purposes and power production—which aided the others—must be undertaken on a basinwide scale.

Theodore Roosevelt insisted that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to devise, undertake and supervise basin development for maximum multipurpose benefits to the public.

We talk about full river basin development. We talk about multipurpose development. We talk about maximum development of the electric power potentials of the streams of America. That is not talk of recent years only. It is not talk confined to even such a recent past as George Norris, Bob La Follette, Hiram Johnson, William Borah, and other great liberals who have walked the carpet on the floor of the United States Senate. This is the inspiration and the idealism of a Teddy Roosevelt and a Gifford Pinchot about which I am speaking this afternoon.

I have underlined in my speech Teddy Roosevelt's principle and I wish to read it again for emphasis.

Theodore Roosevelt insisted that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to devise, undertake, and supervise basin development for maximum multipurpose benefits to the public.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the greatest exponent of Theodore Roosevelt's conservation philosophy and program.

Indeed, he revived it after years of disregard under Republican administrations, particularly of a Harding, a Coolidge, and a Hoover, because during that period of time we saw the beginnings of the shocking giveaway program of the Eisenhower administration. I am always a little amused when President Eisenhower indicates, at a press conference or elsewhere, a little petulance because there are those who dare tell the American people that he is the greatest giveaway President in our history in the matter of natural resources.

When F. D. R. became President, as with Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot came on the scene. The Civilian Conservation Corps, which was one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first steps, came to him right after his election in 1932 from Gifford Pinchot. Here again was Pinchot sensing that there was again real leadership in the White House ready to use conservation to bring us up by our bootstraps in the battle against depression. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, himself a forest-land owner, knew the merit of the Pinchot idea and with his characteristic vigor breathed life into it.

One has only to study Franklin D. Roosevelt's record as a State senator and Governor of New York to know that conservation was a field where he had vast experience. In his term as governor he had initiated programs which enabled New York to add rundown lands to its State forest system. Today New York is dotted with these well-managed State forests—an everlasting tribute to his wisdom.

The Civilian Conservation Corps program performed much the same thing on the national level. In 10 years as many as 500,000 young men who could not obtain work were given useful work. Two million acres of land were planted to trees, 4 million more were improved, 100,000 miles of service roads were built in our national forests; 56,000 miles of firebreaks were built, forest insects, disease, and fire were battled. The accomplishments of these men were great as they advanced to the vision of Teddy Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Gifford Pinchot. But the real wonder of the plan was what it did for our people. In Oregon, boys from Alabama and New York met in CCC camps. They learned trades, they learned about conservation, they learned about our great country. I say that the real accomplishment of the CCC was the conservation and development of the young people of our Nation.

Franklin D. Roosevelt helped the lumber industry to get started in conservation with his NRA. It had a clause which committed the industry to use sound cutting practices. Despite the short life of the NRA the idea planted by that code has developed until today a still small but growing segment of this industry is converting to sustained yield-cutting practices. It was because we had a man of vision in the White House that progress in forestry got its big boost.

Under Franklin D. Roosevelt substantial acreages were added to the national forests and these lands were restored to forest. Fire prevention and tree planting, which started under the Clark-McNary Act, were expanded. The O. and C. lands in Oregon, which had been revested from the railroads in 1916, were put under sustained yield forestry in a plan worked out by the late great Senator from Oregon, Charles McNary, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—a great Republican Senator and a great Democratic President—working together, as we ought to work together, in complete cooperation on a matter so greatly concerned with the interests of the public. The Taylor Grazing Act which provided the first real legislation for managing the public-domain lands under the Interior Department was enacted in 1934 under Franklin Roosevelt.

Turn to the farm for a moment and think of the Rural Electrification Administration. In 1931, while Governor of New York, Franklin Roosevelt worked with Morris Cooke and Gifford Pinchot to develop a study on how to distribute low-cost electricity to farms in the State. In 1934, Cooke took his idea to Roosevelt and by Executive order on May 11, 1935, the REA was born. Later Congress authorized it. In 1933, only 10 farms in 100 had electricity. By 1956, 94 out of every 100 farms had the benefits of electricity. REA is a story in itself. The power companies did not realize that the farmer was a good market for electricity. Today they call REA socialism and want to take it over. How times have changed. If it were not for the insight of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the farmer today might still be in the age of the lantern.

The Soil Conservation Service was started as an embryo in 1903 by Teddy Roosevelt with Hugh Bennett in charge. When finally life was breathed into this agency, it was delivered by "Dr." Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I could speak all afternoon on the work this fine agency has done. I think a few brief highlights tell the story: Soil conservation districts adopt conservation standards by democratic referendum. The farmers participate. This tells the story in a sentence.

Closely associated with the Soil Conservation Service, although the Forest Service did much of the work, was the shelter belts of the Midwest. This again was a Roosevelt idea—his own—and he was ridiculed by many at the time.

Franklin D. Roosevelt came out in support of a program of planting, across the Great Plains areas of the United States, at relatively short intervals, great strips of trees extending hundreds and hundreds of miles. As I have been heard to point out before, there were reactionary Republican editors across the Western States who thought that at last they had some proof that Franklin Roosevelt was not mentally sound, and they wrote editorials to that effect. Today, of course, it is generally recognized how sound he was and how regrettable it is that his full program was not inaugurated. Franklin Roosevelt in those days was warning about a dust bowl. Franklin Roosevelt was warning in those days of the dangers of putting the point of a plow blade into tens of thousands of acres of prairie land that never should have had a furrow turned in it, if we are to avoid erosions like the Dust Bowl. Furthermore I would have the American people keep in mind that one of the things that conservationists recognize is that great historic teaching that we cannot erode our natural resources without eroding our civilization; that we cannot erode our land on a national scale without eroding the standards of our people. It has terrific effect upon human life as well as upon soil and forests and streams.

In paying tribute to these two great conservationists, Teddy Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt, I could not possibly do better, particularly in view of my own personal convictions in regard to this great issue, than to stress the contributions these two statesmen have made in the whole problem of conservation, and, in contrast, to point out how completely lacking in understanding is the present occupant of the White House in regard to this problem.

Under the Midwest tree belt program, in 7 years, some 200 millions of trees were planted on some 30,000 farms. Eighteen thousand miles of trees were planted. Ninety-five percent of them are still in existence, and most of them are flourishing. Mr. President, ask any farmer in the Midwest, and you will know that the shelter belt was a success.

It was F. D. R. who took the programs of Norris, La Follette, Borah, Dill, Bone, and McNary and gave them life and form in TVA, at Bonneville Dam, and at Grand Coulee.

They did more than to advocate and obtain the construction of great dam systems.

THE ANTIMONOPOLISTS

Both Roosevelts also insured that these magnificent and fruitful public developments would redound to the maximum benefit of the greatest number—not to be monopolized by a few.

So the Reclamation Act of 1902 contained two historic antimonopoly provisions: the limitation of irrigation benefits to family sized farms; and the electric-power preference clause for nonprofit public agencies.

F. D. R. made sure that these antimonopoly features were ingrained in TVA and the Bonneville and Columbia Basin—Grand Coulee—acts.

They were an integral part of their common philosophy that the free enterprise system functions best when competition flourishes and monopoly is prevented. They believed with the early English court which stated the principle: "Competition is an ease to the people."

PRINCIPLE FIRST—PARTY SECOND

Both Roosevelts, great and dynamic party leaders though they were, placed political purposes and ideals above partisanship.

In 1912, Theodore Roosevelt bolted his party when it renominated President Taft, whom he believed to be too conservative for the times. So was launched the Bull Moose movement. It was not a success, at least at the polls in 1912. But it was a great example of political independence not lost upon the great progressives who soon followed.

In my judgment, the great movement of the mavericks in American politics has accomplished much by way of setting the pace for the leaders of the parties who are not so anxious, usually, as they should be, to translate into legislation the principles of the general welfare clause of the Constitution.

Although the Bull Moose movement was defeated in 1912, it should not be regarded, and it is not being regarded, in history as a lost cause. To the contrary, many of the proposals of the Bull Moose movement, many of the liberal progressive principles of the Bull Moose movement, now happen to be the law of the land. That is why I am so prone to ask some of my colleagues from time to time in the Senate, what is wrong with being defeated on some issue at the present moment? True, the liberals are perfectly willing to take their defeat today and to wait for the dawn of a better day, knowing that if, on the evidence and the principles involved in their case, they are right from the standpoint of the general welfare of the people of the Nation, sooner or later their point of view will prevail.

That has been the record of the great liberal, maverick movements, such as the Teddy Roosevelt movement in 1912 and the great progressive movement of 1924, the latter under two liberals, one a Republican, the other a Democrat—the Republican being the senior La Follette, and the Democrat, Burton K. Wheeler.

Well I remember that election because, as a young man, I campaigned in the Midwest for the Progressive ticket in 1924. It is interesting now, in retrospect, to take the platform of La Follette and Wheeler and to see how they predated the great liberal movement of the New Deal under Franklin Roosevelt and the Fair Deal under Harry Truman.

I frequently have said to my Democratic colleagues in the Senate: "You had better recognize that the predated New Dealers were those who in 1924 fought for the cause of the Progressive Party, which was defeated."

I stress the great characteristic of Teddy Roosevelt of being willing to put what he considered matters of principle above partisanship.

In that connection, Franklin D. Roosevelt, it will be remembered, made a speech for George Norris in 1936 when Norris was running as an independent against both a Republican and a Democrat. In 1938, he said in his Jefferson-Jackson Day speech:

> My father and grandfather were Democrats and I was born and brought up as a Democrat, but in 1904, when I cast my first vote for a President, I voted for the Republican candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, because I thought he was a better Democrat than the Democratic candidate.

That is principle above politics. I should like to put that statement on the desk of every Democratic Senator. They ought to look at it, because there was one of the greatest of the great Democrats who made it perfectly clear that he would not hesitate to put what he considered to be the welfare of the country above a partisan stand of his party at any time. I recommend that principle to Democrats. I used to recommend it to the Republicans, when my seat was on the other side of the aisle, but to no avail. At least, I have a few partners on this side of the aisle who share this principle of political philosophy—a common principle of both a Teddy Roosevelt and a Franklin Roosevelt.

It may be recalled that in 1904, the year when Franklin Roosevelt said he cast his first vote, the Democratic candidate was Alton Parker, of Roosevelt's own State of New York.

Neither of the Roosevelts was a narrow partisan either in political philosophy or on a geographical basis. They were constitutional liberals.

LIP SERVICE OR PUBLIC SERVICE?

Much has been said and will be said this year on both Roosevelts. These eulogies are deserved. They can recall us to our duty as a nation and as politicians.

Both Roosevelts were among the most beloved—and hated—men of their times. They were great builders and leaders.

They were great liberals.

I ask: Will the Republican Party of today follow Theodore Roosevelt or does his sanctity as a Republican symbol increase only the farther he recedes in time?

And I ask my Democratic brethren: Will we follow the liberalism of F. D. R. or treat him as a kitchen god to be honored in name but not in deed?

In a world beset with peril, in a domestic economic situation beset with danger, do we pause to do lip service only? Or shall we take the ideals and deeds of both Roosevelts as sound guides for expanding the strength and opportunities of this democratic republic?

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, the constitutional liberalism of a Teddy Roosevelt and a Franklin Roosevelt. I say it is past the time to proceed to put into legislative practice the great constitutional liberalism of those two great statesmen.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPT FROM PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S EIGHTH ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, DECEMBER 8, 1908

[From State Paper, vol. 15, pp. 518–523]

All serious students of the question are aware of the great damage that has been done in the Mediterranean countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa by deforestation. The similar damage that has been done in eastern Asia is less well known. A recent investigation into conditions in north China by Mr. Frank N. Meyer, of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture, has incidentally furnished in very striking fashion proof of the ruin that comes from reckless deforestation of mountains, and of the further fact that the damage once done may prove practically irreparable. So important are these investigations that I herewith attach as an appendix to my message certain photographs showing present conditions in China. They show in vivid fashion the appalling desolation, taking the shape of barren mountains and gravel and sand-covered plains, which immediately follows and depends upon the deforestation of the mountains. Not many centuries ago the country of northern China was one of the most fertile and beautiful spots in the entire world, and was heavily forested. We know this not only from the old Chinese records, but from the accounts given by the traveler Marco Polo. He, for instance, mentions that in visiting the Provinces of Shansi and Shensi he observed many plantations of mulberry trees. Now there is hardly a single mulberry tree in either of these Provinces, and the culture of the silkworm has moved farther south, to regions of atmospheric moisture. As an illustration of the complete change in the rivers, we may take Polo's statement that a certain river, the Hun Ho, was so large and deep that merchants ascended it from the sea with heavily laden boats; today this river is simply a broad sandy bed, with shallow, rapid currents wandering hither and thither across it, absolutely unnavigable. But we do not have to depend upon written records. The dry wells, and the wells with water far below the former watermark, bear testimony to the good days of the past and the evil days of the present. Wherever the native vegetation has been allowed to remain, as, for instance, here and there around a sacred temple or imperial burying ground, there are still huge trees and tangled jungle, fragments of the glorious ancient forests.

The thick, matted forest growth formerly covered the mountains to their summits. All

natural factors favored this dense forest growth, and as long as it was permitted to exist the plains at the foot of the mountains were among the most fertile on the globe, and the whole country was a garden. Not the slightest effort was made, however, to prevent the unchecked cutting of the trees, or to secure reforestation. Doubtless, for many centuries the tree cutting by the inhabitants of the mountains worked but slowly in bringing about the changes that have now come to pass; doubtless, for generations the inroads were scarcely noticeable. But there came a time when the forest had shrunk sufficiently to make each year's cutting a serious matter, and from that time on the destruction proceeded with appalling rapidity; for, of course, each year of destruction rendered the forest less able to recuperate, less able to resist next year's inroad. Mr. Meyer describes the ceaseless progress of the destruction even now, when there is so little left to destroy. Every morning, men and boys go out armed with mattox or ax, scale the steepest mountainsides, and cut down and grub out, root and branch, the small trees and shrubs still to be found. The big trees disappeared centuries ago, so that now one of these is never seen save in the neighborhood of temples, where they are artificially protected; and even here it takes all the watch and care of the tree-loving priests to prevent their destructions. Each family, each community, where there is no common care exercised in the interest of all of them to prevent deforestation, finds its profit in the immediate use of the fuel which would otherwise be used by some other family or some other community. In the total absence of regulation of the matter in the interest of the whole people, each small group is inevitably pushed into a policy of destruction which cannot afford to take thought for the morrow. This is just one of those matters which it is fatal to leave to unsupervised individual control. The forest can only be protected by the State, by the Nation; and the liberty of action of individuals must be conditioned upon what the State or Nation determines to be necessary for the common safety.

The lesson of deforestation in China is a lesson which mankind should have learned many times already from what has occurred in other places. Denudation leaves naked soil; then gullying cuts down to the bare rock; and meanwhile the rock waste buries the bottom lands. When the soil is gone, men must go; and the process does not take long.

This ruthless destruction of the forests in northern China has brought about, or has aided in bringing about, desolation, just as the destruction of the forests in central Asia aided in bringing ruin to the once rich central Asian cities; just as the destruction of the forests in northern Africa helped toward the ruin of a region that was a fertile granary in Roman days. Shortsighted man, whether barbaric, semicivilized, or what he mistakenly regards as fully civilized, when he has destroyed the forests, has rendered certain the ultimate destruction of the land itself. In northern China the mountains are now such as are shown by the accompanying photographs, absolutely barren peaks. Not only have the forests been destroyed, but because of their destruction the soil has been washed off the naked rock. The terrible consequence is that it is impossible now to undo the damage that has been done. Many centuries would have to pass before soil would again collect, or could be made to collect, in sufficient quantity once more to support the old-time forest growth. In consequence the Mongol Desert is practically extending eastward over northern China. The climate has changed and is still changing. It has changed even within the last half century, as the work of tree destruction has been consummated. The great masses of arboreal vegetation on the mountains formerly absorbed the heat of the sun and sent up currents of cool air which brought the moisture-laden clouds lower and forced them to precipitate in rain a part of their burden of water. Now that there is no vegetation, the barren mountains, scorched by the sun, send up currents of heated air which drive away instead of attracting the rain clouds, and cause their moisture to be disseminated. In consequence, instead of the regular and plentiful rains which existed in these regions of China when the forests were still in evidence, the unfortunate inhabitants of the deforested lands now see their crops refuse longer to grow at all. That everything dries out faster than formerly is shown by the fact that the level of the wells all over the land has sunk perceptibly, many of them having become totally dry. In addition to the resulting agricultural distress, the watercourses have changed. Formerly they were narrow and deep, with an abundance of clear water the year around; for the roots and humus of the forests caught the rainwater and let it escape by slow, regular seepage. They have now become broad, shallow stream beds, in which muddy water trickles in slender currents during the dry seasons, while when it rains there are freshets, and roaring muddy torrents come tearing down, bringing disaster and destruction everywhere. Moreover, these floods and freshets, which diversify the general dryness, wash away from the mountainsides, and either wash away or cover in the valleys, the rich fertile soil which it took tens of thousands of years for nature to form; and it is lost forever, and until the forests grow again it cannot be replaced. The sand and stones from the mountainsides are washed loose and come rolling down to cover the arable lands, and in consequence, throughout this part of China, many formerly rich districts are now sandy wastes, useless for human cultivation and even for pasture. The cities have been of course seriously affected, for the streams have gradually ceased to be navigable. There is testimony that even within the memory of men now living there has been a serious diminution of the rainfall of northeastern China. The level of the Sungari River in northern Manchuria has been sensibly lowered during the last 50 years, at least partly as the result of the indiscriminate cutting of the forests forming its watershed. Almost all the rivers of northern China have become uncontrollable, and very dangerous to the dwellers along their banks, as a direct result of the destruction of the forests. The journey from Peking to Jehol shows in melancholy fashion how the soil has been washed away from whole valleys so that they have been converted into deserts.

In northern China this disastrous process has gone on so long and has proceeded so far that no complete remedy could be applied. There are certain mountains in China from which the soil is gone so utterly that only the slow action of the ages could again restore it; although, of course, much could be done to prevent the still further eastward extension of the Mongolian Desert if the Chinese Government would act at once. The accompanying cuts from photographs show the inconceivable desolation of the barren mountains in which certain of these rivers rise—mountains, be it remembered, which formerly supported dense forests of larches and firs, now unable to produce any wood, and because of their condition a source of danger to the whole country. The photographs also show the same rivers after they have passed through the mountains, the beds having become broad and sandy because of the deforestation of the mountains. One of the photographs shows a caravan passing through a valley. Formerly, when the mountains were forested, it was thickly peopled by prosperous peasants. Now the floods have carried destruction all over the land and the valley is a stony desert. Another photograph shows a mountain road covered with the stones and rocks that are brought down in the rainy season from the mountains which have already been deforested by human hands. Another shows a pebbly river bed in southern Manchuria where what was once a great stream has dried up owing to the deforestation in the mountains. Only some scrub wood is left, which will disappear within a half century. Yet another shows the effect of one of the washouts, destroying an arable mountainside, these washouts being due to the removal of all vegetation; yet in this photograph the foreground shows that reforestation is still a possibility in places.

What has thus happened in northern China, what has happened in central Asia, in Palestine, in North Africa, in parts of the Mediterranean countries of Europe will surely happen in our country if we do not exercise that wise forethought which should be one of the chief marks of any people calling itself civilized. Nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of the preservation of the forests, and it is criminal to permit individuals to purchase a little gain for themselves through the destruction of forests when this destruction is fatal to the well-being of the whole country in the future.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. Doc. No. 80)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $1,423,236, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED HOUSING ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN POWER BILLINGS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of power billings and related activities under Atomic Energy Commission contracts for electric power with Ohio Valley Electric Corp., Electric Energy, Inc., and Tennessee Valley Authority, for the 18-month period ended December 31, 1956

(with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on a tort claim paid by that Bureau, during the calendar year 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

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

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies or orders granting the applications of certain aliens found admissible into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, at Santa Rosa, Calif., favoring the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations on Government economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, at Santa Rosa, Calif., relating to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL AREA PUBLIC HEALTH COUNCIL, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at their January 30, 1958, meeting, the St. Paul Area Public Health Council, St. Paul, Minn., adopted a resolution urging the continued present Federal subsidy arrangements for school lunch and milk.

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

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

Resolved, Whereas there is a need to continue the school lunch and milk program in the interests of child growth and development,

Whereas there is a need for program subsidy and for surplus foods to hold the pupil lunch costs to a level where schoolchildren of modest means can purchase a school lunch; be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to continue the present Federal subsidy arrangements for school lunch and milk, and to make available an adequate supply of surplus foods for these purposes until a workable plan can be established whereby the various States can provide the full subsidy and obtain the necessary surplus foods.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS AT FULL PARITY LEVEL—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Cloverleaf Local of the National Farmers Union went on record on March 1, 1958, at Crookston, Minn., supporting farm prices at full parity level, and opposing any recommendation to lower farm price support levels.

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

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

Whereas agriculture is a major industry in this community and in Minnesota; and

Whereas the lowering of farm supports on dairy products, wheat, corn, and the feed grains would create increased hardship in our area; and

Whereas price protection is needed on livestock and poultry because these products make up a large percentage of the cash farm income of this community; and

Whereas the community is losing millions of dollars in income and purchasing power each year because farmers are not receiving prices which give them a return equal to the cost of production and living; and

Whereas the farm credit situation is serious and capital is lacking both to finance 1958 operations and to make the needed repairs and replacements on the farm; and

Whereas the lack of farm buying power is holding back a large volume of purchases, repairs, and investment in new buildings and machinery, which contribute in turn to a drop in business activity and employment in the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, we, the Cloverleaf Local of Farmers Union, urge the Congress to take into consideration that the best and most direct method of forestalling the growing business recession and aiding small business in our community, would be to take immediate steps to restore farm prices to a full parity level; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to oppose the recommendations for still lower farm price support levels, and instead to approve measures which will restore farm prices to a higher level at which the sale of farm products will give farmers a fair purchasing power; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Members of the House and Senate in the Congress and to other interested officials.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 6, 1958, the American Legion Post 617 at Eagle Lake, Minn., adopted a resolution urging the passage of S. 2966, providing for pensions to widows and children of World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War I.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

FEBRUARY 15, 1958.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On February 6, 1958, Post 617 of the American Legion at Eagle Lake, Minn., passed the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved,* That Eagle Lake Post 617, American Legion, Eagle Lake, Minn., is in favor of the passage of Senate bill 2966 now before Congress."

The officers and members of Post 617 respectfully urge your support for the bill, which would provide for the payment of a pension to widows and children of World War II and the Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War I.

Very truly yours,

NICK HASSELFELDT, *Commander.*
O. A. ANDERSON, *Vice Commander.*
WAYNE R. WILL, *Adjutant.*

CURTAILMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Wm. Laidlaw Post 208, of the American Legion, at Minneapolis, Minn., adopted a resolution on February 21, 1958, opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter signed by Commander Glenn Dornfield and the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

WILLIAM LAIDLAW POST NO. 208,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Minneapolis, Minn.,
February 27, 1958.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am forwarding to you the resolution, that was discussed and drawn up at our regular meeting January 17, 1958. This resolution was then voted upon at our regular meeting February 21, 1958. The resolution passed unopposed.

Our membership is 500. We truly feel you should oppose any action against veterans' benefits.

I wish to thank you for answering my previous communication on this subject of veterans' benefits.

Yours truly,

GLENN DORNFIELD, *Commander.*

Whereas in the present Congress there are many legislative bills and proposals to reduce veterans' pensions, to make small lump-sum

payments against all future claims to veterans with war disabilities and to merge the programs administered by the Veterans' Administration with Federal social-security programs and to freeze the number of beds available in veterans' hospitals; and

Whereas it is the policy of the American Legion to oppose any such legislative or administrative attempts to merge the Veterans' Administration programs with the social-security programs; and

Whereas it is the policy of the American Legion to oppose any cutbacks on present veterans' pensions or hospital beds available: Therefore be it

Resolved by Wm. Laidlaw Post, No. 208, department of Minnesota, the American Legion, in regular meeting duly assembled on the 17th day of January 1958, That it does hereby go on record as being opposed to any lowering of income limitations, to any such reduction in veterans' pensions and against making any lump-sum payments against future veterans' claims and against freezing the number of beds now available in veterans' hospitals and against the merging of the Veterans' Administration program with social security; and be it further

Resolved, That each member should write their Senators and Congressmen in Washington, D. C., and that a copy of this resolution be sent by the adjutant of this post to the fifth district.

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Mower County, Minn., relating to the improvement of Route 391, as a part of the Federal system of highways. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Be it resolved, That the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota in the planning and construction of Federal Interstate Route 391 through Mower County, Minn., do the following, in addition to the proposed plans:

1. Put a bridge across said Route 391 for county State aid Highway No. 19 and an extension thereof to the north, for the reason that the Rose Creek School District includes land north of said Route 391, and without this bridge there will be no access to this school area; for the further reason that the Rose Creek fire department and milk route and farm business area lies, in part, north of said Route 391, and without this bridge this area will be cut off and there will be no access to it.

2. Put a service road on the south side of said Route 391 across sections 1, 2, and 3 in Windom Township and section 6 in Marshall Township and section 5 in Marshall Township, connecting with the present trunk Highway No. 16, for the reason that, in view of the location and position of the township roads in this area, the school, bus, milk, and mail routes and farm travel will have to retrace and backtrack on their routes without the service drive above mentioned.

3. Put a bridge across said Route 391 for a county State aid Highway No. 1, in addition to the bridge across said Route 391, for county State aid Highway No. 15, for the reason that the said Route 391 divides the Grand Meadow School District and divides the Stewartville School District and divides the Grand Meadow fire protection district, milk and mail routes, and telephone lines and farm business area, and without both of these bridges these areas will have no access to each other.

The failure to bridge 1 of these 2 county State aid highways at Route 391 will result in substantial interference with the maintenance of the unbridged highway.

That, in general, the cost of all of the above additions to the present proposed plans will be considerably less than the added damages to the individual farmers involved if these additions are not made.

That, in general, the said Route 391 will constitute a barrier and separate school and fire districts, business trade areas, and milk and mail routes, and the purpose of the foregoing additions is to alleviate this as much as possible; be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota, in the planning and construction of Federal Interstate Route 391, take whatever other steps are necessary to provide access through and along and eliminate insofar as possible the barrier of said Route 391 separating these said districts, areas, and routes; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following: Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota, State Senator P. J. Holand, State Representative Jacob Herzog, United States Senator Edward H. Thye, United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and the successor of Congressman August H. Andresen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 3262. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1342).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H. J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958 (Rept. No. 1343).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 10881. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1344).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3392. A bill establishing the time for commencement and completion of the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3393. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a tax credit for certain investments in small-business enterprises made during the period beginning March 1, 1958, and ending February 28, 1959; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3395. A bill to provide for the payment of an old-age pension to persons who have attained 65 years of age, if male, and 60 years of age if female; and

S. 3396. A bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue to apply as schedules of ratings and reductions in earning capacity from certain injuries the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1925 and 1945 editions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3397. A bill to amend section 703 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, relating to longevity step increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 3398. A bill to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act; and

S. 3399. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 3400. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MUNDT):

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship; ordered to lie on the table.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. IVES, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to request the President to proclaim March as "Neighborhood House Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MALONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 270) declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that Eric Johnston should immediately register and report as a lobbyist; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MALONE, which appears under a separate heading.)

ACTION BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PERMITTING CHANGES IN CERTAIN CODES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 271), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not, without specific authorization by law, authorize or permit any television broadcasting station to impose a toll, fee, subscription, or other charge, directly or indirectly, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs received over television sets located in the home.

INCREASED MILEAGE OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there are 26 States in the Union which, in earlier years, constructed toll roads, and since the enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956—establishing the Interstate Highway System—these roads, in portion or as a whole, have been designated as a part of the Interstate System.

The total mileage of toll facilities which has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce as a part of the Interstate System, under section 113 (a) of the Federal Highway Act of 1956, is 2,254.8 miles, of which Kansas has 186.6 miles.

Of the 26 States, Kansas has the third largest mileage on the Interstate Highway System.

Unless some provision can be made to compensate States which had the vision and foresight to construct these roads to assist in handling ever-increasing traffic, they will not receive their fair share of the funds voted by Congress for the completion of the Interstate System, as approved by Congress in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Let us look, for instance, at Kansas and what happens to that State. In the first place, the nearly 190 miles of the Interstate System which have been designated as a part of the Interstate System will require that tolls be paid by those who travel this part of the Interstate System in Kansas. It means, of course, that the motorist will be riding free on a system in adjoining States connecting with our Kansas system, and will be required to pay toll as they enter my State.

It will mean, also, that our own citizens riding on the Interstate System and paying toll will not only be paying for traveling on the highway within their own State, but will be taxed to build free roads in other States.

Secondly, unless some provision is made to make adjustment for the mileage of roads which have previously been constructed on a toll-road basis, Kansas will not receive its proportionate share of the taxes collected for the construction of the Interstate System.

In the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Congress indicated its intent to determine whether or not reimbursement should be made to the States for State-financed highways completed or put under construction on the Interstate System between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957. This study has been completed and is available as House Document 301, 85th Congress. It will be recalled that the Clay Committee also recommended that States which took the initiative and, on the most congested routes, built toll roads to meet the intent of Congress spelled out in section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, should be reimbursed or otherwise compensated.

I have discussed this matter with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and members of the Senate Public Works Committee, and all agree that some provision should be made to take care of this inequity.

I am today introducing a bill which would provide that in the case of any State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel which is approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System under section 113 (a) of this act before June 30, 1958, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, designate as a part of the Interstate System other routes within such State which are equal in mileage to the length of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State.

A similar bill has already been introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3393) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended by adding immediately following section 113 the following new section:

"SEC. 113A. Increased mileage for Interstate System.

"In the case of any State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel which is approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System under section 113 (a) of this act before June 30, 1958, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, designate as part of the Interstate System other routes within such State which are equal in mileage to the length of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State."

SEC. 2. Section 108 (1) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) INCREASE IN MILEAGE: Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), relating to the Interstate System, is hereby amended by striking out '41,000 miles' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-one thousand plus the total of all amounts designated as part of the Interstate System under section 113A of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956': *Provided*, That the cost of completing any mileage authorized by this subsection in excess of 40,000 miles shall be included in making the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System as provided in subsection (d) of this section."

CONTINUATION OF SCHEDULES OF RATINGS AND REDUCTIONS IN EARNING CAPACITY FROM CERTAIN INJURIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue to apply as schedules of ratings and reductions in earning capacity from certain injuries the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1925 and 1945 editions. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3396) directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue to apply as schedules of ratings and reductions in earning capacity from certain injuries the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1925 and 1945 editions, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to freeze the 1925 and 1945 rating schedules of the Veterans' Administration as of January 1, 1957. It is necessary to freeze both these rating schedules, because the 1925 rating schedule applies to veterans of World War I and the 1945 schedule to veterans whose service came after World War I.

My reason for introducing this bill, is that for almost a year now I have watched this situation in the Veterans' Administration and I am thoroughly convinced that unless some action is taken immediately to stop the Veterans' Administration from continuing what they call a "review" and what I call a "purge" of already adjudicated claims, we may as well close up the Veterans' Administration—soon there will not be enough veterans left on the rolls to justify keeping this agency open.

At this point it might well be asked, "How and why did the Veterans' Administration embark on this program of wholesale elimination and reduction of service-connected veterans' compensation?" Well, I have the answer to that.

The Bradley Commission report was made public in April of 1956, and this report contains 70 recommendations. Now some of these recommendations, when you read them over, seem harmless. These recommendations are far from harmless. Each and every one is deadly insofar as veterans' benefits are concerned.

In taking off the compensation rolls entirely or drastically reducing approximately 50,000 war veterans, with service-connected disabilities, the Veterans' Administration is following recommendation No. 69 of the Bradley Commission report.

Recommendation No. 69 reads as follows:

"There should be no change in the finality of decisions by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but he should make provision for the central administrative review (or its equivalent on a semidecentralized basis) of all decisions by field boards. After such review, claimants should have the same rights, as at present, to be heard by the Board of Veterans' Appeals."

Now, when this Bradley Commission report, with its 70 deadly recommendations, came out in April of 1956, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration took a look at the report and he liked what he saw—he praised the members of the Bradley Commission in the most extravagant terms. Then he went to work. He called in his hatchetmen, and the hatchetmen went to work.

According to the figures in the press release put out by the Veterans' Administration, dated February 21, 1958, it is shown that as of that date 29,146 veterans have been taken off the rolls entirely and 22,586 other veterans have had their compensation reduced. This is only the beginning, so we are told.

So, the Veterans' Administration is doing a good job or it is doing a mean, despicable job, depending upon how you look at it. At any rate, nobody will deny it is doing a thorough job. The veterans' service organizations have been fighting and condemning this review since it first started.

The Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, unanimously adopted a resolution condemning this wholesale assault on veterans' benefits at their convention on July 26, 1957, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1957. Since that time, I have written officials in the Veterans' Administration here in an effort to straighten this matter out, but have had no success whatsoever.

In an average day, I receive from 1 to 5 letters from veterans in my State, telling me that they have either been taken off the rolls entirely, or, else had their compensation cut as much as 50 percent.

As an example, I have here a letter from a veteran in Sentinel Butte, N. Dak.—his compensation has been cut from 50 percent to 10 percent. Another from a veteran in Dickinson, N. Dak.—his compensation has been cut from 10 percent to 0 percent, another from Fredonia, N. Dak.—his compensation is cut from 60 percent to 30 percent. Where is all this leading? Well, in my opinion, it can only end with the complete wreck and ruin of all the benefits the veterans have fought for.

I must tell you of the case of the veterans who, when he wrote me was living in Topeka, Kans., although he had been a resident of North Dakota. This veteran was rated, by the Veterans' Administration, 40-percent disabled due to loss of hearing which disability was service connected. So he drew his compensation for 3 years. Then, one day, the Veterans' Administration calls him in and gives him a hearing aid. Several months pass, then the Veterans' Adminisration calls him in again. This time they examine him. The examiners reach the brilliant conclusion that now, because he has a hearing aid, he is only 20-percent disabled, so they cut his compensation from 40 to 20 percent. I wrote to the Veterans' Administration and verified all the facts the veteran told me.

I submit, does any Member of this body think that a piece of cord hanging down his neck and a mechanical device inserted in his ear could possibly compensate for the hearing God gave him?

I have no doubt that other Members of the Senate have been receiving letters from veterans in their States, who have been adversely affected, just as I have from those veterans in my State. It seems to me that the only way we can check this review is by means of legislation.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3398) to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

This proposed amendment of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act would change the formula by which FNMA computes its Federal income tax equivalent payments that are applicable to the income from its secondary market operations. It would allow FNMA, in computing such payments, to treat dividends paid on its Treasury-held preferred stock as an operating expense. For the benefit of any who may not be fully familiar with FNMA's operations, the following three paragraphs constitute a brief background statement. They are followed by an analysis of the proposed amendment.

FNMA was organized in 1938 with the initial objective of helping to popularize FHA-insured mortgages by assisting in the establishment of a general secondary market for those mortgages. FNMA gave assistance by purchasing FHA-insured mortgages from local lenders and reselling them to permanent investors after the mortgages were seasoned and at times when market conditions were favorable. In 1948 FNMA's activities were expanded to include VA-guaranteed loans.

FNMA was rechartered in 1954 with the enactment of the present FNMA Charter Act. The rechartered FNMA, which commenced operations November 1, 1954, conducts three separate activities: (1) The management and liquidating functions under which mortgages acquired under contracts entered into prior to November 1, 1954 are managed and liquidated, (2) the special assistance functions, which provide special assistance in financing special housing programs, and (3) the secondary market operations which furnish supplementary assistance to the general secondary market for home mortgages by providing a degree of liquidity for home mortgage investments. Each of these three activities is separate and distinct from the others. Each has its own assets and liabilities and its own borrowing authority. The FNMA Charter Act imposes separate accountability with respect to each. The capitalization of FNMA—which includes the Treasury-held preferred stock and the common stock held by the public—pertains exclusively to the secondary market operations, in that the other two functions have no recourse to it.

FNMA conducts its management and liquidating functions and its special assistance functions solely for the account of the Government. The secondary market operations, however, are conducted for the account of the Government (the Secretary of the Treasury owns all of the preferred stock) and the FNMA common-stock holders. Private mortgage sellers who use the facilities of the secondary market operations subscribe for FNMA's common stock in an amount equal at the present time to 2 percent of the principal amount of the mortgages involved in sales to FNMA. Such subscriptions now amount to more than $30 million. The secondary market operations are designed to become, when all of the preferred stock is retired, entirely privately owned and financed.

The proposed amendment is substantially the same as that included in H. R. 6659, 85th Congress which was favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. It appeared as section 204 of H. R. 6659 as passed by the House of Representatives on May 9, 1957. In the present session, it has been introduced as a separate measure because the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate held the view in 1957 that the subject matter should properly be considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate instead of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In its report on H. R. 6659 (H. Rept. No. 313, dated April 8, 1957) the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives made the following explanatory statement concerning this legislation (pp. 12–13):

"FNMA PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

"Section 204 would change the formula for computing the amount which FNMA pays to the Secretary of the Treasury, as the equivalent of Federal income taxes, with respect to its secondary market operations. FNMA is required to make such payments in 'an amount equivalent to the amount of Federal income taxes for which it would be subject if it were not exempt from such taxes.' It is also required to reimburse the Treasury periodically, in the form of interest on its obligations and dividends on its preferred stock at rates determined by the Treasury, for the cost of the public funds invested by the Government in such securities of FNMA.

"FNMA has demonstrated that the mandatory dividends that it is obliged to pay to the Treasury on its preferred stock cannot be fully earned on the proceeds of the stock under prevailing rates of interest when such dividends are regarded as a distribution of earnings after taxes. To resolve the nature of the dividends for tax purposes, your committee has provided that FNMA may deduct, in computing its Federal corporate income-tax equivalent, any amounts paid to the Secretary of the Treasury as a return on the Government's investment in FNMA securities.

"The preferred dividends paid by FNMA to the Treasury are, in effect, reimbursement of costs to the Government, and they are computed in the same manner and serve the same purpose as interest. Interest is an operating expense. The Congress has in other like instances permitted payments to the Government in reimbursement of Government costs on amounts advanced for stock subscriptions to be treated as operating expenses. Section 583 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is in point. It especially provides that dividends paid on the Government-held preferred stock of national banks, State banks, and insurance companies, shall be allowed as deductions in the computation of the Federal corporate income tax."

Section 583 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was originally written into the law as section 121 of the Revenue Act of 1934 when Public Law No. 374, 74th Congress, was approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 908). This code provision was explained by the Committee on Ways and Means in its report

that accompanied the legislation (H. Rept. No. 1759, 74th Cong., dated Aug. 12, 1935), from which the following is quoted:

"Section 3 of the bill [H. R. 7998] permits a deduction for income-tax purposes of dividends paid for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1934, by banking associations and insurance companies on preferred stock owned by the United States or any instrumentality thereof. The purpose of this section of the bill is to place National banks and State banks on an equal basis. In case State banks issue capital notes or debentures to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the public, the interest paid on such notes or debentures is allowed as a deduction from gross income in computing net income. However, in cases where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other governmental instrumentality, instead of holding capital notes or debentures of the banks, holds preferred stock in such banks, the banks are not permitted to deduct the dividends paid to the governmental instrumentalities on such preferred stock. Section 3 of the bill corrects this situation by permitting a deduction for dividends on the preferred stock owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other governmental instrumentalities."

Section 121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1934 (which became sec. 583 of the 1954 code) allowed the several thousand banks and trust companies in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchased more than three quarters of a billion dollars of preferred stock the same treatment, with respect to dividends paid on their RFC-held stock, that the legislation under consideration would allow FNMA with respect to dividends paid on its preferred stock that is held by the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus, there is no new precedent involved in this proposal.

That the preferred stock dividends FNMA is required to pay to the Treasury are analogous to interest is evidenced by their cumulative nature and the fact that their measure is the interest rate on outstanding obligations of the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. FNMA has no control over the rate or the amount of these dividends.

This legislation is made particularly important and desirable by the fact that the income from the invested proceeds of the Treasuryheld preferred stock is not sufficient to cover the dividends FNMA is required to pay to the Treasury when these dividends are treated as a distribution after taxes. FNMA's income before taxes on the invested proceeds of the preferred stock is approximately 4.2 percent. The Federal income tax equivalent draws off more than half of this income leaving only 2 percent with which to make payment of the preferred stock dividends at the present Treasury prescribed rate of 2.75 percent.

The legislative proposal would allow FNMA more effectively to provide the supplementary assistance to the secondary mortgage market that was intended by the FNMA Charter Act, as it has been necessary for FNMA in determining the amounts to be paid for mortgages to take into account its increased operating costs under existing legislation. To the extent the amendment reults in the association's facilities being more fully used, the transition to full private financing and ownership called for in the Charter Act will be hastened, and the Government will sooner be relieved of a large financial burden in the housing field.

And tax advantage under this proposal will automatically terminate when the Secretary of the Treasury no longer holds any of FNMA's preferred stock.

PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3399) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HOUSING BILL OF 1958

SEC. 1. Short title.

TITLE I—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

SEC. 101. Maximum mortgage amounts for 1-, 2-, and 3-family dwellings: This section would increase to $30,000 the maximum mortgage amount for a 1-, 2-, or 3-family dwelling financed under the basic section 203 of the National Housing Act. Under present law, the maximum mortgage amount for a 1- or 2-family dwelling is $20,000 and for a 3-family dwelling it is $27,500. The present limitation of $35,000 for a 4-family dwelling would remain unchanged. The amendment would also have the effect of permitting the new $30,000 limitation to be applied (under sec. 213 (c) of the National Housing Act) to dwellings built by cooperatives for conveyance to their own members and (under sec. 809 of that act) to dwellings purchased by essential civilian employees at military research or development installations. (Another section of this bill would similarly amend provisions in sec. 220 of the National Housing Act governing sales housing in urban renewal areas.)

The bill would not change the maximum loan-to-value ratios established by the Housing Act of 1957. Under these ratios, the present $20,000 maximum mortgage amount permits, at maximum loan-value ratios, an 85.5 percent mortgage on a home valued at $23,400. The proposed increase to a $30,000 maximum mortgage amount would provide a 79.6 percent mortgage, at maximum loan-value ratios, on a $37,700 home. This is virtually the same as the 80 percent loan-value ratio which was permitted by the original National Housing Act in 1934 for maximum loans of $16,000.

The $16,000 loan maximum was ample in 1934 for almost all 1-family home mortgages. Amendments in 1950 increased the maximum for 3- and 4-family structures to $20,500 and $25,000, respectively. However, despite the fact that construction costs had more than doubled in the 20 intervening years, no change in the maximum insurable mortgage for 1- and 2-family homes was made until 1954 when the original $16,000 limitation was increased to $20,000. (At the same time, the limitations for 3- and 4-family structures were raised to $27,500 and $35,000, respectively.)

Bureau of Labor statistics estimates indicate average costs for new homes built in the Nation rising more than 100 percent from 1946 to 1956, including an increase of 40 percent from the 1950 average. The Boeckh construction cost index for residences rose nearly a third from the 1947–49 average to June 1957, with an increase of 10 percent in the last 3 years alone.

The increases in costs of new homes built in the past 2 years have resulted in about one-fifth of the new homes in metropolitan areas now being in price ranges too high to be financed with maximum ratio FHA-insured mortgages. While the bulk of FHA operations will continue to be in the field of low and medium priced homes, it is nonetheless desirable that the program be available to the normal range of American homes requiring mortgage financing. This normal range includes homes in higher cost areas, homes which are suitable for large families, and those which contain the additional space and equipment frequently demanded on today's market.

Bureau of Labor Statistics sample surveys of new homes built in metropolitan areas show a doubling between the first quarters of 1954 and 1956, from 10.2 percent to 21 percent, of the proportion of new homes priced above $20,000. Although comparable figures will not be compiled for 1957, a 5-percent increase in average cost for 1-family homes built in the United States between the first quarters of 1956 and 1957 suggests that as much as a fifth of the new homes in metropolitan areas may at this time be above the $23,400 valuation which is necessary for a $20,000 insured mortgage under section 203.

SEC. 102. Change in maximum permissible mortgage to nonowner occupant: This section would permit a nonoccupant owner of a home financed under section 203 of the National Housing Act to receive the same maximum mortgage amount as an owner-occupant if the nonoccupant owner puts into escrow 15 percent of the original principal mortgage amount until such time as he sells the property to an owner-occupant. At the end of 18 months, if the property has not been sold to an owner-occupant, the funds held in escrow would be applied to a reduction in the mortgage amount.

In the residential housing market today, a great majority of new-home purchasers already own a home and wish to acquire larger or improved accommodations. Most of them need to use the equity in their existing home as part of the downpayment on a new home. Thus, builders and real-estate dealers are increasingly finding it necessary to accept trade-in houses on new-house sales. The proposed amendment will help existing homeowners in trading their old homes for new ones. It will enable the seller of the new house to place a mortgage on the old house equal to that which can now be obtained when a purchaser for the old house is found. It provides the builder or real-estate dealer up to 18 months to resell the trade-in house and transfer the mortgage debt to the purchaser. This procedure eliminates much of one set of closing costs. In the case of lower price properties, this savings can equal the FHA required downpayment. As soon as the builder or dealer resells the trade-in house to an owner-occupant, the 15 percent of the mortgage proceeds which are held in escrow would be released to him. He thus has an added incentive to look for a purchaser as quickly as possible.

This section can also be of benefit to the development or tract builder producing housing in substantial quantities for the market since he will be able to close the mortgages on the properties as completed in the amounts which an owner-occupant-purchaser would be able to get and yet have an additional 18 months in which to market the properties. Here, too, the advantage consists of eliminating much of one set of closing costs.

SEC. 103. Rental housing for elderly: This section of the bill would place the provisions governing rental housing for elderly persons in a separate section (sec. 229) of the National Housing Act, rather than leaving them in section 207 which authorized FHA's regular rental housing program. The provisions would also be changed in several respects. They would permit, but not require, the FHA to establish rental ceilings. These ceilings have served no practical purpose in this program because all the projects are owned and operated by nonprofit organizations. The new section would also omit the requirement that the project be economically sound. This requirement is not well adapted to projects of special design having a specialized purpose. Instead, the Commissioner would, in administering the program, approve mortgage-insurance applications on the basis of acceptable risk after taking into consideration the need for providing adequate housing for elderly persons.

The term "family unit" which now occurs in section 207 of the National Housing Act continues to create some misunderstanding with respect to housing accommodations for the elderly which do not contain individual cooking facilities or bath. Section 110 of the Housing Act of 1957 removed basic difficulties relating to this matter but, although it referred to occupancy by single persons, it did not eliminate the misleading reference to "family unit." The new section refers to a "living unit," rather than to a "family unit," thereby clarifying the law.

In some areas of the country, construction costs are too high to permit rental-housing projects for the elderly to be provided under the present mortgage ceilings of $8,100 per unit and $8,400 for elevator structures. Accordingly, the new section would apply to rental housing for the elderly the same high-cost area provisions, as are now applicable to FHA's regular rental-housing program. That is, in high-cost areas, the $8,100 and $8,400 per unit ceilings could be increased by not to exceed $1,000 for each room.

Because the non-profit organizations which participate in the program may be the recipients of labor and services, as well as materials, at reduced rates or prices, the prevailing wage requirements contained in section 212 of the National Housing Act would not be made applicable to the new section 229.

Finally, the maximum interest rate proposed for the elderly person rental-housing program is 5½ percent, the same rate which another section of this bill would apply to regular FHA-aided rental housing and to management-type cooperative projects.

SEC. 104. Maximum interest rates for rental housing and cooperative housing mortgages: This section would increase the maximum permissible interest rate on rental-housing mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act and on management-type cooperative housing mortgages insured under section 213 of that act from 4½ percent per annum on outstanding balances to 5½ percent. In the case of homes built by cooperatives for conveyance to their own members, the maximum interest rate under section 213 would be increased from 5 percent per annum to such percent, not in excess of 6 percent, as the Federal Housing Commissioner finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

The FHA has found it necessary to supplement the maximum-interest rate on rental-project mortgages with discounts up to five points, approximately equal to one-half point of interest earnings in yield computations. The treatment of discounts in replacement cost and valuation procedures raises technical problems which tend to discourage the development of rental projects during periods of tight money. Also, the discount controls for section 213 home mortgages are more unworkable than the discount controls with respect to other FHA home-mortgage programs.

The adoption of section 104 would permit the Federal Housing Commissioner to establish maximum interest rates (at or lower than the statutory maximum rates) with the effectiveness of the market process in mind in order to encourage the development of additional rental and cooperative projects. In this connection, it should be noted that the sponsors of both rental projects and cooperative projects may be expected to have a good understanding of the costs involved in borrowing mortgage funds so that these funds will be bargained for carefully.

SEC. 105. FHA mortgage amount ceilings for Alaska, Guam and Hawaii: Section 214 of the National Housing Act authorizes FHA to make the various mortgage ceilings of the act up to 50 percent higher for Alaska, Guam and Hawaii. A question has been raised as to whether the statutory-dollar ceilings for high-cost areas can be so raised for these Territories. This section would make clear that this can be done. Thus, the $10,000 mortgage limit for high-cost areas in section 221 (housing for displaced families) could be increased up to $15,000 in these Territories (or $18,000 if sec. 109 of this bill is enacted).

SEC. 106. General mortgage insurance authorization: This section would provide an adjustment, at the beginning of each of the next 5 fiscal years, of the general mortgage insurance authorization under section 217 of the National Housing Act, which covers all FHA loan insurance programs except the property improvement program under title I of that act and the armed services rental housing program under title VIII of that act. Under this section of the bill, authorization sufficient for $3 billion of new insurance would be made available for use during each of the next 5 fiscal years, in addition to the amounts by which outstanding insurance and commitments to insure are reduced during each such year through amortization or prepayment of mortgages or through expiration of commitments. Any unused amount of old authorization would lapse at the end of each fiscal year except fiscal 1963, at which time further legislation would very probably be needed.

This section would have the effect of increasing the total insurance authorization, as of July 1, 1958, from approximately $25.8 billion (covering outstanding insured mortgages and outstanding commitments, as well as available unused authorization) to about $28 billion.

Insurance authorization need in recent years has ranged upward to a maximum of $2.6 billion per year. Conservative recent estimates similarly indicate a prospective net use of $2.6 billion in authorization under section 217 during the 12 months beginning July 1, 1958. Accordingly, the $3 billion requested for section 217 is sufficient to cover this estimated need with a working margin of $400 million. The working margin would provide for a modest measure of underestimating and would also discourage excessive filing of applications by builders and mortgagees who are fearful of exhaustion of the authorization.

Provision of insurance authorization covering a 5-year period is designed to allow both FHA and the home-building industry to operate during that period without needless interruption or uncertainty concerning the availability of authorization. Congress would be relieved of the necessity to review and act on authorization requirements virtually every year. However, nothing would preclude the Congress from revising the authorization prior to the end of the 5-year period, in order to meet changing conditions.

SEC. 107. Repeal of obsolete provision: This section would repeal section 218 of the National Housing Act. Section 218 permitted fees for applications filed prior to March 1, 1950, with respect to the expired veterans' rental housing program under section 608 of that act to be transferred, in the case of unexpired section 608 commitments, to applications under FHA's regular rental housing program. There are no section 608 commitments outstanding so that section 218 is now completely without effect.

SEC. 108. Housing in urban renewal areas: This section would amend section 220 of the National Housing Act which authorizes special mortgage insurance assistance for both sales and rental housing in urban renewal areas. In the case of sales housing, the maximum mortgage amount for a 1-, 2-, or 3-family residence would be increased to $30,000. This change would merely keep the section 220 program, so far as 1- to 4-family dwellings are concerned, consistent with FHA's regular sales housing program as it would be changed by section 101 of this bill. In the case of section 220 dwellings designed for more than 4 families (but not included in large rental projects), the law now allows $7,000 of additional mortgage amount for each family unit in excess of 4. This section of the bill would instead permit an allowance of $8,100 per unit.

In the case of the rental housing program for urban renewal areas, FHA's experience since 1954 indicates the desirability of certain modifications in order to facilitate processing and encourage greater participation by investors. Under the present law, the sponsor redeveloper who is also the builder is able to obtain section 220 insured mortgages which may approximate total project cost, exclusive of overhead and profit to the redeveloper. On the other hand, if a sponsor redeveloper does not also act as a builder and has to contract with a general contractor for the construction work, the present law is so devised that the available mortgage amount may be 4 to 5 percent less. This type of redeveloper should be encouraged to undertake urban renewal projects because he is usually a long-range investor and tends to maintain the projects better and manage them more soundly. Thus, the present law discriminates against the very type of redeveloper whom it is advantageous to encourage at least to the same extent as builder sponsors.

The particular feature of the law which gives rise to this discrimination is the flat allowance of 10 percent for builder's profit which (as the legislative history makes clear) must be given on a uniform basis where the redeveloper is also the builder. Investors, who hire a general contractor to construct the building, certify that their actual costs in connection with the construction is the amount which they pay to the general contractor under the building contract. In the case of large projects, this amount generally includes a factor for the contractor's profit of only about 4 percent or 5 percent, rather than 10 percent. As a result, under the cost certification procedure prescribed in section 227 of the National Housing Act, the insured mortgage amount is disproportionately smaller and the cash investment is disproportionately larger than would be the case if the redeveloper had acted as his own builder.

Another form of discrimination which results from the statutory 10-percent builder's profit allowance for section 220 projects militates against rehabilitation projects. Where an old apartment house is purchased and rehabilitated, the major portion of the investment may well relate to the purchase of the existing property, rather than to the reconstruction work. A reasonable allowance for builder's profit in connection with such reconstruction work would frequently be above 10 percent. A higher profit allowance for this type of work as compared with new construction would merely recognize that the percentage allowance is being applied to a smaller total construction-work

cost and that it involves a greater degree of risk because of unknown conditions which may be found when the walls of the old building are opened up. Thus, as applied to some rehabilitation projects, the present provisions applicable to the section 220 program, which in effect limit the builder's profit and risk allowance to 10 percent, are less liberal than they should be.

Finally, it should be noted that the present provisions of sections 220 and 227 of the National Housing Act which govern the builder's profit and risk allowance, both with respect to estimated replacement cost and with respect to certified actual cost, are very complicated and difficult to understand. Some distinctions must necessarily be made for new projects and rehabilitation projects and for builder-redevelopers and investor-redevelopers. The various distinctions applicable to the section 220 program which are found both in section 220 and section 227 frequently discourage interest by prospective redevelopers who do not understand them, thereby unduly limiting participation in the program. This is especially true because the entire system of profit and overhead allowances is related, in a complex formula, to a maximum permissible mortgage amount, whereas builders and investors customarily think in terms of necessary cash investment. Accordingly, it is important to simplify these provisions where feasible.

Section 108 of the bill would amend sections 220 and 227 of the National Housing Act (1) to eliminate the discrimination against investor-redevelopers sponsoring new section 220 rental housing projects; (2) to eliminate the discrimination against rehabilitation projects; and (3) to simplify the requirements in order that they may be better understood by prospective redevelopers and lenders.

In the case of new projects, the limitation of the mortgage to 90 percent of estimated replacement cost and 90 percent of actual certified cost would be replaced with a limitation that the mortgage shall not exceed the estimated replacement cost of the actual certified cost (whichever is lower), excluding, however, any allowance for builder's general overhead and profit. This exclusion would very well counterbalance the elimination of the 90 percent limitation, so that with respect to new construction by a builder-redeveloper the insured mortgage amount would be almost the same as under present law. However, a higher mortgage amount than under present law would result for an investor-redeveloper, thereby treating the two types of redevelopers more nearly alike. Thus, the change is not intended either to liberalize or restrict mortgage amounts, but only to simplify the requirements applicable to new construction under section 220 and to eliminate a discrimination against investor-redevelopers.

In the case of rehabilitation projects, the maximum mortgage amount would, as under present law, be limited to 90 percent of estimated value and 90 percent of actual cost, whichever is lower. However, the builder's profit allowance for cost certification purposes would no longer be limited to 10 percent of the reconstruction work, thereby permitting a more liberal allowance to be made in appropriate cases. This change would also simplify the law significantly since rehabilitation projects under section 220 would hereafter be governed by the same cost certification procedures as are applicable to FHA's regular rental housing program under section 207. Under these procedures, the builder's profit allowance would be applied to the cost of the reconstruction work, as is done in normal trade practice. It would not be applied to such miscellaneous items as architect's fees which are now specially included only in the section 220 rental housing program. This change, standing alone, tends to reduce the dollar amount of the builder's profit allowance in the case of section 220 rehabilitation projects, but the fact that profit allowances would no longer be limited to 10 percent would permit use of higher allowances more appropriate to rehabilitation work. As a result, the general effect of the entire amendment would be to include more realistic and higher dollar amounts for overhead and profit under the program.

Finally, it should be noted that the FHA now requires the builder-redeveloper to have a 3 percent cash investment in any project for the first 3 years of operation. Usually a portion of this is represented by cash over and above mortgage proceeds necessary to complete construction, and the balance is a deposit to a special fund. The FHA would, of course, continue this type of administrative requirement in the event section 108 of the bill is enacted. In the case of the investor-redeveloper who is not also the builder, the required cash investment would be covered by the amount established for the general contractor's profit. This would eliminate the requirement for the special fund in such case.

SEC. 109. Urban renewal relocation housing: The FHA section 221 program for housing for displaced families would be amended by this section in order to make it more workable and thus accomplish more readily its purpose of providing housing for families displaced by urban renewal activities or other governmental activities such as highway construction or code enforcement.

The first numbered amendment in section 109 of the bill would remove the requirement that the locality or community in which the housing is to be located must request that the section 221 program be made available in order to assist in providing housing for displaced families. No other FHA program has a similar requirement. Communities which need and are eligible for this type of assistance will generally request it as a matter of routine, so that the procedural requirement in those cases serves no substantial purpose. In some cases it proves to be troublesome, as when displacement occurs in 1 or 2 jurisdictions but there are 6 or 7 jurisdictions within the same metropolitan area. There may be no way of knowing in advance in which of these jurisdictions builders and lenders will choose sites for section 221 housing. Communities then tend to delay making official requests before builder interest is shown and the builders tend to delay seeking sites before the official requests are made. Of course, removal of the requirement would in no way affect the usual controls of any community over the type of housing built within its boundaries.

Under the second numbered amendment, the dollar limit on the amounts of mortgages financing the construction or rehabilitation of section 221 housing in high-cost areas would be increased from $10,000 to $12,000 per family unit. The present $9,000 limit in normal-cost areas would not be changed by this amendment. This increase in cost ceilings would make the section 221 program more workable in high-cost areas, particularly in some large cities. Without this amendment, the program in some localities would be virtually limited to existing houses. The amendment would make the relation of the ceiling for high-cost areas and the ceiling for other areas more nearly correspond to the differences in construction costs (and family incomes) in such areas.

Rental relocation housing for profit (see third numbered amendment in section 109): This amendment would broaden the FHA section 221 housing program for families displaced by urban renewal and other governmental actions, so that rental housing could be produced by builders for profit. Now, section 221 is limited to sales housing, except that nonprofit corporations can build rental housing.

The limits on the amounts of mortgages which can be insured under these new provisions would be the same as those for section 221 housing built by nonprofit organizations except that the mortgage ceiling ratio would be 95 percent of the value of the property instead of the 100 percent presently permitted for nonprofit organizations. Under these proposed provisions, the amount of a mortgage given by a profitmaking corporation or organization could not exceed $12.5 million, or $9,000 per family unit ($12,000 in high-cost areas), or 95 percent of the value of the property or project when constructed or repaired and rehabilitated. The $12,000 per unit limit in high-cost areas would correspond to that limit on mortgages of nonprofit corporations as it would be increased by the second numbered amendment of section 109.

Under the new provisions, displaced families would, of course, receive priority in rental of the dwelling units. Also, builders would be required to give cost certifications with respect to the housing, and be regulated as to rents or sales charges, capital structure, and rate of return, as are builders of other FHA-aided rental housing.

In many cases, this proposal would greatly assist in relocating displaced families. Relocation is one of the most difficult and urgent problems in the whole urban renewal program. The Government has a responsibility to these families forced from their homes. It is estimated that in 3 years 83,000 families will be displaced from urban renewal areas, and 247,000 families will be displaced as a result of all Government programs, including the urban renewal and highway programs. On the basis of urban renewal experience, 77 percent of displaced families, because of family income or other factors, will want to rent private units, rather than buy homes. Only 49 percent of all displaced families are eligible for public housing. See table A below.

Present FHA insurance programs are inadequate to provide the needed rental housing which could be built under the proposal. Only a few projects by nonprofit corporations have reached the FHA commitment stage, and it was never anticipated that nonprofit corporations would produce more than a limited amount of rental housing. Other FHA rental housing programs were not designed for displaced families, and do not have the programing and occupancy priority provisions for these families which are contained in section 221. Section 220 urban renewal housing is not geared specifically to meet their needs, and must be built in urban renewal areas where the land costs are often very high, particularly in central city locations. Section 221 housing is not limited to urban renewal areas, so that builders could acquire land in other areas more appropriate for rental housing to be occupied by families of low or moderate income.

The liberal mortgage insurance terms of the proposal, with the aid of FNMA special assistance, should give adequate incentive for the production of the rental housing to be programed under section 221. The housing would be programed only where it is determined that prospective rentals would be within the range of the incomes of the displaced families to be served. A large portion of the displaced families wishing private rental accommodations would still have to move into existing private structures. However, the proposed rental program could meet a critical segment of the relocation need not met by public housing. In this connection, it may be noted that the proposal would apply to rehabilitation as well as new construction. Rehabilitation would produce lower rentals and thus reach a broader segment of displaced families.

The proposal is essentially a change in the existing FHA insurance program for displaced families to permit a substantial amount of rental housing to be assisted, in

addition to the assistance now being furnished sales housing. This simply conforms to the needs of these families, and helps solve the relocation problem of cities undertaking urban renewal.

TABLE A.—*3-year (fiscal 1958, 1959, and 1960) estimate of families to be displaced by governmental action*

Type of displacement	Number of families [1]	Eligible for public housing	
		Percent	Number
Urban renewal (title I)	83,000	57	47,300
Highway programs	[2] 75,000	46	34,500
Other governmental activity [3]	89,000	46	40,900
Total	247,000	49	122,700

[1] Includes estimated number of single-person households of elderly individuals (65 years of age and over).
[2] Estimate of 70,000 furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads and adjusted to include elderly single-person households.
[3] Such as public construction, code enforcement, eviction of over-income tenants in public housing, demolition of temporary housing, etc.

SEC. 110. Cost certification—technical amendments: This section would add to section 227 of the National Housing Act, which contains the cost certification requirements for FHA-aided rental housing programs, two technical references made necessary by other provisions of this bill. One is a reference to the new section 229 of the National Housing Act (relating to housing for the elderly) which would be added by section 103 of this bill. The other is a reference to the new paragraph (d) (4) of section 221 of the National Housing Act (relating to rental housing for displaced families) which would be added by section 109 of this bill. Section 110 of the bill would also delete from section 227 of the act a reference to sections 903 and 908 of the act (relating to defense housing during the Korean war emergency). The deleted reference is no longer needed because sections 903 and 908 expired several years ago and there are no longer any outstanding commitments to enter into mortgage insurance contracts under those sections.

SEC. 111. Technical provisions relating to payment of insurance by FHA: Section 204 of the National Housing Act contains a number of provisions which govern the obligations of the FHA to the mortgagee where there has been a default under a mortgage on sales housing financed under section 203 of the act, the section authorizing FHA's basic program of assistance for 1- to 4-family homes. Similar provisions governing the FHA's insurance obligations are necessary in connection with each of the following special sales housing programs: (1) section 8, which at one time governed the program (now governed by section 203 (i)) for low-cost, single family homes in outlying areas; (2) section 213 which includes assistance for homes constructed by cooperatives for their own members; (3) section 220 which includes assistance for sales housing in urban renewal areas; (4) section 221 which includes a sales housing program for persons displaced from urban renewal areas or by governmental action; (5) section 222 which provides special benefits in financing homes for servicemen; and (6) section 809 which assists sales housing for essential civilian employees at military research or development installations. The provisions governing the payment of insurance are incorporated in each of the six listed sections by cross references to provisions in section 204.

As the six listed sections were added or amended from time to time and as section 204 was amended from time to time, oversights in drafting resulted in the failure to make all the appropriate cross references to all the appropriate provisions in section 204. Section 112 of this bill would correct these drafting oversights which have resulted in inconsistencies in FHA's dealings with mortgagees and in troublesome problems both in administration and in managing foreclosed properties.

Subsection (a) would add to section 8 of the National Housing Act a cross reference to sections (j) and (k) of section 204 of that act. Subsection 204 (j) permits termination of the mortgagee's liability for payment of mortgage insurance premiums in those cases where the mortgagee forecloses on the mortgaged property but informs the Commissioner that it does not intend to convey the property to FHA in exchange for debentures. Upon such notification (which terminates FHA's insurance liability), the FHA terminates the mortgagee's obligation to pay subsequent mortgage insurance premiums. Similar termination of the mortgagee's obligation results under section 204 (j) when FHA's insurance liability terminates because the mortgage has been prepaid in full.

Subsection 204 (k) permits the Federal Housing Commissioner to authorize mortgagees to make reimbursable expenditures for protection of properties during the period commencing with the institution of foreclosure and continuing until the Commissioner takes title to the property. Subsection (k) also permits terminating the mortgagee's obligation to pay mortgage insurance premiums when an application for debentures has been filed under the insurance contract. This makes it unnecessary for the mortgagee to pay insurance premiums up to the date of acceptance of title by the FHA and then have the amount of these premium payments included in the debentures which the FHA issues to the mortgagee. The provision thus eliminates unnecessary procedures and payments of interest by FHA, there being no point in having the FHA collect sums of money from the mortgagee which would only have to be repaid with interest.

Subsection (b) of section 112 of the bill would similarly add the cross-reference to section 204 (k) of the National Housing Act to sections 213, 220, 221, 222, and 809 of that act. Thus, this entire section is merely a technical amendment.

SEC. 112. Armed services (Capehart) housing: Section 803 of the National Housing Act, which authorizes the program of mortgage insurance for rental housing at military installations, would be amended to provide for a 1-year extension of the program (from June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1960), and to increase the maximum permitted interest rate from 4 percent to 5 percent. Because of the special financing provisions of title VIII of the act, the increased maximum rate would be ½ percent lower than is proposed by other provisions of this bill for rental housing projects insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act and management-type cooperative housing projects insured under section 213 of that act. The amendment would also increase the maximum maturity of section 803 mortgages from 25 years to 30 years to reduce amortization payments. There is no statutory ceiling on maturities under the regular rental housing program of FHA.

SEC. 113. Repeal of FHA and VA statutory discount controls: Section 605 of the Housing Act of 1957 provided for discount controls in connection with Government-insured or guaranteed home mortgages. This section of the bill would repeal section 605. The controls have created confusion and reluctance on the part of lenders toward using FHA-insured financing. This is working a hardship against prospective home buyers, particularly in the lower priced housing market where higher loan-value ratio mortgages are most needed. Also, the controls tend to increase costs for mortgage money because the permitted maximum discount becomes the standard charge for the best transactions. Experience to date indicates that the competitive market mechanism is replaced by price fixing even for those transactions which would otherwise obtain more advantageous terms. Discount controls actually have the effect of excluding from FHA programs those categories of borrowers who are most in need and whom the controls are intended to aid—low income families, minority group families, and residents of small towns. These borrowers have little capacity to compete for limited funds with other classes of borrowers.

TITLE II—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 201. Increased dollar limit for mortgages purchased under secondary market operations: This section would increase the limit on the amount of a mortgage which can be purchased by FNMA under its secondary market operations from $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage to $20,000. The $15,000 limit would remain applicable to mortgages purchased under the special assistance functions. As under present law, no dollar limit would apply to military housing mortgages insured under section 803 of the National Housing Act or to mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii.

The section would make possible assistance through the secondary market operations to housing serving additional families of moderate income, particularly larger families. The change would recognize the progressive increases in housing costs which have taken place in recent years. These increases are reflected in the yearly median sales price of homes, which, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has risen from $12,300 in 1954 to $13,700 in 1955 to $14,500 in 1956. For 1957, the estimated median sales price was over $15,100. In the case of larger families purchasing houses suitable for their needs, cost levels would of course be considerably higher.

In addition, this section would help to meet the special problems faced by higher cost areas. The staff report on income and housing of January 24, 1957, prepared for the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, included a tabulation of the average sales prices of new houses for 126 cities. Average prices ranging from $15,000 to $17,500 were reported by 24 cities, and 16 cities reported prices averaging $17,500 or more. Eight of these cities reported average prices of $20,000 or more. Thus, while the bulk of purchases by FNMA under its secondary market operations have been, and will continue to be, of mortgages on lower priced homes (the average mortgage now being purchased is about $12,000), the $15,000 limitation has forestalled mortgage sellers from obtaining the intended services with respect to median priced housing, particularly housing which serves larger families or is located in high cost areas.

The increase in the dollar limit is particularly appropriate under the secondary market operations, which constitute a business type activity of mixed Government and private ownership. Also, in any mortgage portfolio the inclusion of mortgages having outstanding balances that remain appreciable even after the mortgage has been well seasoned makes for a better balanced and more salable portfolio. This is particularly important when FNMA undertakes to sell blocks of mortgages to local lending institutions or to institutional mortgage investors.

SEC. 202. Purchase prices, fees and charges under special assistance functions: This section would give the FNMA discretion to determine special assistance purchase prices and fees and charges, as was originally provided in the 1954 FNMA Charter Act. The present statutory provisions (1) require FNMA to purchase mortgages under its special assistance functions at a price not less than par, (2) limit FNMA's charges or fees for its special assistance services to a maxi-

mum of 1½ percent, and (3) specify that not more than one-half of such fees or charges imposed with respect to any mortgage may be collected at the times of commitment and purchase, respectively.

While FNMA's special assistance functions are financed only with Treasury-supplied money, the FNMA Charter Act states that the charges or fees of the Association shall be imposed with the objective that the functions be fully self-supporting. Also, FNMA is expected to resell a large number of the mortgages it buys, so that the use of Government funds will be held to a minimum. The objectives of continuing operations on a self-supporting basis and reselling mortgages in appreciable quantities seem unlikely of attainment if FNMA is required by law to pay par for mortgages which the market values at less than par, and if, in addition, FNMA continues to be subject to the present statutory controls relating to fees and charges.

The special assistance functions were designed to supplement and encourage private investment in special categories of home mortgages and not to supplant such investment. The continuation of the par-purchase requirement and the statutory controls on fees and charges make it almost impossible for private investors to compete in the purchase of even the more desirable of the mortgages eligible for FNMA special assistance. In the long run, more funds will be available for the special categories of housing designated for assistance in financing if private capital is actively encouraged to invest in, and become familiar with, these types of mortgages.

SEC. 203. Increase in special assistance authorization: This section would increase by $90 million the FNMA special assistance authorization which is available at the discretion of the President. This authorization is used to assist in financing housing for segments of the population that are unable to obtain adequate housing under established home financing programs. Housing in urban renewal areas, urban renewal relocation housing, housing for the elderly, Wherry Act military housing, disaster housing, and housing in Guam and Alaska have been made eligible for aid under this program. The additional authorization is needed primarily to assist in the financing of mortgages on urban renewal housing and secondarily of mortgages on housing for the elderly.

The following table indicates estimated mortgage purchase commitments for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 under this authorization. Estimates are based on expectations of urban renewal activities and FHA activities and on the assumption that 30 percent of the section 220 mortgages and 5 percent of the section 221 mortgages will find private financing.

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1958 estimate	Fiscal year 1959 estimate
Mortgage purchase commitments:		
Sec. 220	$112.1	$184.2
Sec. 221	67.9	65.3
Housing for the elderly	20.0	40.0
Other (Alaska, Guam, disaster)	12.5	11.0
Total authorization required	212.5	300.5
Authorization available:		
Authorization carried over from previous year	238.9	202.3
Authorization recaptured from cancellations and repayments	25.9	9.8
Recent authorization enacted	150.0	----------
Total authorization available	414.8	212.1
Unused authorization, end of year	202.3	----------
New authorization recommended	----------	90.0

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 301. Planning grants: This section of the bill would remove from title I of the Housing Act of 1949 the authority for the Housing Administrator to make advances of funds to local public agencies for planning work in connection with urban-renewal projects, and would substitute for such provisions an authorization for the Administrator to make Federal grants for a share of urban-renewal planning costs, as explained below.

Under existing law, the Housing Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for (i) surveys and plans for specific urban-renewal projects, (ii) general neighborhood-renewal planning, and (iii) studies to determine the feasibility of proposed urban-renewal projects. These advances cover the entire cost of the planning work and are repayable solely from moneys becoming available to the local public agency for the actual undertaking of the project involved. Thus, such advances are repaid only if and when the urban-renewal project which has been planned is actually undertaken. Furthermore, most projects which are undertaken are carried out with further Federal assistance in the form of loans and grants, with the result that the Federal Government ultimately bears two-thirds of the cost of planning, while the locality bears the remaining third through cash or noncash contributions to the project. Under this system the community makes no contribution to the cost of planning a project until and unless the project is actually undertaken. Consequently, neither the community nor the local public agency suffers any financial loss if the planning work is not completed or if the planned project is never undertaken. In all cases the loss of all planning costs is borne by the Federal Government.

(a) Substitution of grants for advances: This section would change the above provisions so that, on future applications for planning assistance, Federal planning grants would be substituted for advances of funds now made by the Administrator. These grants could cover up to two-thirds of the cost of the planning work for which they would be made under planning-grant contracts executed before July 1, 1959. On that date the Federal share of planning costs would drop to 60 percent; on July 1, 1960, to 55 percent; and on July 1, 1961, to 50 percent. This gradual reduction of the Federal share would parallel the reduction proposed elsewhere in the bill for project-capital grants and would allow time for localities and States to prepare to meet the correspondingly larger share of planning costs. Such a requirement for a direct local contribution to planning costs would give communities a greater responsibility and stake in the planning of projects. This can be expected to result in fewer projects being started and then discontinued after planning expenditures, and greater economies in operations which should lessen the need for Federal administrative reviews and controls.

(b) Planning to be assisted with grants: Under this section planning grants could be made for two purposes, in lieu of the three purposes (enumerated above) for which advances are now made:

(i) The Housing Administrator would be authorized to make planning grants for surveys and plans for specific urban-renewal projects. Contracts for such grants would be made only where the governing body of the locality approves, by resolution or ordinance, the undertaking of the surveys and plans and the submission of an application for such grant assistance. These planning grants could be expended for the same type of planning work in preparation of urban-renewal projects as is now financed by advances of funds for such planning.

(ii) The Housing Administrator would also be authorized to make planning grants for the preparation or completion of community renewal programs. Such programs would identify and measure slums and blighted areas in the community, would evaluate the financial and other resources needed and available to improve such areas, and would schedule urban renewal projects and activities to be undertaken in the community. As with the planning grants for project planning, approval of the local governing body would be a prerequisite to any contract for this type of planning grant. Completion of community renewal programs with this grant assistance should benefit both the local communities and the Federal Government by establishing the framework for sound selection of urban renewal projects in the light of available resources. Community renewal programs would also provide a framework for public improvements and facilities designed to serve urban renewal areas. Therefore, it would be provided that such improvements and facilities that are otherwise eligible and commenced after completion of a community renewal program could be credited as grants-in-aid to urban renewal projects in conformity with such program, so long as their commencement does not precede the loan and grant contract for the project by more than 5 years.

Although the section would terminate the Administrator's authority to make advances of funds for planning, a savings clause would permit the execution or amendment of contracts for advances in cases where the original application for the advance was received by the Administrator prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1958.

SEC. 302. Capital grant authorization, and change in Federal share: This section would increase the amounts of obligational authority available to the Housing Administrator for capital grants for urban renewal projects, providing for increments of such additional authority to become available over a 6-year period. It would also during such period gradually reduce the percentage of net project costs which such capital grants may cover from two-thirds under the existing law to 50 percent on and after July 1, 1961.

The existing statute now authorizes $1,250 million of capital grant authority (exclusive of the $100 million of authorization within the discretion of the President). This amount would be increased by the section in increments of $200 million on July 1, 1958; $250 million on July 1 in each of the years 1959 and 1960; and $200 million on July 1 in each of the years 1961, 1962, and 1963. Since approximately $50 million of presently authorized funds would be carried over at the end of this fiscal year, the new authorization in effect permits $250 million of Federal grant funds for each of the next 3 years and $200 million of such funds for each of the 3 years thereafter.

The existing statute limits the aggregate capital grants paid with respect to the projects of a local public agency to two-thirds of the aggregate net costs of such projects. The remaining one-third of net project costs must be borne by the locality in the form of cash or noncash local grants-in-aid, the latter consisting of such things as land donations and the provision of necessary public improvements and facilities. Under this section of the bill, the Federal Government's two-thirds share would be reduced to 60 percent on July 1, 1959, 55 percent on July 1, 1960, and 50 percent on July 1, 1961, with resulting increases in the local share of project costs bringing such share up to a matching 50 percent. The gradual reduction of Federal contributions would give localities and States time to gear themselves to the provision of a larger share of project costs.

Projects could continue to be approved on a three-fourths Federal share basis where authorized under existing law, except

that the Housing Administrator could reduce such maximum Federal share to conform to the percentage of net project cost applicable at the time to other projects, as described above.

The percentage applicable to the capital grants for a particular project would be the percentage in effect at the time that the project is initiated (normally, the commencement of planning). The statute would still permit the pooling between projects of local contributions in the form of cash and noncash local grants-in-aid. Thus it would still be possible for local contributions in excess of the required local share of net cost of a project to be counted toward the local share of a succeeding project.

Although there would be a reduction (during the 6-year period covered by this section) of the amount of funds available annually for Federal grants from $250 million to $200 million, the accompanying decrease in the percentage of project costs which these grants may be used to meet would permit the lower grant level of $200 million to be applied to more projects and to a total program slightly larger than that covered by $250 million on a two-thirds Federal grant basis. The enactment of the proposed 6-year program authorization, sufficient to maintain a consistent level of program activity, would provide localities with an assurance of continued Federal support of the urban-renewal program, and would permit them to plan their local programs in the light of a clear statutory statement of Federal participation.

Repayment of uncollectible advances (see clause (d) (2) of sec. 302 of bill): To obtain funds for advances (under the Housing Act of 1949) for urban-renewal planning, the Housing Administrator issues notes to the Secretary of the Treasury. The advances to a local public agency are repayable from moneys becoming available to it for the undertaking of urban-renewal projects. However, in some cases the planning work is not completed or projects are not undertaken, or for some other reason such advances become uncollectible. In such cases, this section of the bill would authorize the use of appropriated capital-grant funds for repaying the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to such advances, plus interest attributable to such advances paid or accrued to the Secretary. Without such a provision the Administrator would continue to have the obligation to pay the principal and interest on his notes to the Secretary of the Treasury which were issued to obtain the funds to make these advances, and the Administrator would also lose such interest already paid. As the advances would be uncollectible, there is no reason for the related obligations of the Administrator to the Treasury to be carried on the books and accumulate interest which the Administrator would have to pay indefinitely. The amounts of repayments by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury would be a charge against the capital grant contract authorization.

This section would not affect the obligations of the local public agency to the Federal Government. If funds should become available at some time in connection with one of the projects involved, the local agency would remain obligated to pay the Federal Government the amount of the advances in connection with that project. Under another section of this bill planning advances would be discontinued on future projects, and project planning would be assisted on a Federal and local grant basis.

In the past, planning advances have been rendered uncollectible because the projects for which they were made did not enter the execution stage for one of three reasons: (1) it was found that the execution of the project would be ineligible for urban-renewal assistance under State or local law, or (2) the local public agency decided, on the basis of detailed surveys and planning work, that the project should be abandoned, or (3) the Urban Renewal Administration has found that the local public agency had not observed the conditions of the advance contract requiring that the planning work be carried out in an expeditious manner.

This section is in accord with a General Accounting Office recommendation for legislation to accomplish this purpose.

SEC. 303. Technical.

SEC. 304. Simplification of urban renewal plan to expedite projects: Before an urban renewal project can enter the execution stage and the acquisition of land can begin, the urban renewal plan must be approved by the local public agency and reviewed by the Housing Agency. Under existing law, it is mandatory that every urban renewal plan shall (in addition to other requirements) indicate such land acquisition, demolition and removal of structures, redevelopment, improvements, and rehabilitation as may be proposed to be carried out in the urban renewal area, zoning and planning changes, if any, land uses, maximum densities, and building requirements. This section of the bill would change the law (section 110 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949) so that these elements of the urban renewal plan would be required only to the extent required by the Housing Administrator for the making of loans and grants for project execution. This change would provide flexibility which would greatly assist in expediting the execution of urban renewal projects.

Experience has shown that often it is not reasonable to require an urban renewal plan to include every one of the elements now set forth in the law. At times, the placement of improvements such as minor streets and utilities will depend on the type of construction, or the nature of the enterprise, that will occupy the land after redevelopment. In some instances, this is not known until a redeveloper has been selected by the local public agency, and his plan for development of the cleared land has been approved. In other cases, the precise location of land uses (and therefore zoning) may depend on the redeveloper's final plan, or on the arrangements that he makes to finance the project. (The exact location of neighborhood shopping facilities in a residential project is an example of this.) It is unrealistic in such cases to require a complete plan, as now described in the law, which holds up the commencement of acquisition of land in the project area.

This section of the bill would enable the Housing Administrator to expedite land acquisition in many urban renewal projects by omitting or simplifying requirements for one or more of the elements of the urban renewal plan where they are unrealistic and cause unnecessary delay.

This proposed change in the law would benefit localities engaged in urban renewal, because it would permit a simplification of project procedures and documentations that add to their burden of paperwork. The change should have no effect on the number of projects initiated, nor on the ultimate cost of projects to the Federal Government.

SEC. 305. Loans (without grants) for nonresidential areas: Under existing law, urban renewal projects assisted by the Federal Government must be predominantly residential, either as to the original site or the redeveloped area. An exception from this requirement, up to 10 percent of the capital grant authorization, is allowed under present law for nonresidential projects where the site includes a substantial number of slum or blighted dwellings.

This section of the bill would authorize the Housing Administrator to extend financial assistance, other than capital grants, for urban renewal projects which do not meet the predominantly residential requirement. This financial assistance would be similar to that now authorized for other types of urban renewal projects. The section would also authorize the making of refunding loans to refund temporary loans when the project assisted under this section is completed. The refunding loans could be made for a period up to 10 years and in an amount not exceeding the net project cost of the project involved.

A temporary loan made under this authorization would make available to the local public agency the working capital needed to finance the carrying out of urban renewal project activities in the area. The proceeds which it receives from disposition of land in the project area would go to repay a portion of the temporary loan. The remaining portion of the loan could be refunded by the locality with a refunding loan authorized by this section.

The aggregate amount of refunding loans made by the Housing Administrator which could be outstanding at any one time would be limited to $150 million. Local public agencies would be authorized to borrow funds from private sources by pledging certain of their rights under their loan contracts with the Government, thus avoiding the necessity for actual disbursement of loan funds by the Government. In effect this amounts to a Federal guaranty of private loans, and makes it unnecessary in most instances for local public agencies to actually borrow Federal funds. The Administrator would be directed to require local public agencies to obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government under this procedure unless he determines in the particular case that it is not feasible.

Many of the projects which cities are most interested in undertaking do not meet the predominantly residential requirement because the areas are not best suited for residential development and the existing sites are not predominantly residential. Undoubtedly, the redevelopment of these areas for commercial or industrial uses is often essential to the surrounding residential areas and to the financial soundness of the municipalities as a whole. The weakening of the tax bases of cities caused by the declining character of central areas of cities has led to a rapid increase in pressure for assistance to these commercial or industrial areas. The preservation of values in downtown commercial and shopping areas would often go a long way toward strengthening the city's tax base.

Specific proposals are frequently made which would increase or liberalize the 10-percent exception from the predominantly residential requirement, or would otherwise liberalize or repeal that requirement. It is desirable that the 10-percent exception be retained without change. This exception is needed in order to cover those essential projects which are predominantly nonresidential (but which include a substantial number of substandard dwellings) and which must have Federal capital grants because of large write-downs involved in the clearance of structures and the sale of the land in the project for typical commercial or industrial uses. However, it is clear that many of the commercial projects which communities wish to undertake, particularly on the fringe of central business districts would result in very little, if any, net project cost because of the high market value which the property would have for the construction of downtown office buildings or other nonresidential structures of high value. Accordingly, these projects could be undertaken if the Federal Government furnished loans without capital grants. The increased tax base which would result

from the redevelopment of areas for commercial or industrial purposes should serve as an incentive for the assumption of such local expenditures as would be required.

It is very important that these projects be undertaken without capital grants wherever possible, so that the capital-grant authorization can be maintained for projects which are predominantly residential, either as to original use or the new use, in accordance with the basic purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949. Therefore, the 10-percent exception should not be increased, but loans for nonresidential projects should be authorized as provided in this section of the bill. Such loans should reduce pressure for the use of capital grants for many of these projects at the expense of projects which are predominantly residential.

SEC. 306. Uniform date for determining application of going Federal rate to urban renewal contracts: The definition of going Federal rate in the Housing Act of 1949 is used as a basis for determining the interest rate on loans and advances for urban renewal projects. The existing law inconsistently determines the applicable rate at different times for different types of contracts. One date (date contract is approved by Housing Administrator) is provided for contracts executed after the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954, another date (date contract is made) applies to contracts executed prior thereto, and still a third date (date contract is revised or superseded) is used for amendatory contracts. This section would provide a single uniform date for the determination of the applicable going Federal interest rate. It would fix the date for determining the applicable rate for all contracts as the date the contract, or amendatory contract, is authorized by the Administrator. Such authorization is evidenced by an internal allocation order, which allocates capital grant funds for the particular project. This allocation order would serve as a uniform and convenient date for determining the applicable interest rate. This change is merely technical and would not tend to either increase or decrease aggregate interest payments by localities.

TITLE IV—LOW-RENT HOUSING

SEC. 401. Exemptions for determining eligibility and rent: The Housing Act of 1957 provided a number of additional exemptions in calculating income for purposes of determining whether a family is of low income and eligible for occupancy in a low-rent housing project and also for rent-fixing purposes. These additional exemptions included $600 of the income of each member of the tenant family other than the principal wage earner and also $100 for each adult dependent member of the family having no income, including the spouse of the head of each family. The general objectives of these exemptions was to eliminate from consideration in determining eligibility and rent sporadic and other earnings of members of low-income families which normally are not available for the support of the family and to make an adjustment in favor of larger families by extending to adult dependents the $100 per capita exemption previously authorized only for minors. The Housing Agency endorses these general objectives.

However, the cumulative character of the $600 exemption for secondary wage earners (when considered with all other exemptions authorized by law) would permit the occupancy of low-rent projects by families whose incomes are far above the level which may reasonably be classified as low-income. Also the $100 exemption, if applied to the spouse of the head of the tenant family, would effect a substantial unwarranted loss in project rentals with a corresponding increase in Federal subsidies. This exemption alone, as applied to the spouse, would occasion a reduction in annual rental of $20 for a substantial majority of the tenant families in a program of between 400,000 and 500,000 dwellings.

This section would correct these two defects in the 1957 law by limiting the exemptions for secondary incomes to a total of $600 and by eliminating the $100 exemption for spouses. However, the section would (1) continue the exemption granted in the 1957 act of $100 for adult members of the low-income family (except the head of the family and his spouse); (2) now extend this exemption to such a member even if he has income and even if the $600 exemption out of such income has come into play; (3) continue all the exemptions now applicable to minors; and (4) continue, and incorporate in the basic housing law, the provisions now in section 502 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948 which relate to exemption of amounts paid by the United States Government for death or disability occurring in connection with military service. Thus, the underlying purposes of the earlier legislation would continue to be served.

In addition, this section would clarify the language of the present law by substituting the term "principal income recipient" for "principal wage earner." We believe that Congress intended to cover those situations where the principal source of family income comprises not only wages but also pensions, welfare payments, etc., and have so interpreted the existing law. Finally, it should be noted that the repeal of some provisions of section 502 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948 is a purely technical amendment because the only repealed provisions which would not be incorporated in the basic housing law are some references to Federal rent controls which are no longer in effect.

SEC. 402. Extension of authorization: This section would extend the time limit on the present authority to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions to low-rent public housing. Under section 10 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the authority which became available on July 31, 1956, to enter into such contracts for 35,000 additional units will terminate July 31, 1958, and the authority which became available on July 1, 1957, for another 35,000 units will terminate July 1, 1959. This section of the bill would postpone each termination date by 1 year, to July 31, 1959, and July 1, 1960, respectively.

This proposed extension of time for entering into contracts for additional public housing will assure adequate time for proper planning of the projects prior to the execution of the contracts. It may well be that all of the presently authorized low-rent units will be placed under contract by the present deadline dates. However, the increasing scarcity of available sites, recent increases in costs, and other such difficulties may delay applications by communities. In such cases, the proposed extension would avoid the alternative of executing contracts for projects which are not soundly planned or permitting the projects to become ineligible after considerable expenditure of local effort.

SEC. 403. Disposal of federally owned projects: This section would permit disposal of the few PWA low-rent housing projects still remaining in Federal ownership to other than a local public agency. The existing law directs the PHA to sell its Federal projects to divest itself of their management through leases as soon as practicable, but only to a public housing agency. Forty-three PWA projects have been sold. Of the seven remaining projects, four are leased to local housing authorities and negotiations are well along the way for their sale. However, no sale or lease to a local public agency is possible now in the case of the two projects located in Enid and Oklahoma City, Okla., because there is no enabling State legislation, and none seems to be in the offing. Neither has the PHA been able to negotiate a sale or lease with a local public agency in Indianapolis, Ind., and, because of local opposition, it seems unlikely that this can be done in the near future.

This section is necessary in order to enable the PHA to sell the three projects on the private market if the three localities still do not wish to take steps to obtain State legislation or municipal approvals which would make local public ownership possible. The project at Enid (Okla. 1–1) is an 80-unit project which was completed in October 1937. The 80 units are located in 8 buildings, 1 or 2 stories high, on 4.8 acres of land. The project at Oklahoma City (Okla. 2–1) is a 354-unit project which was completed in August 1937. The units are located in 85 buildings, 1 or 2 stories high, on 36.8 acres of land. The Indianapolis project (Ind. 17–6) contains 748 units which were completed in October 1938. They are located in 23 buildings, 2, 3 or 4 stories high, on 22.1 acres of land.

TITLE V—COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 501. Availability of private financing: This section would amend the present law with reference to the availability of private financing so that the Housing Administrator would not be required to make a direct loan to an educational institution unless he determines that private financing is not available to it on terms and conditions which he considers reasonable and consistent with the purposes of the college housing law. The present law provides that no loan may be made unless the educational institution is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources on terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions available under the direct loan program. The terms of some loans may not be equally as favorable as a direct Federal loan in all respects, but still may be reasonable and consistent with the college housing law.

Of course, it has always been the policy that private rather than public funds be used for the provision of college housing wherever feasible. A direct loan should not be made if it is available on reasonable terms and would not defeat the purposes of the college housing law. This proposed change in the law should be considered in conjunction with sections 505–509 (establishing a college loan guaranty program) which would provide one means of obtaining private funds for those institutions which could qualify.

SEC. 502. Interest rate on college housing loans: This section would require the Housing Administrator, in making college housing loans, to charge an interest rate equal to that payable by him to the Treasury plus one-fourth of 1 percent. The present law provides for a similar spread, except that if the resulting rate is less than 2¾ percent, the higher rate must be charged. However, because of the different base to which the one-fourth percent differential would be applied under the provisions of section 504 (which changes the formula fixing the interest rate paid by the Administrator on funds borrowed from the Treasury for college housing loans) as compared with the present law, college housing loan interest rates would be increased from 3 percent to a more realistic figure, under current market conditions.

SEC. 503. Increase in college housing loan authorization: This section would increase the college housing loan authorization by $200 million (from $925 million to $1,125 million). It is estimated that the uncommitted balance of the present authorization will be, as of June 30, 1958, around $27 million. The increased authorization provided

by this section, along with the estimated balance would therefore permit new net commitments during fiscal year 1959, of approximately $225 million. Coupled with the new guaranty program explained below, this increase will permit continuation of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities at least at the level of the past several years.

The need for college housing is largely a reflection of college enrollments. From 1950 to 1957 fall college enrollments increased from 2,297,000 to 3,068,000, a rise of 34 percent. During the next 10 to 15 years, enrollments are expected to double, exceeding over 6 million students in 1970, as the war baby age groups reach college age. Both the college age group and the percentage of that group enrolling in colleges is expected to rise annually throughout this period.

No increase is proposed in the current limitation of $100 million for student unions, student centers, and related facilities. As noted in the President's budget message, to meet the increased needs for college housing arising from soaring enrollments, Federal loans to colleges should be entirely for essential dormitories and faculty housing, and should no longer be made for student unions and other less essential facilities. However, Federal aid for the latter classes would be available under the proposed guaranty program.

Similarly, no increase is proposed in the current limitation of $25 million for the housing of student nurses and interns, but Federal assistance would be available under the guaranty program.

Sec. 504. Interest rate on borrowings from the Treasury for college housing loans: This section would provide that college housing funds borrowed by the Administrator from the Secretary of the Treasury shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of maturities comparable to those on college housing loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth percent. This formula would be in place of the formula now in the law which bases the interest rate on the average rate borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, irrespective of maturity, as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, or 2½ percent, whichever is higher. Assuming that the Secretary of the Treasury fixes the rate payable by the Administrator on the basis of the estimated market yield on 15 year or 20 year United States marketable obligations, the formula proposed would currently result in the Administrator paying 3⅛ percent on funds borrowed from the Treasury. Under the present law, the rate for fiscal year 1958 is 2¾ percent.

The enactment of the interest rate formula proposed which would raise the interest rate on college housing loans, on the basis of February market conditions, from 3 percent to 3⅜ percent would eliminate the subsidy inherent in the existing interest rate formula by requiring the Administrator to borrow college housing loans funds from the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate of interest reflecting what the Treasury itself would have to pay if it went into the market to borrow the funds for a comparable length of time, and to charge a rate reflecting this cost.

Sections 505 through 509: New program of guaranties of taxable bonds of educational institutions to aid in financing housing and other educational facilities: These sections would amend the college housing law (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950) to establish a new program providing for Federal guaranties of bonds of educational institutions, the income of which is subject to Federal taxation, to assist these institutions in financing housing and other educational facilities, as defined in the act. This program would be in addition to the present program of direct loans to such institutions for the same purposes. Educational institutions which issue taxable bonds would have the option of borrowing either directly from the Federal Government under the existing loan program if funds are not available from other sources on terms and conditions which the Administrator considers reasonable and consistent with the purposes of the college housing program, or borrowing from private sources with the bonds being guaranteed by the Federal Government. It is expected that private educational institutions would be the primary beneficiaries of this new program, as the income from bonds of public institutions is generally exempt from Federal taxation.

Under the proposed legislation the housing obligations issued by eligible educational institutions would be backed by the credit of the United States through the medium of debt service guaranty contracts pursuant to which the United States would guarantee the debt service on such obligations as long as they remained outstanding. By assuring private lenders that the debt service payments would be met as scheduled, the proposed legislation, if enacted, is expected to be helpful in assisting educational institutions, which can issue taxable bonds, to obtain funds in the private market on favorable terms which will allow their dormitory construction programs to proceed.

Section 505 amends the existing law to authorize appropriations for the new program so that appropriations could be made for debt service payments.

Section 506 is a technical amendment.

Section 507 would make applicable to the Administrator's activities under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (both with respect to direct and guaranteed loans), the provisions of section 309 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950. The cited section authorizes agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act to merge funds in the Treasury from whatever source derived into one or more checking accounts for expenditure. Section 309 further provides that such funds may be expended only for the purposes authorized in their respective governing statutes.

The purpose of this section is to permit the Administrator to establish and maintain the College Housing Loan Guaranty Fund (provided for in sec. 509) on the books of the agency—thus assuring full separate operations of and accountability for this fund—while still maintaining, for efficiency and economy of operations, a single cash account with the Treasury for receipts and expenditures of both the direct loan and loan guaranty programs.

Section 508 adds a definition of "bonds" to the existing law.

Section 509 adds a new section to the existing law establishing the new guaranty program as follows:

Paragraph (a) would authorize the Housing Administrator to enter into contracts pursuant to which the Government would undertake to guarantee the payments of bonds, the income of which is subject to Federal taxation, sold by colleges and universities to private investors to finance the construction of housing and other educational facilities. The guarantee would cover the debt service on such bonds, to the extent that the pledged revenues prove inadequate. The aggregate amount of such guaranteed bonds outstanding at any one time would be limited to $100 million.

Paragraph (b) would establish a revolving guaranty fund which would be used by the Administrator to finance the costs, including administrative expenses, involved in carrying out the bond guarantee program. All receipts of the Administrator in carrying out his functions under this new program would be deposited in this fund and all expenses of the program would be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not immediately needed in the operation of the program could be invested in obligations of the United States or guaranteed by the United States or which are eligible for investment of public funds.

Paragraph (c) would authorize the Administrator to charge and collect a guaranty fee, to cover all expenses and to establish a reserve for possible losses. Such fee may be included in the amount of the bonds guaranteed.

Paragraph (d) would authorize the Administrator to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary which, when added to the moneys available in the fund, would be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on all guaranteed bonds pursuant to the provisions of the debt service guaranty contract. The interest rate on Treasury borrowings would be determined in the same manner as for similar borrowings for direct college housing loans as provided in section 504 of this bill.

Paragraph (e) is a technical amendment.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Surveys of public works planning: The Housing Administrator is now carrying out a program of advances for the planning of public works pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, which established a revolving fund for the program. This section of the bill would authorize the use during any fiscal year of $50,000 of the moneys in that revolving fund for the systematic and continuing collection of information on the current status of State and local public works planning and requirements for such public works. A survey of the status and volume of advance public works planning was undertaken pursuant to authority granted in the Housing Act of 1954, but that survey is now obsolete and no authority exists for additional ones to be made.

Under this section of the bill, it is contemplated that the information authorized to be collected would be compiled through representative sampling surveys of the more than 100,000 State and local governments. This would determine the current status and volume of plans for public works and the estimated long-range requirements for public works. This data, not now available, would provide the means for measuring the volume, type, and location of State and local public works plans and the extent to which such governments are meeting or planning to meet the steadily expanding requirements for public facilities. This would be of assistance in the program of advances for public works planning, aiding in evaluating applications received from the many local governments for planning advances. This would also provide continuing data for relating Federal public works programs to State and local programs so as to obtain the maximum economic benefits from minimum expenditures.

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the rates of basic compen-

sation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3400) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, introduced by Mr. LONG (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

S. 27 as passed by the Senate on February 28, 1958, was a good labor bill. It provided generous pay increases for post-office employees ranging from 17 percent at the lowest level to 7½ percent in the higher levels.

The bill had serious shortcomings as a management bill. It failed to maintain the differentials between clerks and carriers as compared to supervisors and postmasters. It failed to recognize fully the importance of good management and good supervision. It did not provide fully the desirable incentive to encourage clerks and carriers to seek to improve their skills and to advance in the service. In some respects it could be regarded as demoralizing to most of those who have advanced beyond level 5, inasmuch as most of those persons would not receive pay raises as much as those received by employees in grade 5 and below.

It will be noted that the enormous majority of employees beyond level 5 are concentrated in levels 6, 7, and 8. These employees presently receive salaries less than $500 per month. They are affected by the problems occasioned by the increase in the cost of living in much the same fashion as those in levels 4 and 5. The small amount of monetary savings occasioned by neglecting those in levels 13 and above would save the Government less than $250,000 annually. This minor savings does not justify a decision to withhold pay increases from this group. The savings does not offset the morale effect upon those who have heavy responsibilities and managerial duties in the administration of the postal service.

The present bill is to eliminate the inequities of S. 27 as applied to postmasters, postal supervisors, and other persons in grades above level 5 in the postal service.

S. 27 provides for a 7½-percent increase for post-office workers. In grades 1 through 5 it provides for an additional increase of $240. Grade 6 was provided an additional increase of $160 and grade 7 an additional increase of $80. In the absence of the amendments such as those proposed by Senators YARBOROUGH and LONG, S. 27 would fail to preserve the differentials between the various levels of postal employees. These differentials exist in order to maintain the ranking of positions in the postal field service on the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work. The pay increases proposed in the Long bill would correct this shortcoming. It would give proper recognition to the substantial differences in duties and responsibilities and in the difficulty of work to be performed. This bill would recognize the scope and variety of the tasks involved and in the conditions of performance.

Exhibit A sets forth the difference between the salaries proposed in S. 27 and the salaries proposed in the Long bill.

EXHIBIT A

The following chart shows how the schedule proposed in S. 27 would affect the salary schedule established by Public Law 68 unless the proposed changes are approved

Level (1)	Present salary (2)	Proposed salary S. 27 (3)	Proposed salary attached (4)	Proposed S. 27 (5)	Increase Long bill (6)	Difference between cols. 6 and 7
1	$3,480	$3,995	$3,995	$515	$515	----------
2	3,720	4,250	4,250	530	530	----------
3	4,020	4,570	4,570	550	550	----------
4	4,410	4,985	4,985	575	575	----------
5	4,630	5,220	5,220	590	590	----------
6	5,030	5,565	5,645	535	615	$80
7	5,460	5,940	6,100	480	640	160
8	5,910	6,365	6,605	455	695	240
9	6,390	6,875	7,115	485	725	240
10	7,000	7,525	7,765	525	765	240
11	7,700	8,270	8,510	570	810	240
12	8,460	9,105	9,305	640	840	200
13	9,290	9,990	10,150	700	860	160
14	10,180	10,940	11,060	760	880	120
15	11,150	11,850	12,050	700	900	200
16	12,100	12,875	13,075	775	975	200
17	13,200	14,055	14,255	855	1,055	200
18	14,600	15,560	15,680	960	1,080	120
19	15,200	15,900	16,330	700	1,130	430
20	16,000	16,000	17,000	0	1,000	1,000

Exhibit B sets forth the number of employees in each level, together with the amount of increase which the Long bill would provide over and above S. 27, as follows:

EXHIBIT B

Schedule indicating number of employees by levels benefiting by the proposed amendment to S. 27. The dollar increase per employee and the total cost, including fringe benefits

Level	Number of employees	Increase	Cost by levels
6	10,244	$80	$819,520
7	17,521	160	2,803,360
8	10,029	240	2,406,960
9	5,969	240	1,432,560
10	3,346	240	803,040
11	1,709	240	410,160
12	1,086	200	217,200
13	877	160	140,320
14	592	120	71,040
15	280	80	22,400
16	112	80	8,960
17	39	80	3,120
18	11	----------	----------
19	3	50	150
20	13	(1)	13,000
Gross costs	51,831	----------	10,066,365

[1] Ceiling raised to permit 6.2 percent increase.

NOTE.—The total estimated cost of $10,066,365 includes 10 percent which is the estimated costs of various fringe benefits as retirement, group life insurance, and payments under 204 (b) of Public Law 68 for those serving in higher level positions.

Exhibit C indicates the amount of increase that could be expected, as well as the percentage of increase comparing S. 27 to the Long bill:

EXHIBIT C

Level	Present step 7	Temporary rate	Amount of increase	Percentage increase proposed by Long bill	Percentage as passed by Senate Feb. 28, 1958
4	$4,410	$4,985	$575	13.0	13.0
5	4,630	5,220	590	12.7	12.7
6	5,030	5,645	615	12.2	10.6
7	5,460	6,100	640	11.7	8.8
8	5,910	6,605	695	11.7	7.7
9	6,390	7,115	725	11.3	7.5
10	7,000	7,765	765	10.9	7.5
11	7,700	8,510	810	10.5	7.4
12	8,460	9,305	840	9.9	7.5
13	9,290	10,150	860	9.2	7.5
14	10,180	11,060	880	8.6	7.5
15	11,150	12,050	900	8.0	6.3
16	12,100	13,075	975	8.0	6.4
17	13,200	14,255	1,055	7.9	6.5
18	14,600	15,680	1,080	7.4	6.6
19	15,200	16,330	1,130	7.1	4.6
20	16,000	17,000	1,000	6.2	---------

Exhibit "D" sets forth the number of employees who will benefit from the proposed changes:

EXHIBIT D

The number of employees who will benefit from the proposed changes in S. 27 total approximately 51,831, broken down as follows:

Regional	6,679
Inspection Service	1,365
Postmasters	[1]13,729
Post Office Supervisors	21,755
Postal Transportation Service Supervisors	[1]6,903
Custodial Supervisors	[1]800
Motor Vehicle Service Supervisors	[1]600

[1] These totals are estimates.

Approximately 49,000 of the supervisory employees listed above are in levels 6 through 11. It should be pointed out that the maximum salaries of supervisors in levels 6 through 11 range from $5,030 in level 6 to $7,700 in level 11. This clearly indicates that the great mass of supervisors and officials in the postal field service schedule are in the lower levels.

DESIGNATION OF MONTH OF MARCH AS NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MONTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim the month of March as Neighborhood House Month, beginning in 1959, and for each following year.

Since the establishment of the first settlement house in New York City's lower east side in 1886, these institutions have played a vital role in providing essential services to the people of their communities. They function as centers of community activities, culture, fellowship, education in health and ethics, and athletics. As a beneficiary in my youth of settlement-house training, I know the value of the work done by these organizations among people who need assistance and guidance. The twin objectives of neighborhood houses to

strengthen family life and develop better neighborhoods have paid off tremendously in terms of individual development and civic progress.

Since its beginning in New York in 1886, the settlement-house movement has grown throughout the United States, so that there are now more than 700 such establishments in almost every city of over 100,000 population in the country.

Through the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Houses, the coordinating agency, these centers carry forward a basic American principle of helping people to help themselves. It is most fitting that the public be made aware, through an annual month set aside for that purpose, of the contributions of the organizations to our society.

I believe the people of the country will be much interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to request the President to proclaim March as Neighborhood House Month, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 10881) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 4, line 9, after the amount insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) Within 60 days after the effective date of this act, any 1958 cotton acreage-reserve agreement shall be canceled without penalty, at the request of the farmer;

"(2) For any farm which does not participate in the 1958 cotton acreage-reserve program, the cotton-acreage allotment shall be increased by 30 percent: *Provided*, That the cotton produced from such increased acreage shall not be eligible for price support and the production from such increase shall not be taken into account in determining the level of price support for the 1958 crop; and

"(3) The additional acreage planted on the basis of such increased allotments shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county and farm-acreage allotments and such acreage shall be in addition to the county, State and national-acreage allotments. The production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10881, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

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. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address entitled "Underwriting the Future Strength of American Science and Technology," delivered by Dr. James Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, on March 2, 1958, at the Regional Conference of Massachusetts Institute of Technology on "The Outlook for Science in America."

By Mr. GREEN:

Editorial entitled "Our Restive Neighbors," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 3, 1958.

By Mr. COTTON:

Editorial entitled "Man of Courage," published in the Washington Star of March 2, 1958.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Immovable Mr. Benson," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 3, 1958.

Editorial entitled "Fake Tax Cut," published in the Washington Daily News of February 8, 1958.

By Mr. LONG:

Editorial entitled "Let the Public Decide," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1958.

By Mr. MORTON:

Editorial entitled "Compromise or Else," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1958.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Editorial entitled "Our Restive Neighbors," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 3, 1958; which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "Federal Taxes Cut State, Local Revenue," written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the Greenwood (S. C.) Index-Journal of February 24, 1958.

Article entitled "President's Civil Rights Allies Wavering," written by Holmes Alexander and published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of February 28, 1958.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Article entitled "White Slaves Plant the Red Moon," published in Germany in the magazine World on the Weekend.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "Loans for Development of Asia and Africa—Plan by Senator MONRONEY," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of March 2, 1958.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

Article entitled "The Harried 'Boss,'" published in the Denver (Colo.) Post of January 9, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "A Chemical Engineer Visits the U. S. S. R.," written by Edgar L. Piret and published in Chemical Engineering Progress of December 1957.

PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FISH IN CERTAIN AREAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to 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 ricefield crops, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 8, after "determine" insert ", in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture,"; on page 2, line 10, after "crops;" insert "and"; on page 2, strike out lines 11 and 12, and on page 2, line 13, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on page 2 of the bill, the House added a very minor amendment, relating to cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately following conclusion of morning business, there be a call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1298, Senate bill 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Thursday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 573. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski;

S. 674. An act for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun; and

S. 888. An act for the relief of Alex P. Collins.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margot M. Draughon;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Ralph H. Weeks;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf; and

H. R. 5163. An act for the relief of Forest H. Byroade.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the front pages of today's newspapers report the arrangement which has been made by President Eisenhower with Vice President NIXON to assure that the powers and duties of the Presidency will continue to be carried out in an orderly fashion in the event of Presidential disability. The first report of the existence of this arrangement was made by the President at his press conference last

Wednesday, February 26, in his answers to questions put to him by two reporters. I request that the text of these questions and answers be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the questions and answers was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S NEWS CONFERENCE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1958, AS PUBLISHED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES, FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Felix Belair, of the New York Times: "Mr. President, you have asked Congress repeatedly, I think, sir, to deal with the question of Presidential disability, and on constitutional ambiguity on that point, but nothing has been done up on the Hill about it as yet. Now, it is reported that you have reached an understanding with the Cabinet and Vice President NIXON on the question, as far as your own administration is concerned. I wonder if you could tell us anything on that?"

Answer. "Well, I brought out long ago, I think after my first illness, or certainly quite a while back, that I think this is something that Congress should take action on, and I personally think it probably requires a constitutional amendment, if it is going to be clearly corrected.

"Now, in my own case, because I think in between Mr. NIXON and myself there is a rather unique state of mutual confidence and even liking and respect, that there, I think there is no problem, because I think Mr. NIXON knows exactly what he should do in the event of a Presidential disability of the kind that we are talking about. And so, I have got my own conscience clear at the moment, but I still think it should be handled as something for all future cases."

Robert J. Donovan of the New York Herald Tribune: "Sir, in answering Felix Belair and talking about your relations with Vice President NIXON, may I ask: Have you put in writing any specific expression of your will for Mr. NIXON or for the Cabinet in case of emergencies?"

Answer. "I don't think that is really quite the answer that—an answer that I should give, for this particular reason: If I have, then probably you would want the letter, then you would want to see whether my grammar is correct, and all the rest of it [laughter], and I say this: There is such a clear understanding between Mr. NIXON and myself, an understanding to which others around me are completely privy, that it is inconceivable, that is, between him and me, that any misunderstanding could occur."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it was only natural, following this report, that there should be interest expressed in knowing the precise terms of the arrangements referred to by the President.

It might have been expected that the President would disclose to the country the terms of the arrangement as he did yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's agreement with the Vice President on the transfer of power in the event of the President's disability be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE INABILITY PACT

(NOTE.—The text of the President's agreement with Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on transfer of power in the event of disability.)

The President and the Vice President have agreed that the following procedures are in accord with the purposes and provisions of article 2, section 1, of the Constitution, dealing with Presidential disability. They believe that these procedures, which are intended to apply to themselves only, are in no sense outside or contrary to the Constitution but are consistent with its present provisions and implement its clear intent.

1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the office until the inability had ended.

2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from so communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the office and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe that the country is very fortunate in having a Chief Executive who has handled with such candor this important and troublesome question of what shall happen in the event of his disability. He has at no time sought to mislead the public either as to the condition of his health or as to how the conduct of the office of the Presidency would be continued in the event of his disability.

I believe that yesterday's White House announcement on Presidential disability will come to have great historical significance. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the text of the front-page story published in this morning's New York Times, reporting the announcement, together with the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times]

EISENHOWER DISABILITY PACT CALLS FOR ACTING PRESIDENT—TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT MADE PUBLIC—NIXON WOULD TAKE OVER DUTIES UNTIL EISENHOWER RECOVERED

(By Edwin L. Dale)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—The White House announced today details of an agreement between President Eisenhower and Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on what is to be done if the President becomes disabled.

The plan calls for the Vice President to become Acting President and to assume "the powers and duties of the office until the inability had ended."

The determination of inability would be made, "if possible," by the President, who would "so inform the Vice President."

In case of an inability "which would prevent the President from so communicating with the Vice President," the Vice President would make the determination "after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances."

In any event, the President himself "would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the office."

The announcement said the two had agreed that the procedures were "in accord with the purposes and provisions of article 2, section 1, of the Constitution, dealing with Presidential inability."

The announcement also said that the procedures "are intended to apply to themselves only."

James C. Hagerty, the White House press secretary, said today's statement had been drawn up this morning in the President's office by the two men and the Attorney General, William P. Rogers.

He said Rogers had fully concurred in the constitutional aspects of the statement.

Mr. Hagerty said that the plan did not imply any abandonment of the administration's request to Congress for a constitutional amendment dealing with the problem.

The press secretary would not say whether any written agreement on procedures for Presidential disability had existed before today's statement.

The question of whom the Vice President would consult in case of a disability so severe that the President could not make the finding himself would depend upon the circumstances, Mr. Hagerty said.

Asked whether the Cabinet, or the Chief Justice, or medical authorities would be consulted, Mr. Hagerty refused to elaborate.

CITES ILEITIS SURGERY

He suggested, however, that the President might have invoked such a plan before his operation for ileitis in June 1956.

At that time the President was under anesthesia for about 6 hours. Mr. Hagerty indicated that invocation would have been more likely then than at the time of the President's heart attack in 1955.

Republican Congressional leaders were informed of today's announcement before it was made public.

Public concern with the disability question took a sudden spurt last week when the President disclosed at his news conference that he and the Vice President had a complete understanding on the matter. The President hinted at the existence of a written agreement.

Mr. Hagerty said today's statement was issued to avoid "any air of mystery" about the matter. If questions are raised about the legality of the plan, he said, it will be up to the Attorney General to answer them.

Asked whether the Vice President would take an oath upon assuming the powers and duties of the Presidential office, Mr. Hagerty said he was not certain but that he thought not.

The administration's request for a constitutional amendment on the disability question has been bogged down in Congress. Among others, House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas, has opposed the plan in favor of a simple act of Congress.

Under the administration proposal, the procedure would be much the same as in today's announcement, except that the Vice President, if he were required to make the determination of disability, would have to get the written approval of a majority of the Cabinet.

The original constitutional provision on disability is vague, and is generally agreed to have been left vague purposely by the Founding Fathers.

The pertinent section reads in part:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President."

Mr. Hagerty said today the President and Vice President had discussed the disability problem from time to time since the President's 1955 heart attack. However, the plan was only "crystallized" in the last month, he said.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 4, 1958]

SENSE ON SUCCESSION

President Eisenhower's understanding with Vice President NIXON ought to go a very long

way toward satisfying the public concern over what to do in the event of Presidential disability. Among the virtues of the simple arrangement announced yesterday by the White House are that it involves no erosion of Presidential powers and requires no constitutional amendment or legisaltion inviting political jockeying—and it is wholly within the purview of what the Constitution intended. Why there should have been any doubt about the wisdom of making the arrangement public is a mystery; in any event, Mr. Eisenhower is to be congratulated for completing this step.

In accordance with the understanding, the President could ask the Vice President to serve as Acting President until his disability had ended. If the President were so disabled as to be prevented from making such a request, the Vice President—after appropriate consultation, presumably with the Cabinet—could assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President until the disability had ended. In either event the President himself would determine when his disability had ended and when he should regain his office.

Although this arrangement applies only to Messrs. Eisenhower and NIXON, it is a highly sensible procedure which could well become a precedent for future understandings by other Presidents and Vice Presidents. Some question may remain about what would happen in the remote event that a mentally disabled President sought to regain his office. Such a situation of course could be handled by the process of impeachment; and Congress could provide a means whereby its leaders could summon it back into session if it were not meeting when this sort of contingency arose.

The Eisenhower-Nixon arrangement makes clear that the accession of the Vice President in the case of Presidential disability would be as Acting President. There are, to be sure, some disagreements over what the Constitution actually contemplated in this connection, though the debates indicate pretty conclusively that the Founding Fathers envisaged a temporary role for the Acting President. The assumption of Presidential duties and powers in the event of disability would in any case be different from the accession of the Vice President in the event of the death of the President—a situation in which tradition and precedent have made the Vice President's accession permanent.

If Members of Congress are worried about any possible ambiguity in the present management, they could well confirm by simple joint resolution their understanding of and concurrence with the President's plan. Indeed, similar action might well become a first order of business for new Presidents and Congresses upon taking office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is clear to all of us that the uncertainty attending the exercise of the powers and duties of the Presidency in case of Presidential disability results from the imprecision of language in article II, section 1, clause 6, of our Constitution. It is also clear that the uncertainty has persisted because of the failure of Congress for 169 years to act so as to remedy this vagueness. President Eisenhower has done all that he can do to eliminate the uncertainty so far as his term in office is concerned. There can be no doubt that the responsibility for eliminating the uncertainty as to the future lies with Congress.

In the discussions of this subject there has been much sincere and well-reasoned disagreement as to how best to clarify the question. I know that the Senate Judiciary Committee has given long and thoughtful consideration to the subject. I hope that when its recommendations are made to the Senate, we may vote on a constitutional amendment at this session.

George Washington once wrote:

Government is not mere advice; it is authority, with power to enforce its laws.

The time has come for Congress to exercise its authority, and to provide a law by means of which the country will have a permanent, clear understanding as to how the powers and duties of the Presidency shall be exercised if ever the President becomes disabled.

In closing my remarks I ask that the text of three excellent articles on this subject, written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of February 27 and 28 and March 2, 1958, respectively, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1958]

A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING WITH THE VICE PRESIDENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—The "conviction" expressed here under date of February 19 that the President had taken steps to assure that the Vice President would take over his powers and duties if or when the President lay in a state of physical and/or mental disability to exercise them was confirmed by the President at his news conference today. The existence of the arrangement seemed conclusively indicated on February 18 when the Attorney General, unyielding in his stand for constitutional amendment as a permanent solution, showed no concern that any such emergency would arise in this administration.

The simple, though temporary, solution has always been available to any President. The important difference is that President Eisenhower recognized this and put the fact to practical use.

POWERS AND DUTIES ASSUMED

His clear understanding with the Vice President, doubtless in a legal form approved by the Attorney General, disposes, so far as this administration is concerned, of the grave problem that has existed since the Constitution was ratified. If President Eisenhower should become disabled to a point where he could not himself certify it, the Vice President would assume the entire Presidential function with the advance approval of the stricken Chief Executive. The office, as distinct from the powers and duties, would (unless he resigned meanwhile) remain in the President's possession during the inability period to the end of his elected term, should the period last that long.

Since President Eisenhower has been practical and sensible enough to make this simple arrangement, it is reasonable to assume that it also provides a formula for the resumption of his powers and duties by the President—thus filling another gap in the Constitution, under the authority of this language: "Such officer (the Vice President) shall act until the disability be removed or another President shall be elected." The gap is the failure of the Constitution to prescribe how and by whom it shall be determined that the disability has been removed.

PERMANENT MEANS STILL NEEDED

What is known of the understanding between this President and this Vice President strongly suggests that it provides also against a situation—most improbable in the case of Eisenhower—where a still-disabled President would notify a Vice President he was resuming the exercise of his powers and duties. But this situation could arise in a subsequent administration. Also, a future President would not be bound to effect the same kind of understanding with the Vice President that Eisenhower and NIXON have reached and of which essential members of the Cabinet have been apprised. That is why a permanent means to assure continuous, orderly, and competent Executive government can be furnished only by act of Congress.

The constitutional amendment proposed to Congress by the Attorney General, and an implementing statute, would create machinery to take care of all contingencies. It would even make specific provision for the exceedingly perilous possibility that a President, still incompetent to function, would use his undoubted right to resume the exercise of his powers and duties. By this section of the proposed administration amendment, if the Vice President and a Cabinet majority should assert to Congress in writing that the President was still incompetent, Congress would invoke the impeachment process. If the House approved the assertion and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting agreed, the President's function would remain in the hands of the Acting President until the end of the current term, or until majorities of both branches of Congress voted that the competence of the President had been restored.

BINDING STATUTE EXCLUDED

The Attorney General has announced that he will counsel the President to veto any statute by which Congress undertook to create machinery to determine disability and its termination that was binding on the Executive. There is little doubt such a veto would stand because the repassage of the measure would be a firm invitation to legal challenge of every Executive action it authorized. Apparently a purely advisory or permissive statute would not be vetoed. But it would be merely an ineffective gesture and thus no solution at all.

The President's explanation today why none of the conceivable emergencies can occur before the end of his term, January 20, 1961, shatters the principal argument against the amending process. For there is no reasonable ground to believe that an amendment, submitted at this session by Congress to the States, cannot be added to the Constitution by that time.

Twice after the President's heart attack in 1955, and his subsequent candid discussions of the problems of disability determinations that the Constitution leaves open, the obvious and simple arrangement he said today he had made was reported here as his probable solution for the duration of his term.

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1958]

CRITICS WHO ARE UNITED ONLY IN CRITICISM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Instead of praising President Eisenhower for taking the first constructive step in American history to provide for continuous, legal and orderly executive government in event of the physical and/or mental disability of a President who cannot or will not announce this, Democrats in Congress today were concentrating on criticism. Yet it is the failure of Congress for 169 years to help fill in this loophole in the Constitution that obliged the President to supply the best possible temporary substitute.

This is his clear understanding with Vice President NIXON, and Cabinet members essential to its execution, whereby such an interregnum can be averted. Until the details can be known of this arrangement, presumably written in a form approved by

the Attorney General, the main question of its scope that Democrats raised today cannot be evaluated. This question is whether, if the Vice President in the administration should take over the President's powers and duties for a period of disability that the President afterward declared terminated, the office would revert to its elected incumbent.

Speaker RAYBURN's comment today on the President's announcement of the understanding yesterday was that he does not see how, in view of the oath required of the President by the Constitution, the Presidency—the office itself—could revert, once the oath was taken by an Acting President. This oath, as prescribed by section 1 (7), article II, is: "I do somenly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

AN ANSWER TO RAYBURN

In the Speaker's view no understanding or inter-Executive arrangement, however documented, can put any time limit on the tenure of whoever takes this oath except the end of the term for which the President was elected. This is a point. But it is not conceivable that the Attorney General failed to take it into account in the Eisenhower-Nixon understanding. And, in the opinion of constitutional lawyers of high repute to whom this correspondent referred the issue, RAYBURN's argument is nullified by its premise, which is that an Acting President must take the oath above.

According to these authorities, the Vice President, for example, can temporarily exercise the duly delegated duties and powers of the Presidency under his own oath, and under that part of section 1 (5), article II, which specifies that the Presidential powers and duties shall "devolve on (any legal successor) * * * until the disability (of the President) be removed or a President shall (again) be elected."

AN INCONSISTENCY

Moreover, the citation by the Speaker of the Constitution to support his point is wholly inconsistent with his decision that all the uncertainties over Presidential disability can be disposed of by a statute that would be binding on the Executive. After long opposing any action at all, RAYBURN has become the leader of the Congressional group which not only takes this position but rejects the administration's conclusion that solely by constitutional amendment can Congress be authorized to supply permanent machinery by which the Executive will be bound.

If the Constitution bars an inter-Executive understanding by which Presidential duties and powers can temporarily be delegated to the Vice President, then by the same reasoning the same document supplies the barrier against a statutory solution of the remaining aspects of the problem. Thus by his citation the Speaker has implicitly conceded the legal validity of the administration's position that an amendment is necessary, and that a binding statute, being invalid, must be vetoed.

THE INACTION OF CONGRESS

Other Democratic critics of the President's historic stopgap arrangement for the period of his incumbency, an arrangement made necessary by the continued inaction of the Congress of which they are Members, had other complaints. These did not, like the Speaker, offer exceptions based on legal arguments. Some reasonably demanded that all details be made known. But Senator MORSE, of Oregon, accused General Eisenhower of viewing the Presidency as "a tight little preserve like a quail-hunting lodge." He denigrated the provision against a paralyzing interregnum during this administration as a "secret understanding," and added the slur that "if the President is not up to his job he ought to declare the fact and resign."

In none of this was there commendation for statesmanship which greatly merits it. And in none was there admission that its necessity arose from the abiding negligence of Congress to do its part. This negligence has been even less excusable for the last 3 years because, ever since his heart attack, the President has been citing his own medical experience as a conclusive reason why Congress should act.

[From the New York Times of March 2, 1958]

PRESIDENT PRESCRIBES DISABILITY SOLUTION—HE HAS MOVED TO AUTHORIZE NIXON TO TAKE OVER EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN SPECIFIED CIRCUMSTANCES—STILL SEEKS AN AMENDMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—President Eisenhower has cut the Gordian knot at which Congress has been plucking listlessly for 169 years. His clear understanding with Vice President NIXON, whereby the latter temporarily will exercise the powers and duties of the Presidency if or when the President becomes incompetent to function, provides for such an emergency in this administration.

The understanding, evidently in written form approved by Attorney General Rogers, apparently provides also for the contingency that the President's disability might be such he could not assert it (the Constitution requires this before his function can be delegated). The President has discussed this possibility publicly as a danger that should be obviated.

Apparently, also, the President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General are confident their formula disposes of an old bugaboo. This is the argument of a minority of constitutional lawyers that, once an Acting President has taken over the Chief Executive's powers and duties, the Presidency itself goes with the assumption and cannot revert to the incumbent if and when he declares that his disability has terminated.

Among those who have been troubled by this interpretation is Speaker RAYBURN, because his premise is that an Acting President must take the Presidential oath. Administration lawyers, however, reject this premise, holding that the oath taken by all officials, beginning with the Vice President, who are in the line of Presidential succession, is legally sufficient to the purpose, in combination with this language of section 1 (6), article II:

"The same [which they construe to refer only to duties and powers] shall devolve on the Vice President; and Congress [in the event there is no Vice President] may * * * declare what officer shall then act as President.

BASIS FOR CONCLUSION

This is the basis of the administration's legal conclusion that no such officer is required to take the Presidential oath.

But the Attorney General, while satisfied that the "clear understanding" fully protects the Nation from a paralyzing interregnum in the life of this administration (it ends January 20, 1961), has urged Congress to make the protection permanent by submitting to the States at this session a constitutional amendment, substituting organic law for his intrepretations by providing that—

1. During a period of Presidential disability when an Acting President is exercising the powers and duties of the Chief Executive, the Presidency itself shall remain with the incumbent until the end of his elected term, should his disability last that long and he fail to resign.

2. There shall be no automatic reassumption of his powers and duties by a still-disabled President; in that event the Vice President and a majority of the heads of the executive departments may carry the issue to Congress. If the House concludes by a majority that the President is still disabled, and the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting, accepts this conclusion, the Acting Presidency will continue until, by majorities in both branches, Congress reverses its finding.

EXECUTIVE DECISION

3. The initiation of both processes, however—the Acting Presidency and its termination—shall rest exclusively with the executive department instead of being shared with Members of Congress, as other amendment texts and proposed statutes now prescribe.

If Congress should submit any amendment to the States that does not include this third point, or if Congress should legislate a Presidential disability formula binding on the Executive, the Attorney General has announced he would recommend a veto. Since there is no doubt the President would follow this recommendation, and little chance that Congress could produce the two-thirds required to override such a veto, the prospect is that Congress will accept the Attorney General's plan, if it legislates at all.

UNDERSTANDING DISCLOSED

The fact of the "clear understanding" was disclosed by the President Wednesday at a news conference, and only then in response to a reporter's question. He declined to give details, including whether the arrangement is documentary. This was understandable in the most informal circumstances of the historic revelation. But, though not disputing this, both Republicans and Democrats in Congress insisted the President must give these details to the Legislature and to the American people. It was pointed out that Congress is entitled to the information, and not only for the reason that the President has asked it to legislate on disability. And it was also pointed out that the people are entitled to know because of the vital national and international consequences that are potential in the understanding. The prevailing impression here is that the President will accede to this demand.

The President's provision against the kind of interregnum during his tenure that paralyzed Executive government for periods of the Garfield and Wilson administrations was made in the framework of continued Congressional inaction on this problem. Several times before, discussing (with a candor no previous Chief Executive has displayed) the possibility implicit in his three illnesses that he could become incompetent and unable to announce it as the Constitution requires before there can be an Acting President, General Eisenhower appealed to Congress to amend the Constitution to forestall such a disaster.

RENEWED EFFORT

Until he announced he had made a covering arrangement so far as his tenure is concerned, Congress had produced no cohesion on any proposed solution. After his disclosures, a bipartisan effort took form for an amendment in the pattern defined by the Attorney General—the work of Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois. Other Members are still pressing for a binding statute, despite its foreshadowed death by veto. Still others favor an amendment authorizing Congress to devise any mandatory machinery it chooses.

But the President's disclosure shattered the principal argument against an amendment—that ratification would take too long in view of his medical history. And his announcement foreshadowed also that the end Congressional product will be the Kefauver-Dirksen proposal, which accepts the administration's view.

ALTERATION OF THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was very gratifying to learn yesterday that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is now supporting the efforts of those who seek to prevent the alteration of the east front of the Capitol. Today I have learned with great pleasure that the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has declared his opposition to changing the Capitol's east front.

It would seem that as more of my colleagues become aware of the nature of the project, the more support they give to the position of those of us who have been attempting to find other solutions to Capitol problems of safety and space.

Those of my colleagues who are still unaware of the present controversy would be well advised to read the excellent articles of Elsie Carper, the second of which appeared in today's Washington Post. I inserted the first article in the RECORD yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the second article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CHANGING THE CAPITOL: EAST FRONT PLAN PARALLELS PROPOSAL OF TRUMAN TO REVAMP WHITE HOUSE

(By Elsie Carper)

Men in public office have in the past been made aware in no uncertain terms that the buildings in which they work don't belong to them but to the people.

This was the case when President Truman tried to revamp the executive offices at the White House in 1946. Public demand stopped the White House addition.

There are many parallels in the White House project and the proposal now being pushed by a Congressional commission to re-do the east front of the Capitol.

Both plans were conceived and put into motion without public hearings. No authorizing legislation went through Congress. Funds for the projects were tacked on at the last minute to appropriations bills.

President Truman wanted additional office space, a cafeteria and a 2-story auditorium added to the White House west wing.

The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, headed by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, wants to rebuild the historic east front, the scene of Presidential inaugurals to provide for more offices, restaurants and a private corridor.

Historical and architectural organizations led a last ditch fight against the White House changes. When the project was halted by Congress, a section of fence had been torn down and wreckers were at work in the basement.

Later when the main section of the White House was found to be in need of repair, the interior was rebuilt from cellar to roof without damage to the exterior walls. A proposal to raze the mansion and rebuild it in marble was turned down because of the historic significance of the building.

Walls as historic as those in the White House would disappear if the east front is reconstructed. The plan is to put up a marble replica 32½ feet east of the present portico at a cost of $10.1 million.

The center section of the Capitol is built from the same Virginia sandstone as the White House. Washington supervised the planning of both buildings. The walls of both were burned by the British in the War of 1812.

The American Institute of Architects and historical groups across the country are leading the fight to stop the Capitol project.

They are endorsing a bill now before a Senate Public Works Subcommittee, headed by Senator PAT MCNAMARA (Democrat, Michigan), that would halt the east front extension and turn architects loose to find other and less expensive means of adding office and eating space.

Consulting architects, hired by the Commission to plan the east front alteration, last summer came up with sweeping plans that would extend the building to the east and west and also provide underground garages. RAYBURN quashed all of the proposals except the one for the east front.

The Commission never publicly released the architects' proposals. They fell into public hands when Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND (Republican, California), a member of the Commission, put them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the hectic closing day of the last Congress.

Since then the American Institute of Architects has vainly sought to see the detailed plans and sketches locked in the office of Capitol Architect J. George Stewart.

Not until hearings were held before MCNAMARA's subcommittee did the AIA learn why its request to see the plans were turned down and why its offer to give free advice on other ways of providing space was rejected.

Plans "do not belong to the public," Stewart testified.

Since then Stewart has released bare outlines of floor plans for the east front, showing the extended walls, the pattern of rooms and new corridors. The plans were released only after the Commission had authorized him to go ahead and let contracts.

Stung by the AIA's criticism that the east front alteration was sneaked through Congress without hearings, Stewart traced legislative history for the proposal back to 1903 and pointed out that hearings were held in 1935 and 1937.

"The validity of those arguments (relating to the extension) * * * does not change with the years," Stewart said.

What Stewart didn't say was that the lack of hearings kept Congress from airing the proposal. When the hearings were held, the east-front plan was defeated.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the continuous stream of information coming to us about achievements of the mutual security program belies increasingly the slogan "give away," used by the opposition to the program.

In an article in the January 16 issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mr. William L. Ryan, of the Associated Press, writing about the technical assistance program in the Middle East, states:

On the whole, Arabs agree most of the projects have been worth while.

One Arab leader is quoted as saying, "Point 4 has given employment to thousands in the Middle East who otherwise would not have jobs."

The extent of the activities of the technical assistance program is impressive. Mr. Ryan points out that—

The Middle East has many examples of so-called trivial jobs which paid off. There are dozens of big projects too, like the Litani River program in Lebanon which proved an irrigation-hydroelectric project feasible and induced the World Bank to lend $26 million for it.

This, says Mr. Ryan, is the free world's answer to the Communist declaration of economic war. We are helping these nations to achieve economic progress through the methods of free men. Success depends upon our will to continue this aid until the momentum of growth can be sustained by these nations alone, and their societies become strong enough to resist Communist subversion.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Ryan, dated January 16 and entitled "America's Unsung Ambassadors: 862 United States Technicians in Mid-East," be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

AMERICA'S UNSUNG AMBASSADORS: 862 UNITED STATES TECHNICIANS IN MID-EAST—THEY ARE SEEKING TO STEM RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC GAINS THERE

(By William L. Ryan)

WASHINGTON.—The Russians served clear notice of their intentions.

"The capitalist countries no longer have a monopoly on supplying machinery and equipment, granting credits and imparting know-how," Soviet Delegate A. A. Arzumanyan told the Afro-Asian Conference in Cairo last month.

The Russians thus repeated their war declaration in the political-economic field in underdeveloped countries. And, despite sputniks and missiles, the political-economic arena is the place where the decisive battles of the cold war are likely to be fought.

An important, and often unnoticed, part in this battle is played by America's small army of technical experts under the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) program to help other nations help themselves.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

How are the Americans doing? Are there too many of them in the Middle East and North Africa?

Compared with the rest of the world, the Middle East, probably the most sensitive cold war front, received a relatively small share of the United States technical aid program, which Arabs still call point 4.

Once, under President Truman's point 4 program, Americans were welcomed in Egypt. Their work inspired some of the ambitious projects of the Egyptian revolution. But American-Egyptian relations soured. Today, the program in Egypt is insignificant.

Altogether there are 862 Americans working on technical aid programs in Middle East countries, distributed as follows: Iran, 315; Iraq, 101; Jordan, 81; Lebanon, 63; Libya, 134; Ethiopia, 157, and Egypt, only 1.

Syria was offered point 4 and rejected it on political grounds. Saudi Arabia first accepted, then rejected such help. There is no program in the Sudan.

Before the Suez Canal nationalization in 1956, Egypt had 75 American technicians. The ICA program has been temporarily suspended since that crisis.

TUNISIA AND MOROCCO

In North Africa, Tunisia has only eight American technicians. United States prestige is high there. Tunisia wants more Americans.

Morocco has a staff of 21 Americans. There is no significant anti-American feeling, but since there is a military installation of 15,000 Americans, it is one of the countries which might complain of too many Americans.

In the Arab east, the once common complaint of too many Americans seems to be lessening. Perhaps this is because Soviet offers of technicians made Arabs suspicious. They do not know Russians. They know

Americans and generally like them—although the United States Government has been losing friends swiftly through the area.

Arabs have complained that too many aid dollars went into fat American salaries. The facts seem to dispute this. In any event, ICA officials contend there are just not enough Arab technicians qualified to do the work. This is the basic reason for the ICA program.

PROJECTS AND WORK

On the whole, Arabs agree most of the projects have been worthwhile. Said one Arab official:

"Point 4 has given employment to thousands in the Middle East who otherwise would not have jobs. Even Americans are spending their money here, which means employment for still more."

In Lebanon, American technicians' work produced a new breed of chicken which thrives in the climate and produces eggs greatly superior to the local type. Lebanese call them point 4 eggs.

The Lebanese Government had been spending $16,000 a year trying to keep coastal highways clear of drifting sand. It was a losing fight. But "in 3 days a point 4 technician did the job for all time," a Lebanese official said. He found a wild grass which would thrive in the sand, and had the Army plant shoots along the highways.

The Middle East has many examples of so-called "trivial" jobs which paid off. There are dozens of big projects, too, like the Litani River program in Lebanon which proved an irrigation-hydroelectric project feasible and induced the World Bank to lend $26 million for it.

In Iraq, ICA technicians cooperated with the Iraq Development Board on a huge economic program paid for by the nation's oil revenues. Similar work goes on in Jordan, Libya and other Arab areas.

VIEWS OF ADMIRAL STRAUSS

In Tunis, Adm. Elliott B. Strauss, director of the special United States Economic Mission, says his staff of 8 American technicians is clearly insufficient. Current aid to Tunisia runs to $15 million yearly to raise living standards. It has sent Tunisian students to the United States and Europe for training. It has supplied wheat to meet local shortages. But, said a Tunisian official, it is just an encouraging beginning.

"If we cannot obtain sufficient American and French aid," said Ahmed Kenani, Tunisia's planning undersecretary, "unemployment will rise and will quickly threaten the foundations of the current regime. Without an increase of resources and economic-technical aid from France and the United States, Tunisian independence will no longer have any meaning."

In Rabat, Cedric H. Seager, chief of the Morocco ICA Mission, concedes there may be too many Americans around, what with the military personnel. He says it might be advisable to keep the American aid staff in Morocco to a minimum and find substitutes, possibly among the French and Spanish. The consensus among Moroccans seems to be that they don't want American technicians so much as United States cash to finance projects which they think they can handle themselves.

PUBLIC DEBATE WITH THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in today's issue of the New York Times there is published an editorial which makes the following statement with regard to the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson:

It is doubtful that, even among those critics who profess to regard his policies as unsound, one could be found who would be prepared to meet the Secretary of Agriculture in open debate in public, which proves this much, at least—that though they may not know much about agricultural economics, they at least have a highly developed instinct for survival.

Mr. President, I have written to the New York Times the following letter:

EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In your editorial entitled "The Benson Issue" appearing in the March 4 issue you say, "It is doubtful that, even among those critics who profess to regard his policies as unsound, one could be found who would be prepared to meet the Secretary of Agriculture in open debate in public, which proves this much at least—that though they may not know much about agricultural economics they at least have a highly developed instinct for survival."

May I say as a Senator who has been persistently critical of Secretary Benson and who therefore may qualify, I will be happy to meet Mr. Benson in public debate any time, any place, under any kind of arrangements, before any audience he may choose.

Because of this suggestion in the New York Times I am writing Secretary Benson today, calling his attention to your editorial and informing him that all he has to do is say the word and he will have this Senator as his opponent in public debate. He can choose any and all of the circumstances of the debate.

I will only suggest that since the verdict must be with the voters that he set the date some time before next November's elections. I will be a candidate for the United States Senate in these elections. Mr. Benson's policies will be an important issue, not only with the 20 percent of our Wisconsin people who live on farms but with the 80 percent who do not.

Let us have this debate wherever and whenever he wishes and then let the people decide.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of March 4, 1958]

THE BENSON ISSUE

The average reader following the news stories dealing with the attitude of Congress toward the retainment of Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture might be forgiven if he concluded that the only Republican standing behind this dedicated and courageous friend of the farmer was the man who appointed him, President Eisenhower.

This would not be the fault of the newspapers; it would be because the outcry raised by Mr. Benson's critics is noisy and persistent, out of all proportion to its importance, and is prompted predominantly by a desire to make the headlines. It is doubtful that, even among those critics who profess to regard his policies as unsound, one could be found who would be prepared to meet the Secretary of Agriculture in open debate in public, which proves this much at least—that though they may not know much about agricultural economics they at least have a highly developed instinct for survival.

Unfortunately for the reputation and the future of the Republican Party, a sizable proportion of this noisy minority pitches its opposition to Mr. Benson at an even lower level than those who profess objections to the Secretary's policies. These are the boys who have been frightened into opposing him not because his policies are not right but because, while he is probably right he may have antagonized agriculture's vested interests. Primarily these would be the big farmers, who learned to become accustomed to living off Government subsidies under temporary legislation enacted in wartime and whose Representatives in Congress have steadfastly refused to return, as they were directed by that legislation, to a farm program designed to meet the requirements of peacetime.

Confidence in the basic policies of Mr. Benson, a successful farmer and graduate student of agriculture, is not confined to the White House. That confidence is shared by such farm organizations as the American Farm Bureau Federation, by an overwhelming majority of farm economists and by the studies of groups, objectively minded, such as the American Assembly, which have no ax to grind and which are representative of every important segment of the economy.

ORDER REDUCING PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY COMMODITIES ON APRIL 1

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at the end of this month, a terrible blow is to fall upon the dairy farmers of this country.

The Secretary of Agriculture has ordered price supports for dairy commodities to be reduced on April 1 to only 75 percent of parity. This means a loss of about 25 cents per hundred pounds in the price farmers will get for milk which is used in manufacturing dairy products.

This action by the Secretary will slash dairy producers' gross incomes by 8 percent. It will bring a much greater proportional cut to their net incomes—for no reduction in costs will accompany the cut in the prices they receive. For many producers, it will wipe out the last, thin margin of net return on the farmers' labor and investment. It will simply destroy the economic foundations of those farm families.

Mr. President, this cut in dairy farmers' incomes is unwise, unfair, and dangerous. I have received from a dairy farmer who lives in my State a letter which describes with unusual clarity and accuracy the errors of this proposed cut in dairy farm income. He speaks from experience. In view of the urgent importance of this matter to the Nation's leading agricultural industry—dairying—I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of this most informative and convincing letter from a real farmer printed in the RECORD.

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

TURTLE LAKE, WIS., *February 24, 1958.*
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I wish to express my views on the farm problem, and how it may be solved.

Secretary Benson proved that low farm income is not the answer to the farm surpluses problem so far as the dairy farm is concerned. In my own case when we had the rigid 90 percent of parity, I had 15 cows and got along nicely with my income. When flexible parity prices were imposed it cut my income approximately $100 per month. So I had to buy more cows, now I have 22 and still can't make ends meet. And more cows

increases our surpluses still more. If this condition exists for me it must exist for the other farmers also.

During the war the price of milk in this area was about $6 per hundredweight. And the cost of living was about one-half of what it is now. Now the price of milk per hundredweight is $3.10 and the cost of living is more than double. I realize that we can't have wartime prices for our milk all the time, but this situation seems way out of proportion.

I attribute the large scale layoffs in the auto and farm implement industry to the low purchasing power of the farmer. In my own case I have a 1946 auto and a 1938 model tractor, and a number of other pieces of wornout machinery which would be potential business for large industry if I had enough income to replace them.

Now I think big business or the middleman is responsible for our inflationary spiral especially in the food line. For example, the price of bacon in a Red & White store was 79 cents per pound. Red Own store sold it for 79 cents. National Tea sold it for 85 cents per pound. The largest of three stores got the highest price.

The farmer gets about 6 cents per quart for milk and he has to pay for getting it hauled to the creamery. The creamery pasteurizes it and puts it in bottles and sells it for 20 cents per quart. The middleman gets the large cut. Almost every large food market is giving 10-cent or 15-cent coupons to apply on your next purchase, to stimulate business. If instead they would actually lower prices it would be a big step toward curbing inflation.

Speaking of surpluses maybe we should not be too hasty in trying to get rid of them for a number of reasons.

First, a surplus economy is a sound economy.

Second, a surplus of food is the greatest weapon of war we have.

Third, our surface waters have become contaminated with radioactive fallout. So maybe our soil also, so in a short time we may not be able to raise as much food and feed as we now do.

Fourth, in a few short years our fast-growing population will catch up with our surpluses and perhaps even create shortages in the dairy industry.

Even though we lost the lead in the missiles and space race to Russia, we should not take a chance and lose the economic race also.

If the cost of living and price of dairy products to the farmer stays at this low level I most likely will lose my farm within the next year.

I am writing this letter in hopes it will help in getting something done to help the farmers in this session of Congress.

Yours truly,

EDWIN R. KROKICH.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have read with interest the recent and final report by Gen. J. M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to the Attorney General, on the special Hungarian refugee program. In my view, the Immigration and Naturalization Service is worthy of the highest praise for the competency and efficiency with which it performed its significant duties in furthering the migration of the Hungarian refugees to the United States without any sacrifice of our national safety or security.

I am much impressed with the comments of the Attorney General, in his letter of transmittal, respecting the status of those Hungarian refugees who have been paroled into the United States and are now living here.

The President's program relative to immigration, as represented by S. 1006, has my full support. Nevertheless, I believe it imperative that the Congress should take action without further delay in regard to certain portions of that program.

On yesterday, I introduced a bill to establish a statutory procedure whereby the immigration status of the recently arrived Hungarian parolees may be adjusted—as originally proposed by the President and contained in S. 1006.

While I urge prompt action upon my bill, I wish it to be perfectly clear that there is nothing in my proposal which, if adopted, would make the adjustment of the immigration status of these people a hasty process for the sake of mere expediency. My bill would require physical presence in the United States for at least 2 years before the paroled alien could apply to the Attorney General to have his status changed to that of a permanent resident. Thereafter, the Attorney General would make the necessary investigations and, if he approved the application in a worthy case, would be required to submit his determination for consideration by the Congress. Only after Congressional review, will the status of the alien be finally changed to that of a permanent resident. No one can doubt, I am certain, that this procedure, with its safeguards, is in the best interests of the United States. I hope that my bill will be promptly acted upon.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, introduced by me on yesterday, Senate bill 3391, together with copies of press releases issued by the Attorney General on February 16 and 17, 1958, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3391

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188; 8 U. S. C. 1182 (d)) is hereby amended by adding a new additional paragraph (9) reading as follows:

"(9) (A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or any other law, any alien who is or has been paroled into the United States by the Attorney General under the authority of paragraph (5) of this subsection and has not otherwise acquired permanent residence status in the United States may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(B) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien has remained in the United States for at least 2 years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. A complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the 1st and 15th days of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the alien shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188; 8 U. S. C. 1182 (d)) is hereby amended by adding a new additional paragraph (10) reading as follows:

"(10) The number of aliens who may be granted the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to paragraph (9) of this subsection, shall not, unless otherwise specified by a joint resolution of the Congress, exceed in any fiscal year the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year between June 25, 1948, and July 1, 1957, by any special public acts of Congress enacted during that period."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
February 16, 1958.

Commissioner Joseph M. Swing made his final report to Attorney General William P. Rogers yesterday on Immigration and Naturalization Service operations in the Hungarian escapee program of the United States which terminated on December 31, 1957. In the mass exodus from revolt-torn Hungary 31,738 parolees entered this country.

"The processing of this mass migration, probably without comparison in our history," Commissioner Swing said, "was effected with dispatch and yet without sacrifice of our national standards. * * * As a final demonstration of our national good faith, and to complete the special Hungarian program, there remains only the enactment of legislation to provide a method of authorizing permanent resident status for those Hungarians who have entered as parolees."

The text of Commissioner Swing's report follows:

"MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is submitted herewith the final report of Immigration and Naturalization Service operations in the Hungarian escapee program of the United States which terminated on December 31, 1957.

"The story of the aborted revolt of the Hungarian peoples against their own and foreign oppressors and the accounts of the flight of these patriots to Austria and Yugoslavia have been well and fully reported elsewhere.

"On November 8, 1956, the President of the United States announced that 5,000 escapees would be accepted into the United States as our contribution to the cooperative efforts of the governments of the Western World both to aid the freedom fighters and to ease the burden on Austria, whose resources were inadequate to house, clothe, and feed the refugees.

"Officers of this Service stationed at the consulate in Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands were detailed immediately to Austria to assist in the programs to carry out the President's purpose. The balance of special nonquota immigration visas under section 4 (a) (2) of the Refugee Relief Act were allocated by the Department of State to the

Hungarian escapees in Austria. The first visa was issued on November 19, 1956, and the first planeload of visaed immigrants left Austria on November 20, arriving at McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey on the following day. By December 1 the last of the 6,130 available numbers had been assigned. On that date there remained in Austria, despite the removal of 38,000 of the first arrivals to other countries, approximately 75,000 fugitives. Their number was being increased by an average of 2,000 daily crossings of the Hungarian-Austrian border.

"On the instructions of your predecessor I had arrived in Vienna on November 19, 1956, in the company of the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania. My observations on the general conditions in Austria, following surveys at the border and in the refugee camps of that country, and the operations of the international organizations, and the public and private agencies of the United States were orally reported to Mr. Brownell on my return, with my recommendation for an expanded program.

"Pursuant to the directive of the Attorney General, implementing the President's announcement that an additional 15,000 Hungarian escapees would be offered asylum in this country, I invoked the authority delegated to me under section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and authorized the entry of that number to the United States as parolees. The responsibility of examination and selection of applicants for admission to the United States thereafter was the exclusive responsibility of this Service.

"The immigration officer force in Vienna and Salzburg was augmented by additional officers detailed from the United States, 2 of whom were Hungarian-speaking officers, 1 born in Budapest, the other of Hungarian extraction. Their first task was to investigate the competence and reliability of interpreters and other locally employed clerical assistants. Because of chaotic conditions of transport and communications, the absence of a central registry of refugees, and the size of our force (at no time did the number of immigration officers exceed 17), representatives of the private United States voluntary agencies were authorized to distribute and assist in the preparation of specially designed application forms and to present for examination daily an assigned quota of applicants.

"The broad eligibility requirements were flight from Hungary after October 23, 1956, and admissibility to the United States under the provisions of the general immigration laws. A single exception was made in behalf of 300 accompanying members of otherwise admissible family units who were afflicted with tuberculosis. This was the first time in the post World War II refugee programs of the United States that such afflicted persons were authorized to enter the United States and further established our intention to welcome a representative cross section of the escapees in Austria. In passing it should be noted that the first session of this Congress incorporated this policy in the basic immigration law of the United States.

"During January 1957, through the cooperation of the Austrian authorities, application forms were made available throughout that country to every Hungarian national who desired to be considered for migration to the United States. The applications were cataloged by date of entry in Austria and relationship, if any, to persons in the United States. From this central registry, maintained in our Vienna office, applicants were thereafter selected by the Service and given appointments for interview. No attempt was made to substitute the opinion of any stateside official of this Service for the judgment of the officer in charge at Vienna in weighing the numerous intangibles which governed the selection of candidates for interview. The United States voluntary agencies agreed to continue their assistance in locating employment and housing in the United States for the vast majority who did not have individual sponsors. They also assumed major responsibility for locating and transporting to the examination centers in Vienna and Salzburg those escapees selected for interview.

"In May 1957 parole examination was extended to other Western European countries for the purpose of reuniting in the United States members of the immediate families of Hungarian escapees who had become separated in the flight to Austria or during the early removals from that country. A total of 517 such persons were selected in 15 countries of second asylum.

"In July 1957, following a survey in Yugoslavia and consultations with officials of that country, parole operations were extended to cover Hungarian escapees who had fled directly into Yugoslavia and who were being cared for in refugee camps operated by that Government. Of 3,451 applicants who were interviewed, 2,416 were passed for parole.

"Examination of all parole applicants consisted of the identical medical examination, including X-rays by physicians of the United States Public Health Service as is accorded normal immigration visa applicants, and interrogation and fingerprinting of each principal applicant and accompanying member of his family over the age of 14 by United States immigration officers. The records of the established security and intelligence agencies of this Government were examined. Lookout lists of the Budapest and Vienna consulates were checked and maximum use was made of informants among the refugees whose general desire to purge their own ranks of undesirables can well be appreciated.

"With the close of the program it is now appropriate to reveal that the Service is in possession of a thoroughly authenticated copy of an official listing of principal functionaries of the Hungarian Communist Party at all levels, against which all applicants for parole were also checked.

"The within-Europe transportation of parolees was arranged by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the transatlantic transportation was handled under the auspices of that organization but for the most part on planes and vessels of the Military Air Transport and Military Sea Transport Services.

"The general operation of the Army-reactivated reception center at Camp Kilmer, N. J., has been described in the report of Mr. Tracy Vorhees, Chairman of the President's Committee on Hungarian Refugees. A brief description of Service operations there suffices for this report.

"All normal Public Health, Customs, and Immigration inspection usually performed at the time and place of actual United States entry was deferred to Camp Kilmer. Each refugee was photographed and, following the authorization of parole, each was issued a laminated parole identification card. No refugee was released from the camp until the officer in charge of the Service was satisfied that the subject and the members of his family had confirmed housing and employment or assurances of support.

"On May 1, 1957, after 31,869 refugees had arrived at Kilmer, the need for such a large installation having ceased, future reception operations were transferred to Service-operated quarters in the St. George Hotel, Brooklyn, N. Y., for the remainder of the program.

"The investigation of the parolees did not cease with their entry into the United States. All allegations of a derogatory nature received from any source are thoroughly investigated. Over 3,000 such investigations have been completed, resulting in a total parole revocation and return to Austria of 74 principal parolees and 43 accompanying members of their families.

"In accordance with assurances given Hungarian refugees that this Government would assist those who, after arrival in the United States, desired to return to Hungary, a total of 290 voluntary repatriates have been returned to Austria for transit to Hungary, after it has been determined that each individual has made his decision freely and without fear or threat. No refugee has been returned to Hungary against his will.

"The attached statistical tables reflect the total movements of Hungarians from Austria by all cooperating governments (and the total of emigrants from each such country to the United States under normal immigration), the age, sex, and major occupational groupings of the 31,738 parolees who had entered the United States by the close of business on December 31, 1957, and an analysis of rejected cases in all areas.

"The processing of this mass migration, probably without comparison in our history, was effected with dispatch and yet without sacrifice of our national standards. The attached factual tables establish beyond a doubt the potential value to the United States of the Hungarians who came to this country since the October 1956 revolt. As a final demonstration of our national good faith, and to complete the special Hungarian program, there remains only the enactment of legislation to provide a method for authorizing permanent resident status for those Hungarians who have entered as parolees.

"Sincerely,

"JOSEPH M. SWING,
"Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization"

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, Hungarian Refugee Situation, Austria, Dec. 31, 1957, 14:00 hours

1. Breakdown of departures by country of destination:	
(a) Overseas:	
Argentina	906
Australia	9,423
Brazil	977
Canada	24,525
Chile	258
Colombia	215
Costa Rica	15
Cuba	5
Dominican Republic	581
Ecuador	1
Rhodesia	40
Israel	1,893
New Zealand	960
Nicaragua	4
Paraguay	7
Turkey	505
Union South Africa	1,309
Uruguay	35
Venezuela	549
United States of America	35,026
(b) Within Europe:	
Belgium	3,416
Cyprus	2
Denmark	1,173
France	10,232
Germany	14,270
Iceland	52
Ireland	541
Italy	3,849
Luxembourg	227
Netherlands	3,556
Norway	1,159
Portugal	4
Spain	19
Sweden	5,453
Switzerland	11,962
United Kingdom	20,590
2. Residing in Austria	18,993
Total	172,732

Hungarian refugees to countries other than United States through Dec. 31, 1957, and immigrants admitted from those countries to the United States, November 1956 through June 1957

Country of destination or birth	Hungarians departed from Austria November 1956 to Dec. 31, 1957 (14 months)	Immigrants admitted in United States November 1956 to June 1957 (8 months)
Final departures from Austria (specified countries)	118,713	123,461
Overseas destinations	77,234	37,276
Argentina	906	1,391
Australia	9,423	367
Brazil	977	857
Canada	22,565	20,976
Canada, via Netherlands	1,960	
Chile	258	479
Colombia	215	1,286
Costa Rica	15	386
Cuba	5	7,496
Dominican Republic	581	637
Ecuador	1	656
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	40	5
Israel	1,803	892
New Zealand	960	164
Nicaragua	4	755
Paraguay	7	50
Turkey	505	422
Union of South Africa	1,309	161
Uruguay	35	61
Venezuela	549	235
Within Europe	76,505	86,185
Belgium	3,416	925
Cyprus	2	92
Denmark	1,173	954
France	10,232	2,714
Germany	14,270	30,113
Iceland	52	116
Ireland	541	6,676
Italy	3,849	8,840
Luxembourg	227	63
Netherlands	3,532	9,674
Netherlands (for processing Canada)	24	
Norway	1,159	1,748
Portugal	4	1,070
Spain	19	673
Sweden	5,453	1,513
Switzerland	11,962	1,178
United Kingdom	20,590	19,836

Hungarians paroled into the United States by major occupation, age, and sex (Dec. 31, 1957)

	Male	Female	Both
Occupation:			
Professional, technical, and kindred workers			3,513
Farmers and farm managers			609
Managers, officials, and proprietors			585
Clerical			2,189
Sales			379
Craftsmen, foremen			5,904
Operatives			4,746
Private household workers			197
Service workers			762
Farm laborers			246
Other laborers			1,460
No occupation			11,148
Housewives			2,725
Retired			9
Students			2,876
Children under 14			5,374
Unlisted			164
Age:			
Under 5	1,053	1,002	2,055
5 to 9 years	1,127	1,030	2,157
10 to 14 years	1,028	833	1,861
15 to 19 years	2,994	1,386	4,380
20 to 29 years	6,888	3,417	10,305
30 to 39 years	3,381	2,622	6,003
40 to 49 years	2,032	1,406	3,438
50 to 59 years	669	521	1,190
Over 59 years	132	217	349
Total	19,304	12,434	31,738
Marital status:			
Single	16,355		
Married	13,706		
Widowed	680		
Divorced	981		
Unknown	16		

Cases rejected for parole to the United States in Austria and other European countries, except Yugoslavia

			Total
On security grounds	538	(568)	1,106
As split families	293	(93)	386
As "ineligible" [1]	323	(210)	533
On criminal grounds	20	(11)	31
For misrepresentation	22	(17)	39
As illiterates	11	(5)	16
As LPC's	16	(9)	25
As mental cases	18	(22)	40
For medical reasons, including tuberculosis	246	(275)	521
Total	1,487	([2] 1,210)	2,697

IN YUGOSLAVIA

			Total
On security grounds	84	(111)	195
As split families	126	(71)	197
As "ineligible" [1]	255	(232)	487
On criminal grounds	2	(6)	8
As illiterates	5	(7)	12
On medical grounds, including tuberculosis	58	(78)	136
Total	530	([2] 505)	1,035
Grand total	-----	--------	3,732

[1] Rejections as "ineligible" include following classes: (1) Not bona fide refugees; (2) departures from Hungary prior to Oct. 23, 1956 or those who returned temporarily to Hungary after that date; (3) those who departed Hungary with passports or under normal emigration processes; (4) temporarily deferred applicants who abandoned their application.

[2] Figures in parentheses denote accompanying dependents of rejected principal.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
February 17, 1958.

Attorney General William P. Rogers asked Congressional leaders today to expedite passage of legislation to authorize permanent resident status for deserving Hungarians admitted to the United States as parolees under the Hungarian escapee program.

In sending to the leaders the final report of Commissioner Joseph M. Swing, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on the operation of the program, the Attorney General pointed out that our responsibilities to the parolees and to the Free World required that these Hungarians be permitted to look forward to the day when they can seek to become citizens.

Substantially identical letters were sent to Senators LYNDON B. JOHNSON and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the minority leader of the House, and to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the chairmen, respectively, of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees.

Pending measures intended to accomplish the objective are S. 1006 in the Senate and H. R. 4202 and H. R. 4205 in the House.

The text of the letter to Senator JOHNSON follows:

"HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR: I am transmitting for your information the final report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with the accompanying letter of Commissioner Joseph M. Swing, on the operation of the Hungarian escapee program of the United States which terminated on December 31, 1957.

"The report shows the Immigration and Naturalization Service has carried out this massive and unprecedented operation on behalf of the Department of Justice efficiently, expeditiously, and with compassion for the individual and concern for our Nation's welfare and security. I believe all Americans can be very proud of the enormous contribution thus made to the advancement of their country and the rest of the Free World in the continuing struggle against Communist tyranny.

"The one remaining step to bring the escapee program to a successful conclusion now falls to the Congress—the enactment of legislation to authorize permanent resident status for deserving Hungarians who were admitted to the United States under the program by parole. These Hungarians, unlike those fortunate few granted asylum under the provisions of the expiring Refugee Relief Act, have neither the privileges nor the security of permanent residents. Unless they can adjust their status to become permanent residents, they can never seek to become citizens. Certainly our responsibilities to them and to the Free World require that they should be permitted to look forward to the day when, after they have lived uprightly in the United States for a definite period, the temporary asylum they have sought so fearfully will become their home.

"This objective would be accomplished by enacting the President's recommendation contained in section 5 of S. 1006 now pending with the Senate Judiciary Committee. I earnestly hope that the enclosed report will serve to stimulate renewed interest in the pending legislation and that Congress will take favorable action without delay to discharge our immediate responsibilities for these worthy Hungarian people.

"I am also transmitting a copy of the enclosed report and letter to the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Sincerely yours,

"_____ _____,
"Attorney General."

LOAN TO INDIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement relating to the action of the Department of State today in announcing a loan to India, as a result of discussions between the two governments.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The Department of State announced today that the United States has agreed to loan to the Republic of India $225 million. One hundred and fifty million dollars is to be loaned by the Export-Import Bank and $75 million will be provided from the Development Loan Fund established by the Congress last year.

The $225 million which will be provided will be of great aid to India in meeting its current needs. And if the suggestion I have made several times is followed, that payment of the balance of the wheat loan due the United States approximating $170 million, be changed into repayment in local currency, to conform with our policy of agricultural surplus sales, India would be enabled to extend its credit at the World Bank by $100 million to $125 million. Such an extension of credit, coupled with the $225 million loan announced today would meet India's needs for 1959.

The gap in foreign exchange under the life of its 5-year plan, which is to end in 1961, will amount to $1.4 billion. The chief sources for the capital goods it will need are Europe, Russia and the United States, and it is possible that the bulk of aid must come either from Soviet Russia or the United States.

It is my understanding that if a total of $700 million is made available by the United States in loans during the duration of the 5-year plan, India would be enabled to meet substantially the objectives of its program. The $225 million is a part of this total figure. I was glad to note in the press release of the

Department of State that this problem of continuing need has evidently been discussed by the representatives of the two countries. I call attention to the following language which seems to me to recognize that the loan announced today, important as it is, does not foreclose our future assistance.

I quote from the statement of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles:

"We recognize that the Indian problem of maintaining economic growth is one of great magnitude. It is the expectation of both parties that the funds from these $225 million of loans will be expended for requirements of the next 12 to 18 months. We recognize that the Free World has a tremendous interest in the outcome of India's efforts to improve its economic well-being in the framework of its democratic political institutions. As I indicated some weeks ago, we hope that we, together with other Free-World countries and the World Bank, can give the foreign-exchange requirements of the Indian program enough support, in the form of loans, so that it will be possible for that program to continue in an adequate form."

In 1956, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, I gave reasons why I believed the United States should assist India in its two 5-year plans. Twice this year, on the floor of the Senate, I have developed those arguments.

There are other countries in Asia, friendly countries, which are striving to make democratic political and economic institutions succeed for their people. We wish them success and we give them our assistance. But, in my view, India, by reason of its size, population, resources, and great influence, is the key country in the development of democratic strength in Asia. I know from my own experience of the continued interest and support of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State for India's efforts to improve its economic well-being. That broad interest which is the interest of our country was shown in concrete terms today.

TRADE, FOREIGN AID, AND LOBBYING

ERIC JOHNSTON, MOTION-PICTURE CZAR, AND THE WASHINGTON CIRCUS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we are witnessing the greatest lobbying trust ever launched in Washington—to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, free imports—and billions to Europe and Asia. The leader is Mr. Eric Johnston, of motion-picture fame.

The names of the estimated 1,000 persons joining this grandiose lobbying activity in the Nation's Capital, together with the list of contributors, would be very interesting reading to the American jobless workingmen and the American investors whose jobs and investments are being transferred to foreign soil, through free imports from low-wage nations—and further billions to foreign countries to build production plants.

On February 27 I addressed the Senate on this unusual spectacle in the Nation's Capital.

RESOLUTION TO REGISTER LOBBYIST JOHNSTON

I submit a resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. The resolution 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 Senate that Eric Johnston is required by the terms of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act immediately to register and report under such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 270), submitted by Mr. MALONE, was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reports are prevalent to the effect that certain public moneys have been utilized in the lobbying work to which I am referring. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of an act passed by the Congress on June 25, 1948.

It is chapter 645, Sixty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 792, prohibiting such use of funds. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

§ 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment. (June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 792.)

MR. DULLES AND MR. ACHESON

Mr. MALONE. On February 24, 1958, Mr. Dulles was questioned by Representative NOAH MASON, of Illinois, in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MASON asked him if Mr. Johnston's activities did not embody the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the expenditure of millions of dollars of the money of American taxpayers among European and Asiatic nations. Mr. Dulles replied:

Yes. I mentioned both of them in my statement because I think that they are twin measures that are equally indispensable to maintain the peace and security of the United States.

In my speech on the floor of the Senate on the 27th of February I quoted the former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson who said:

It is hardly possible any longer to draw a sharp dividing line between the economic affairs and political affairs. Each complements and supplements the other. They must be combined in a single unified and rounded policy.

Mr. Thorp, his assistant, testified about that time before a Senate committee and stated that the billions to Europe represented temporary relief to foreign nations, and that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—1934 Trade Agreements Act—was a part of the whole plan, and further said that the International Trade Organization—ITO—put before Congress by the State Department was a one-package deal. That the three all went together, and each part was dependent on the other. I refer to this statement to show that the two aims, one by Acheson and the Dulles plan, are absolutely the same, and have been so from the beginning.

Congress denied the ITO, which is now before Congress as the OTC—Office of Trade Cooperation.

Mr. Johnston is lobbying for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, with his 1,000 potential assistants and the $50,000 he has already collected, according to his radio announcement, as well as the hundreds of thousands he hopes to collect will, presumably, be utilized in publicity propaganda to intimidate Members of Congress.

THE PRESIDENT MAY SACRIFICE ANY INDUSTRY

Mr. Dulles testified before the Committee on Finance in 1955, when the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—so-called reciprocal trade—was extended for 3 years, that under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the President may at his discretion, refuse to recognize the peril point, the escape clause, or any recommendation by the Tariff Commission to preserve an industry.

He may refuse such recognition if in his opinion his foreign policy, including treaties and agreements with such countries will be furthered thereby.

Mr. President, he, the President, can and does trade a part or the whole of any American industry to further his foreign policy.

History shows that such treaties agreements will not be kept when the chips are down.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is the hidden implement in the President's hands that was never before advanced until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as made effective.

From 1789, the date of the first tariff act, until 1934 the duty or tariff was utilized to equalize the costs of production here and abroad.

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

REMAKING THE INDUSTRIAL MAP OF AMERICA

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find, if he reads Mr. Dulles' testimony very closely, that Mr. Dulles, in effect, said that the President could, in pursuing our foreign policy—and Mr. Dulles thought he should if it advanced the interests of this Nation—reach any sort of understanding with foreign countries even though such an understanding might do considerable harm to American industry.

Mr. MALONE. That is what he said in 1955 under my questioning. It is a most dangerous thing and can be the most dangerous move to the American workingmen and investors in the history of the regulation of foreign trade and American markets since 1789. The policy is remaking the industrial map of America. The President, through the State Department, is remaking the industrial map of this Nation—it has been proceeding since 1934, but two wars and preparation for war has deferred the effects.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. One almost gathered the impression from the Secretary's testimony that he felt if it were possible thereby to gain one or two votes in the United Nations, we should make trade agreements that could bring irreparable harm to our own industry.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. The Free Imports Act—the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—is only one of the pincers movement to destroy the American working men and investors—with world government at the end of the rainbow.

There are other pincers—billions to Europe and Asia—inflation—the GATT organization in Geneva with 36 foreign competitive nations dividing out markets among them.

I know the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would be interested in this plan.

The authority given the President is one that Congress has never before given to anyone in the history of this country—as Mr. Dulles testified, by which under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, he could do exactly what the Senator has said, destroy any industry and was and is doing it.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. While I do not completely agree with the Senator's argument, I must say that I have been very much concerned ever since Secretary Dulles testified that in pursuance of our foreign policy he felt, if it was desirable from our foreign policy point of view, the President should make any agreement he thought desirable, no matter what injury might result to American industry.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. Not only can the President through the State Department sacrifice any part or all of any industry on the altar of foreign treaties and agreements—but the 36 foreign competitive nations working under GATT in Geneva can continue to divide our markets among them, since they do not need to keep their end of the bargain as long as they are short of dollar balance which will prevail until all of our markets and wealth are equally divided among them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. PASTORE to make a statement on Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt.)

PRESIDENT HAS FULL POWER TO SACRIFICE ANY INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in further answer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—so-called reciprocal trade—changed the course of history on building and maintaining our high standard of living.

Mr. Dulles testified before the Senate Finance Committee in 1955 and, as you have so ably pointed out, he has reiterated before the House Ways and Means Committee, the President has full authority, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended to June of this year, to sacrifice any part or all of any industry to foreign nations if he considers it would further his foreign policy of securing treaties and agreements with foreign nations.

AMERICAN JOBS AND INVESTMENTS PROTECTED FROM 1879 TO 1934

Since 1789, when the first tariff act was enacted, until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the policy of Congress was to adjust the duty or tariff to represent roughly the difference between the effective wages and the cost of doing business in this country and the chief competing nation on each product.

Sometimes awkwardly done, sometimes too high, sometimes too low.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION AN AGENT OF CONGRESS

But Congress had continually improved the machinery for making such adjustments, and in 1930 it placed in the hands of the Tariff Commission the power to fix all duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

In section 336 of that act, Congress provided that the Tariff Commission was to determine the cost of producing an article in this country and that article or a like article in the chief competing foreign country and recommend the difference as to duty or tariffs. The American workingmen and investors had equal access to their own American markets.

That policy was completely changed in 1934, and power was placed in the hands of the President to sacrifice a part or all of any industry or industries on the basis of foreign policy. He was given full authority to remake the economic map of this Nation, which the administrations have proceeded to do.

In 1947, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—Mr. Dulles testified that authority was there—the President of the United States did transfer the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and domestic economy, which duty Congress was charged with in Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, to Geneva, Switzerland, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT.

COMPETITIVE NATIONS DIVIDE OUR MARKETS

Under multilateral trade agreements, the competitive foreign countries proceeded to lower American tariffs and divide the American markets between them, then operating GATT under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. But the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade regulations provide that as long as such foreign countries are short of dollar balances, they need not live up to the agreement.

They, of course, will always be short of dollar balances until the wealth and the markets of this country are divided equally so that the people of all nations will be living alike.

On March 3, in the House of Representatives, Mr. BAILEY, of West Virginia, said:

> 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 Capitol 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.

Further quoting Representative BAILEY:

> Mr. Johnston, who was being interviewed on television only yesterday—

This was on Monday, so it would have been on Sunday that Mr. Johnston was interviewed—

> 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. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter I received from the Torrington Company, of Torrington, Conn., signed by Harry B. Purcell, director of industrial relations.

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

THE TORRINGTON CO.,
Torrington, Conn., February 11, 1958.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I deeply appreciated receiving from your office, the copy of the extension of your remarks on "For America—Views on World Government and Our Survival." And may I say that I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in Mr. Dresser's letter, and with those contained in the excerpts from the address delivered by General Fellers on January 12th, which sentiments are in accord with those you have so ably presented from time to time on the Senate floor.

Coincidentally enough, your reprint of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD arrived just as I was preparing to write my compliments to you on your outstanding performance in the Senate on January 31 regarding tariff and trade and "The Late Senator John P. Jones, of Nevada."

I receive the RECORD each day but it isn't often that I read every word of nearly 14 pages of that fine print. But that is precisely what I did with your treatment of the frightening tariff issue. It was a masterful piece of work, and as one who has had an opportunity to personally and intimately witness the alarming effects of our country's tariff and trade policies, I want to extend to you my sincere thanks.

I beg of you not to lose heart in this grave struggle. The extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as proposed by the White House could, in my opinion, be ruinous beyond recovery for American industry, which is to say, of course, for America.

For America's sake then, please persevere.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. PURCELL,
Director of Industrial Relations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to the members of the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee written by J. M. Fisher, the director of engineering of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

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

PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 26, 1958.

To Members of the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee.

(Attention: Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE.)

GENTLEMEN: Now that there is another bill being considered by Congress authorizing the President to further cut tariff rates another 25 percent, I am wondering if there is going to be an end to this trend before we have eliminated tariffs entirely.

When authority for this action was up for consideration the last time, I appealed to you on behalf of our employees not to authorize such action. I now again appeal to you to defeat H. R. bill 10368, which is being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee.

I get more concerned daily by the general philosophy and actions of our governmental bodies whereby they seem to assume responsibility for the welfare of other nations and in the process, to me it seems like, they are weakening our own Nation. If this trend is not stopped, our fate will eventually be in as precarious a situation as we seem to imagine so many other countries are in today. We do not have the moral courage to recognize the limits of our ability to control the welfare of the other nations. This to me is evidenced by our mortgaging our future further and further every few years by raising our national debt limit in order to carry on such giveaway programs.

I am a great admirer of Senator BYRD's philosophy regarding economic matters and I am pleased that he is going to make himself available for continued service in the Senate and wish that we had a majority of such sound economic thinkers in both our House and Senate.

Please add the weight of my thoughts regarding this matter in favor of defeating H. R. bill 10368 at the earliest possible stage of its progress.

Yours truly,

J. M. FISHER,
Director of Engineering.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from W. N. McClelland, dated February 28, 1958, and addressed to me.

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

FEBRUARY 28, 1958.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Tariff rates on flat glass, the industry in which I am engaged, were reduced by the maximum 15 percent allowed after the 1955 extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Imports have gone up, and foreign glass has made substantial inroads in our sales of plate and window glass in the United States market and to a very serious extent here on the eastern seaboard. The volume of glass imports in 1956 were 3 times as high as in 1954.

Flat glass tariffs have been cut more than two-thirds since 1930. Further cuts of 25 percent could be expected if the extension to the act now requested is passed. It would follow naturally and mean even more of an advantage to foreign manufacturers, with wage rates only one-fourth to one-fifth of those paid in this country.

It has been well established that the escape clause is not the answer and has not served to safeguard domestic producers seriously injured by increased imports. Many of us also feel that the reciprocal trade agreements program has failed to achieve reciprocity, and that some industries, flat glass included, have been loaded with an abnormally heavy part of the cost of furthering foreign policy objectives.

The above is intended to indicate my concern over the administration's proposals for extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I urge you to oppose H. R. 10368, the Mills bill.

Yours very truly,

W. N. MCCLELLAND.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Joseph T. Owens, of Pittsburgh, Pa., dated February 28, 1958, and addressed to me.

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

PITTSBURGH, PA., *February 28, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I am writing to express my opposition to H. R. 10368 which would extend the Trade Agreements Act for 5 more years and authorize the President to cut tariff rates by another 25 percent.

As I see it, the President, the Secretary of State, and other persons in the administration are advocating the extension of the Trade Agreements Act because they think it will achieve certain foreign-policy objectives. Even if they should be wholly or partially correct in this view, it is my belief that these foreign-policy objectives should not be obtained at the expense of those American businesses and industries which are vulnerable to imports, but should be financed by taxation upon all elements of the economy.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program is not administered on the basis of an actual reciprocal exchange of tariff reductions. On the other hand, it appears that the program is administered in the spirit of additional aid to foreign countries at the expense of American business and industry. Although the United States makes substantial tariff reductions, most of the nations who receive the benefit of these reductions continue to exclude American products to a large extent through embargoes, import quotas, currency licensing, and other similar barriers.

As an employee of an American flat-glass manufacturer, I am definitely opposed to further tariff reductions which will have the effect of closing American glass plants and turning the American market over to European glass manufacturers. The technology of European glass manufacturers is equal to our own, but the wages paid by European glass manufacturers are from one-fourth to one-fifth of the wages paid by United States glass manufacturers. Flat-glass tariffs have been cut more than two-thirds since 1930 and as a result the mounting volume of European glass imports is now bringing hardship to the industry. Additional tariff reductions will be ruinous.

The company for which I work has recently furloughed 1,300 employees at one plant and is faced with the necessity for making additional layoffs at other plants. Under these circumstances, I cannot stress too strongly the importance of avoiding additional tariff reductions and additional loss of business to foreign producers.

I have not been opposed to the mutual aid program of the United States, but it must be obvious to anyone that we cannot continue to spend billions of dollars of tax funds for aid programs if we destroy the source of these tax revenues by turning our markets over to foreign competitors under a program which is not actually reciprocal.

In view of the above, I respectfully urge that you vote against H. R. 10368.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH T. OWENS.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Daily News of January 29, 1958.

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

HIKE THE DEBT LIMIT?

The Senate Finance Committee yesterday took up the Eisenhower administration's plea for a temporary national debt limit boost from the present $275 billion to $280 billion. The House already has voted for the hike.

We think Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, has the right idea, in urging that the increase be only $3 billion.

Raise the ceiling high enough to save Treasury officials from feeling cramped under it, and their zeal to keep the debt under control seems bound to slack off.

But perhaps BYRD is fighting a hopeless battle. Senator GEORGE W. (MOLLY) MALONE, Republican of Nevada, remarked yesterday: "As long as the Members of Congress haven't got the gumption to cut down on foreign aid, and as long as they let imports come in duty-free and knock our boys out of jobs, what can we do [to keep the national debt from soaring]?"

We hate to say it, but maybe that's the perilous long and short of it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of Friday, February 7, 1958, entitled "Administration's Free Trade Policy Under Fire."

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

ADMINISTRATION'S FREE TRADE POLICY UNDER FIRE

Administration request to give the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act a new lease on life brings the whole question of American policy up for review. Whether the United States shall continue and intensify the free trade policy it inherited from the New Deal and the one-world crowd or whether it shall

return to the protectionist policy of a generation ago, is what has to be decided before the existing legislation expires next June.

The trade agreements act has been on the statute books for nearly 24 years. The original grant of authority to the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries for mutual exchange of tariff concessions was made for a 3-year period in 1934. Since then, the act has been extended 10 times, sometimes for 3 years, other times for only a single year. The present request is unusual in proposing extension for 5 years. The administration also asks for power to cut duties by as much as 25 percent over the next 5 years.

Using or abusing the tariff-cutting authority over the years has reduced most American duties to a fraction of the high levels attained under the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930—last tariff framed directly by Congress itself. The process of reciprocal tariff reduction, begun by negotiations of agreements with individual foreign countries, was speeded up after World War II by a shift to mul'i-lateral negotiations. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), negotiated at Geneva in 1947 and extended in several subsequent tariff-bargaining conferences, now covers the foreign trade of 36 countries in addition to the United States—and puts American trade more or less under the control of other countries.

Renewal of the Trade Agreements Act faces a stiffer fight this year than ever before. The South, long the home of free trade, and which used to sell a large share of its cotton crop abroad and wanted to keep tariffs down to facilitate that trade, has been turning into an industrial region. Arrival of textile plants from the North and growth of other manufacturing enterprises have stimulated southern protectionist sentiment. Imports of other foreign products—Swiss watches, for example, have raised protests elsewhere in the country.

The mining industry of the entire Nation has been hard hit by the competition of cheaply mined and refined metals. The last 2 years have seen the shutdown of some of the biggest producers of lead and zinc, of mercury and tungsten, and other critical materials, while imports of these metals has been increasing. The copper industry—one of the West's largest—has been slowed to a crawl.

Senators and Representatives who formerly accepted the administration's free-trade policy are taking a second sharp and critical look at this form of foreign aid and global giveaway, as they see the ruinous effects on mines and refineries and factories in their home States, and as they hear the angry protests from their constituents.

Supporters of the trade agreements admit that tariff concessions are damaging some manufacturers or whole industries, but the remedy they proposed is not higher tariffs, but temporary Government assistance to help injured industries, workers, and communities readjust to other pursuits. Not only the directly injured parties, but the taxpayers of the Nation who have to dig up these subsidies through ever-increasing taxes, are supposed to make this sacrifice in the name of world trade and waging total peace.

All that this accomplishes is to punish American industry and American workers and investors and compel them to subsidize competition from abroad.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial column from the Las Vegas Review-Journal of February 2, 1958, entitled "It Seems to Us."

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

IT SEEMS TO US—MAY PAY OFF

About a decade ago a freshman Senator from the State of Nevada dared raise his lone voice against the then Democratic administration's Reciprocal Trade Act and promptly got his ears pinned back by his colleagues. The Senator was GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, and immediately he was labeled as a maverick of the first water.

Despite the fact that he was soundly thrashed in his battle, MALONE refused to give up. He kept harping on the Reciprocal Trade Act until it became almost monotonous, but he was so sincere in his efforts that he began to gain the ears of some of the leaders of the upper house.

The Nevada Senator claimed that the act was suppressing American industry and that, sooner or later, the economy of most of the United States would be undermined. There were only a few who would listen to him and the others brushed him off like a piece of lint on a blue-serge suit. But that did not deter MALONE. He kept right on fighting, gaining a supporter here and one there and the few grew into the many.

Came the recession of a couple of years ago and a lot of the boys began looking at their hole cards. When they did, there was MALONE's face staring them right in the eyes. He had proven himself right while the majority was wrong.

Comes now the showdown. President Eisenhower has asked the Congress to extend the Trade Act and Congressional leaders are threatening all over the place to scuttle it.

Even the stanchest supporters of the Eisenhower proposal predict difficulty in getting it through Congress. If it is beaten, then the President no longer will have the power to lower barriers to trade with other countries.

Key Republicans are leading the opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Act and Democrats, who have traditionally formed the bulwark of the support were extremely pessimistic about passage.

Already two GOP House leaders have come out strongly against the President's program and there is a growing bloc of Republicans in the Senate who are opposing the extension. Eisenhower must have almost unanimous GOP support for the program and if he doesn't get it chances are slim for passage.

Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican of Pennsylvania, who is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and also heads the GOP Campaign Committee, called the Trade Act "the giveaway of our American markets to foreign enterprise." He said that it would place American industry, agriculture and labor "on the sacrificial altar of diplomatic expediency."

Those words have a familiar ring, because anyone who has talked to Senator MALONE for any length of time over the past decade, will recall that he has made the same point only in much stronger terms.

Leaders of both parties in the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, agree that extension of the Trade Act is the most controversial piece of legislation facing Congress this year. The 22-year-old law expires June 30.

MALONE has stood alone for these many years and has been castigated by his own colleagues as well as the press. The time is coming, and it may not be many weeks off, when his lone fight will pay off and the American markets will return to the hands of the American people.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution passed by the Republican State Central Committee of Nevada on December 15, 1956.

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

The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenets of the Republican Party since its inception more than 100 years ago.

We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard-money standard using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

We believe the Republican Party must urge the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in 1958.

We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on May 4, 1957, the President's Republican Regional Conference, of 10 Western States, was held at Salt Lake City, Utah, after having been called by the President of the United States, to determine the sentiment of the various areas, being one of several such regional meetings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Salt Lake City conference, which appears on page 3 of a reprint of my debate on May 15, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FOREIGN TRADE AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Whereas 34 foreign, competitive nations are sitting in Geneva, Switzerland, regulating our foreign trade through multilateral trade agreements under the auspices of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade; and

Whereas this distribution of our foreign trade between such foreign competitive nations is being carried on under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended (so-called reciprocal trade); and

Whereas under this act more than $30 billion of American capital has been invested in such foreign low-wage standard of living nations to compete in American markets with American labor and investors in the textile, livestock, mining, crockery, glass, precision instrument machine tool, chemical and electro-chemical, and several hundred other fields: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 10 State Republican regional conference, including the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming urge the Congress to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign trade and the national economy through the adjustment of the duties, imposts and excises (art. I, sec. 8) through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire in June 1958.

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

the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Politics Tied to Defense" from the Austin Reveille of February 1, 1958.

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

POLITICS TIED TO DEFENSE

(By Jock Taylor)

Right at this time the ordinary citizens—a classification that includes virtually all of us—can easily be pardoned if they are as bewildered as a male shopper in a lingerie department.

Leaders of both parties solemnly, urgently and continuously preach to us that politics must play no part in national defense and security—and in the next breath those same leaders are one and all hammering each other over the heads with accusations and charges that this or that party is wholly responsible for the sorry predicament in which we find ourselves. To many of us—just the common run of citizens who pay the taxes and carry the load, and not the masterminds who continuously muddle things up for us—who got us into the predicament seems a lot less important now than who is going to get us out of it.

To many of us it seems that politics—and usually mistaken politics—is at the root of all the evils besetting us, and that only a better brand of politics can cure those ills. In short, we don't believe that national defense—nor anything else pertaining to government—can be entirely divorced from politics, as our leaders tell us must be done.

Let's go back to the beginning of all this, when in 1934 we took the first steps toward becoming a welfare state, with an allpowerful centralized Government in Washington assuming the obligation of directing the course of all our lives from the time we crawled out of the cradle until we were tucked into the coffin. Along then was when we went off the gold standard, adopted the Trade Agreements Act, and inaugurated a lot of other measures that have since killed most of our individual freedom and all of our national independence.

We have had changes in political parties since that time, but there has been little—if any—change in our politics. We still are off the gold standard, still have the Trade Agreements Act and, in addition, have developed our policies of those earlier welfare days to where they now embrace the entire world through foreign aid. The politics of 1934 is the politics of today—merely grown more oppressive and burdensome.

It is impossible to divorce national defense from politics. The same politics that created the present urgent need for national defense measures is now being adapted to the very measures of national defense we are desperately trying to put into effect.

First we have the Trade Agreements Act—offspring of politics, nurtured by administrations of both parties and grown to maturity as the pet of the United Nations. Under the provisions of that act we have enriched—and are still enriching—the moneyed classes of nearly two score foreign nations, who still pay their workers sweatshop wages, while our own workers and our own industries find prosperity—and even good living conditions—slipping away from them farther and farther every day.

Added to the Trade Agreements Act is foreign aid, under which we have squandered more than $60 billion creating abroad the very industries and conditions that are now destroying our own industries and our own prosperity. Both those things are the offspring of politics—political measures adopted by former administrations and still fetishes of the present one.

What brand of philosophy makes it possible for us to be told that we must continue to cling to those two outright political policies for the sake of national defense, and at the same time be told politics must play no part in national defense?

What we really are being told is not that we must keep politics out of national defense, but that we must not permit considerations of national defense to make any change in the politics by which our destiny has been directed for more than a quarter of a century.

Those giving us that advice and information are politicians—and the main concern of politicians is politics. Politics is as much a part of our national defense as are intercontinental missiles, and the question boils down to whether we shall continue to cling to the politics under which our independence and freedom have been virtually destroyed, and our national existence now threatened. Or shall we shift to a different form of politics—one more in line with the constitutional form of government our present brand of politics has virtually abandoned?

We must continue the Trade Agreements Act—and particularly foreign aid—we are told because by so doing we assure ourselves of the support, should war come, of all those nations that are, and long have been, receiving our largesse at the expense of our taxpayers.

Is that true? Have the vast sums of money we have spent for the benefit of those foreign nations actually bound them to us by either gratitude or mutual interest so we can rely on their coming to our aid in an emergency?

A while back a poll was taken among 10 of the nations of Europe who have been recipients of our generosity. Or, if you prefer it in more factual terms, whose friendship we have been trying to buy.

The question asked was whether, in case of war between the United States and Russia, "your country should do everything possible to stay out of it" or should it help the United States. The answers are enlightening.

The percentage by which the people of eight of the countries voted they should stay out of such a war and let the United States go it alone is as follows: Sweden, 94; Austria, 89; Norway, 74; Belgium, 74; Italy, 72; France, 66; Germany, 63; Britain, 54. Only Australia and Netherlands voted to come to the aid of the United States should such a war occur.

Italy, over which we have expressed such almost sentimental concern in recent years, isn't even slightly interested in helping us should we need help; France isn't much more interested, and even Britain made it clear it will turn us down if it is possible.

Thus, under the form of politics which has sought to create for us a national defense based on buying friends, we have spent billions upon billions of dollars for the benefit of foreign countries that now make it clear they will get out from under immediately if we ever really need their help.

Despite all urgings and declarations to the contrary, our national defense is based on politics—and at present it is based on the wrong conception of politics.

Our need is not to keep politics out of all considerations of national defense, but to inject into such consideration a changed and improved form of politics.

Politics we always have had, and always will have, with us in every national program and emergency.

Our immediate problem is to base our preparations for national defense on a form of politics that gives primary and major consideration to our national welfare instead of the welfare of a world that is willing and eager to take all from us and give nothing in return.

THE RESPONSIBILITY REVERTS TO THE TARIFF COMMISSION—AN AGENT OF CONGRESS UNDER THE 1930 TARIFF ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the United States Tariff Commission, dated January 29, 1958, in which there is described exactly how the bilaterial and multilateral trade agreements would be canceled and the duties or tariffs adjusted—how the constitutional responsibility of Congress would revert, in the event the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is not extended beyond June 30, 1958, when that act expires.

The letter explains that after June 30, 1958, if the act is not extended, then no more trade agreements can be made either by the State Department or at Geneva, Switzerland, under GATT, where such authority was transferred by the President in 1947 by virtue of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Then upon the expiration of 6 months following notice by either the United States, or the respective foreign country with which the bilateral trade agreement is made by our President, then the agreement expires.

As to the multilateral-trade agreements made in Geneva, under GATT, 60 days notice is required of such withdrawal, and 60 days after notice of such withdrawal is received by the Secretary General of the United Nations then that multilateral trade agreement would expire.

Mr. President, when those agreements do expire, the entire authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which was taken away from Congress and put in the hands of the President, subsequently transferred to Geneva, Switzerland, under GATT, would revert to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress and the statutory rates prevailing before the agreement was made would prevail.

Mr. President, then the Tariff Commission has the statutory authority in section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act to proceed to adjust such duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Section 336 relates to equalization of costs of production and reads in part as follows:

(a) Change of classification or duties: In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the Commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article.

Then, Mr. President, further in the paragraph it is stated:

If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences.

They recommend that to be the duty or tariff, and that would be the tariff always and continually adjusted by the

Commission on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, that can be done by the Tariff Commission every day, every 6 months, or every 2 years, or whenever the chief competing nation should raise or lower its standard of living. Then the duty or tariff could be adjusted by the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, to equalize that difference.

Then the American people, the American workingmen, and the American investors would again have equal access to their own markets, just as prevailed from 1789 to 1934.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter that I received from the United States Tariff Commission dated January 29, 1958.

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

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
January 29, 1958.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: Reference is made to your telephone request to Mr. McCauley of our legal staff, on January 28, 1958, for a statement of the provisions of the several trade agreements to which the United States is a contracting party governing termination of such agreements. You are particularly interested in the procedures available for terminating our outstanding trade agreement concessions on petroleum and petroleum products so as to accomplish the reinstatement of the statutory rates of duty on such articles.

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as amended, provides:

"Every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to this act shall be subject to termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date on which the agreement comes into force, and, if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice."

All existing bilateral trade agreements to which the United States is a contracting party are now subject, in accordance with the terms thereof, to termination upon the expiration of 6 months after either the United States or the respective foreign country gives notice to the other party of its intention to terminate the agreement.

Any contracting party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (including the United States), in accordance with the terms of the Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is free to withdraw from the agreement upon the expiration of 60 days after notice of such withdrawal is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The United States could, under the abovementioned procedures, eliminate all trade agreement obligations. In these circumstances, the statutory rates of duty (or in certain instances, the rates established pursuant to section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930) for the articles currently covered by trade agreement concessions would become effective. With respect to those articles covered in the GATT and not previously or presently covered in a bilateral agreement, the reinstatement of the effectiveness of the statutory rates of duty thereon could be accomplished solely by withdrawal from the GATT. With respect to those articles covered in the GATT, which are also covered in a bilateral agreement between the United States and a foreign country that is now a contracting party to the GATT, and the bilateral agreement has not been terminated, termination of the bilateral agreement in question, in addition to withdrawal from GATT, would be necessary to bring about the effectiveness of the statutory rates. Finally, with respect to those articles covered only in a currently effective bilateral agreement, termination of the said agreement would be necessary for the reinstatement of the statutory rates of duty.

Petroleum, crude, fuel or refined, and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzine, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil, not specially provided for, are free of duty under paragraph 1733 of the Tariff Act of 1930. However, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1932, as amended, the following import taxes (duties) were provided for: Crude petroleum one-half cent per gallon; fuel oil derived from petroleum, gas oil derived from petroleum, and all liquid derivatives of crude petroleum, except lubricating oil and gasoline and other motor fuel, one-half cent per gallon; gasoline or other motor fuel, 2½ cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 4 cents per gallon; paraffin and other petroleum wax products, 1 cent per pound. These taxes were continued in the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

In 1939, pursuant to concessions granted by the United States in the bilateral trade agreement with Venezuela, the rate of tax on crude petroleum and fuel oil derived from petroleum was reduced to one-fourth cent per gallon, applicable to imports of such products which were not in excess of 5 percent of the total quantity of crude petroleum processed in continental United States refineries during the preceding calendar year. All imports in excess of this amount remained subject to the one-half-cent-a-gallon tax.

In 1943 a bilateral trade agreement with Mexico, the 5-percent-tariff-rate quota was superseded by a concession tax rate of one-fourth cent per gallon on an unlimited quantity of imports of such articles. In addition, the tax on kerosene and liquid petroleum asphaltum, including cutbacks, and road oil was reduced to one-fourth cent per gallon pursuant to the Mexican agreement.

In the GATT (Geneva 1947), a concession was made as follows:

"Topped crude petroleum, fuel oil derived from petroleum including fuel oil known as gas oil, and all-liquid derivatives of crude petroleum (except lubricating oil and such derivatives specified hereinafter in any item 3422 [of the Internal Revenue Code]), one-fourth cent per gallon.

This GATT concession contains a proviso to the effect that in no event shall the import tax applicable to topped crude petroleum be less than the rate of tax applicable to crude petroleum.

The following rates of duty are also provided for in GATT: Mineral oil of medicinal grade, derived from petroleum, one-half cent per gallon; gasoline and other motor fuel, 1¼ cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 2 cents per gallon; paraffin and other petroleum wax products, one-half cent per pound.

Effective January 1, 1951, the bilateral trade agreement with Mexico was terminated. This resulted in (a) the reinstatement of the concessions granted in the bilateral trade agreement with Venezuela, with particular emphasis on the reestablishment of the 5-percent-of-domestic-refinery-output tariff-rate quota, supra, and (b) the tariff-rate quota becoming applicable to topped crude petroleum, in accordance with the proviso to the GATT concession, supra. This joint Venezuela-GATT arrangement remained in effect until late 1952.

In 1952, the President entered into a trade agreement supplementary to the 1939 agreement with Venezuela. Pursuant to this agreement (effective October 1952) the tariff-rate quota on crude petroleum, fuel oil, gas oil, and topped crude petroleum was removed. In addition, the tax on these products testing under 25 degrees (American Petroleum Institute) was further reduced to one-eighth cent per gallon. Also, the following GATT-rates were granted to Venezuela: Gasoline or other motor fuel, 1¼ cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 2 cents per gallon; and paraffin and other petroleum wax products, one-half cent per pound.

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 reenacted the taxes originally established by the 1932 code, as amended, and continued in the 1939 code, but such reenactment specifically preserved existing trade agreement rates.

In order to accomplish the reinstatement of the statutory rates of duty on these petroleum products by the termination process (as distinguished from elimination of the particular concession by such negotiating procedures as may be available), it would be necessary for the United States to withdraw from the GATT and to terminate the bilateral agreement with Venezuela. It should be noted that the termination of trade agreements would not, in all instances, result in higher duties. The higher-than-statutory rates of duty which have been established pursuant to the trade agreements legislation (including those established under the escape-clause procedure), would be superseded by the lower statutory rates.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR B. BROSSARD, *Chairman.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, Public Law 361, entitled "Equalization of Costs of Production."

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

THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930—PUBLIC LAW 361

EXCERPTS FROM SECTION 336

SEC. 336. Equalization of costs of production:

(a) Change of classification or duties: In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the Commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article. In the course of the investigation the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section. The Commission shall report to the President the results of the investigation and its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 percent of the rates expressly fixed by statute.

(b) Change to American selling price: If the Commission finds upon any such investigation that such differences cannot be equal-

ized by proceeding as hereinbefore provided, it shall so state in its report to the President and shall specify therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the American selling price (as defined in section 402 (g)) of the domestic article, as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 percent of the rates expressly fixed by statute, and no such rate shall be increased.

(c) Proclamation by the President: The President shall by proclamation approve the rates of duty and changes in classification and in basis of the value specified in any report of the Commission under this section, if in his judgment such rates of duty and changes are shown by such investigation of the Commission to be necessary to equalize such differences in costs of production.

(d) Effective date of rates and changes: Commencing 30 days after the date of any Presidential proclamation of approval the increased or decreased rates of duty and changes in classification or in basis of value specified in the report of the Commission shall take effect.

(e) Ascertainment of differences in costs of production: In ascertaining under this section the differences in costs of production, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable:

(1) In the case of a domestic article: (A) The cost of production as hereinafter in this section defined; (B) transportation costs and other costs incident to delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States for the article; and (C) other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition.

(2) In the case of a foreign article: (A) The cost of production as hereinafter in this section defined, or, if the Commission finds that such cost is not readily ascertainable, the Commission may accept as evidence thereof, or as supplemental thereto, the weighted average of the invoice prices or values for a representative period and/or the average wholesale selling price for a representative period (which price shall be that at which the article is freely offered for sale to all purchasers in the principal market or markets of the principal competing country or countries in the ordinary course of trade and in the usual wholesale quantities in such market or markets); (B) transportation costs and other costs incident to delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States for the article; (C) other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition, including advantages granted to the foreign producers by a government, person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that all Congress has to do at this session is to sit still and pass no legislation on foreign trade and constitutional responsibility of the Congress to regulate such foreign trade and the national economy reverts to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, to adjust such flexible duty or tariff on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. The 1930 Tariff Act is still the law, although superseded by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which has been extended and which will now expire on June 30, 1958.

Mr. President, the authority transferred to Geneva, under GATT, where 37 nations—of which we are one—each with one vote, are busily engaged in dividing the remaining American markets among themselves, reverts to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress—and the American workingmen and investors are back in business.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act—which took away from the Congress its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and the national economy—is the act which Mr. Eric Johnston is so anxious to have extended along with billions of taxpayers' money to send to foreign competitive nations to build production plants to compete with our own workingmen and investors.

Let us just return to the Constitution of the United States.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATORS REGARDING BILLS ON THE CALENDAR AND READY FOR ACTION

After Mr. MALONE had obtained the floor,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, with the understanding that in yielding, he will not lose the floor, and that my remarks will be printed in the RECORD following his remarks?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of all Senators, that the Senate has a printed calendar of business. Some of the measures on the calendar have been on it longer than others. When a measure is reported and placed on the calendar, that is notice to each Senator of the possibility that it will be acted upon.

The minority leader, through facilities he has established to service the minority, reviews the calendar each day, and marks on it the position he takes regarding each of the measures. For instance, he may mark, beside the listing of a particular measure, "O. K., notify Senator PAYNE"; or "O. K., notify Senator KUCHEL"; or "O. K., notify Senator MALONE"; or "Hold" until some Senator returns.

I attempt to comply with the request of the minority leader in each and every instance, because in a Senate which is so equally divided, that is good policy, and it is conducive to the economical and efficient transaction of public business. But I wish all Senators to know that any measure on the calendar may be brought up by motion.

On yesterday, a bill in which the administration is very much interested was brought up by motion. The chairman of the committee concerned was present; so was the ranking minority members of the committee. Both of them spoke in behalf of the bill.

The bill had been unanimously reported by the committee. The leadership had not polled each Member but was not aware of any objection on either side. The minority leader suggested the absence of a quorum, so each Senator could be notified.

In similar fashion, several other bills were passed.

To have acted otherwise would have meant that the Senate would have had to adjourn at 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and would not have been able to keep abreast of its work.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—PROPOSED EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are trying to have a housing bill placed on the calendar during the next few days. We hope to have a road bill in a short time. The Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on various measures which are rather important. The chairman of the committee tells me that he expects action to be taken.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has the Cordiner report, and proposed legislation on pay is being considered.

We have a retirement bill. I believe the Senator from Delaware is interested in it. It has already been reported.

In the first 60 or 90 days of a session, the committees must organize; and it is a little difficult to have them organize and hold hearings and receive testimony and have the hearings printed and take action on the bills, all in a short period of time, although the Senate already has acted on the postal rate bill, the postal pay bill, the debt ceiling measure, and many other measures.

Beginning this month, I believe the committees will act on substantial amounts of substantive legislation.

It is planned to have the Senate take an Easter recess, beginning with the Thursday before Good Friday. I do not have a calendar before me, but that date comes early in April.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it is the 3d of April.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed by my good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that it is the 3d of April.

We expect to have votes taken through that Thursday evening. None may be taken, but every Senator should be prepared.

It is expected that then the House of Representatives and the Senate will pass a joint resolution to the effect that following that Thursday evening, there will not be a session until the following Monday a week. That is in accordance with the usual procedure of Congress at Eastertime. Senators have duties aside from their duties in committee or on the floor. In that respect, their situation is somewhat like that of an airline pilot who has to fly for a certain number of hours each month, if he is to continue to be a good pilot. Senators have to spend a certain number of hours every few months with their constituents, in order to be good Senators.

So this is a period that we shall set aside, and we are giving Senators ample notice in advance.

I have talked about this matter to the distinguished minority leader. He is agreeable to this program. I have talked to the leadership at the other end of the Capitol—to the distinguished

Speaker of the House of Representatives—and I believe he has reached an agreement with Mr. MARTIN.

So the appropriate joint resolution will be before the Senate, for its consideration, at the proper time.

Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time. My friend, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], is always generous with me. So when I take advantage of his friendship and courtesy, in order to perform my duties, I know that he does not mind.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Texas mentioned the retirement bill. I may say I have no objection to having that bill taken up today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that, but the Senator wants to be notified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I want to be on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I used that bill as an example. The Senator always cooperates. I commend the Senator for his cooperation with the leadership on both sides. He does not always agree with the leadership, but he treats the leadership fairly.

ELIMINATION OF CLAIMS OF IMMUNITY FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate bill 6. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may the committee amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the words "with respect to" it is proposed to strike out "tax liabilities accruing" and insert "business activities occurring."

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 and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that this bill is of such importance that free discussion of it should be had at this time. I had supposed that the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who introduced the bill, would discuss it.

The bill involves the age-old and well-intentioned principle of law which existed up until about 1940, that a State had no right to tax the Federal Government or an instrumentality of the Federal Government, or to lay a tax upon the Union of States.

Senators will recall that this great principle had its inception in the case of McCulloch against Maryland, the opinion in which was written by the then Chief Justice, John Marshall, laying down emphatically the doctrine that individual States could not lay a burden or a tax upon the National Government. It was a principle out of which grew a well-known adage of government, that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

That was the well-established law in this country until about 1940, when the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 5-to-4 decision, upset that principle, in effect. I recall the language in the dissenting opinion, written by Mr. Justice Roberts, in which he said that the Court's decision, arrived at by the majority, upset a precedent of more than 100 years.

Since that time there has been the right of a State, under the case of *James* v. *Dravo Contracting Company* (302 U. S., 134), the case to which I last referred, to tax contractors who are employed by the Federal Government, to levy a State tax upon them and their work.

In the case of James against Dravo Contracting Co., the United States Government, in the construction of a great lock and dam in the Kanawha River in West Virginia, proceeded with the work, and the State of West Virginia attempted to exact a privilege tax upon the gross income or the contract price which the Dravo Contracting Co. was to receive. That case went to a three-judge court, and from there directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, with the result which I have just mentioned.

Since that decision a case arose in Arkansas, the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.*, v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110). In that case there was a provision in the contract between the Government and the contractor that the contractor was to be the agent of the Government and was to purchase two machines in the name of the Government, title to the machines to be vested in the Government.

The Federal court held in that case that there was an express agency created, that there was an express instrumentality arising, and that the purchase of the two machines was free from a State tax.

As I understand the purpose of the bill, it is to wipe out the effect of the decision in *Kern-Limerick, Incorporated* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S., 110). In other words, the pending bill provides that a State may tax the property or the right of purchase of property or a transaction in which title passes to the United States of America. It is one more step away from the great principle that a State cannot, by the power of taxation, lay a burden upon the Federal Government. That subject was discussed at length in the committee. The Senator from South Carolina presented his case very ably, and the bill was reported by vote of a majority of the committee.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to what is contained in the bill, and what the whole purport of it may be. I say we are more and more getting away from the distinction between the State governments and the Federal Government; that more and more we are giving to States the power to tax the Federal Government and, to invoke the old adage, the power of destruction through taxation.

I must confess it is not a far-reaching bill in this instance, in that it draws a distinction between a written provision in the contract that the contractor is expressly the instrument or the agent of the Government and the privilege of performing work for the Government. Nevertheless, the fact is that regardless of the decisions—and the decisions are binding on us—as stated by the great Justice who wrote the dissenting opinion, whether we express it or not, when we undertake on behalf of the Federal Government to create a Federal structure, the person who is the agent of the Government and performs the work for the Government, is an instrument of the Government, and therefore not taxable.

The pending bill simply goes one step further and says that even though the Government expressly states that the contractor is its agent and its instrument, the State may nonetheless tax.

I felt that the Senate should know fully what is in the bill and the purport of it. As I say, it does not go much farther in effect, but it does go so far as to bring the express creation of the agency within the rule, whereas heretofore the employment of a contractor to build a structure for the Government did not create an instrument, unless, as was held in the recent case, it is expressly stated that the contractor is an instrument, and the property shall belong to the Government.

With that explanation, I close my remarks.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the simple question involved in the pending bill is whether a State or local government can validly apply its taxing power over one of its citizens who happens to be doing business with the Government of the United States. That is the problem before us, and it ought to be easy to answer.

My good friend the Senator from West Virginia has suggested that to his way of thinking that constitutes taxation by a State or local government of the Federal Government. I deny that.

A number of years ago, before I came to the Senate, I was in the State Government in California. The Atomic Energy

Commission was engaged at that time, as it is now, in prodigious undertakings, and it entered into many contracts with private firms. Those firms were located in California. In order to discharge their contractual responsibilities with the Atomic Energy Commission—quite obviously a Federal instrumentality—those firms made purchases of personal property in California. Ordinarily they would have been subject to the State's sales tax. Why not? Why should they not be? They were the recipients of every other service of the State government which all the other citizens and businesses were receiving from the State government in my State. Why should they be treated differently?

Nevertheless, the matter was litigated, and the United States Supreme Court held that those private businesses doing business with the Atomic Energy Commission were immune from State or local taxation, to the extent of such business dealings.

In 1953, when I came to the Senate, I introduced a bill, cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to eliminate that unfortunate exemption, and Congress enacted that legislation. The President signed it. Today private businesses in the State of California, as elsewhere, doing business with the Atomic Energy Commission, are subject to precisely the same tax laws that the Senator would be were he doing business in a completely private capacity alongside the private businesses working under contract for the Government.

I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. In my opinion he has performed a service which I believe was recognized by the United States Supreme Court in a decision which it handed down today.

Ours is a unique Federal Government. We are participating with respect to Federal problems, but each State has its responsibilities, too. A State cannot tax the Federal Government. That is a good principle. The Federal Government cannot tax the States. That is a good principle. However, when someone works for or does business with the government of a State, the Federal Government has a right to tax that individual, as it should. What the Senator from South Carolina attempts to do is to have that principle work both ways.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has made an observation as to the right of the Federal Government to tax someone who performs a service for the State. I do not know of any privilege tax or tax on the privilege to do work. There is a great distinction between the taxes the Federal Government exacts, such as an income tax, and a tax laid by a State for the privilege of performing work, which is, in effect, the privilege of performing work for the Federal Government. If we lay a tax for the privilege of doing work for the Federal Government, the question that immediately arises is: Are we not, in effect, taxing the Federal Government?

I make the further observation, with the indulgence of the able Senator from California, that in the final analysis it all gets down to the fact that these taxes will be paid by the people of the country, because the contractor is going to put into his bid the amount of the taxes he will have to pay, whether it is to the Federal Government or to the State government.

However, getting back to the right of the Federal Government to tax, the Federal Government, so far as I know, levies no privilege taxes for the right to perform work. Performing work for whom? For the Federal Government. I fail to observe the distinction which the Senator seeks to draw.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator would not object to the levy by a State of a State sales tax on personal property which a contractor bought from a private firm in a given State?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I would think that the levying of a sales tax, where the property was the property of the Federal Government, would be, under the old established rule, a wrongful levying of a tax. Let us suppose that the Department of the Interior goes into a State and buys certain property. Would the Senator levy a State tax upon the Department of the Interior for that purchase?

Mr. KUCHEL. As a matter of law, I could not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. But this is an entirely different situation, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to differ with him. In this instance, we are dealing with contracts the Pentagon makes with private firms to manufacture certain material and to sell it to the Pentagon. Is that not correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. We are dealing with the contractor. The whole question comes down to this: Whether it be an individual or a corporation, on the one side, or an employee of the Government on the other, the distinction is made that if he be an employee of the Government, he is acting for the Government, is a part and parcel of a department of the Government, and no tax is laid, but if he be an individual who makes a contract with the Government, and the Government, in the contract, says, "I authorize and direct you, as my agent, to buy machines or to do work for me, and the machines and the work will become mine," the Supreme Court has held that a tax cannot be imposed. It is to get around that position that it is sought today to enact the bill into a statute. I think there is a distinction.

Mr. KUCHEL. In my judgment, when the Pentagon, whether it be the Navy Department or any other department in the Pentagon, seeks to make large firms the agents of the Federal Government merely to permit such large firms to bypass and avoid their responsibility to share in the cost of State and local government, the Pentagon is wrong and I want the opportunity to cast my vote against that kind of policy.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Not just now. That, in my judgment, is the opportunity which Senate bill 6 gives to me. I want to object to the misapplication of the law of agency which allows the Federal Government to make of a private individual or a firm, no matter how large it may be, a so-called agent of the Government of the United States. I do not believe it is fair, and I do not believe it is sound public policy. Congress applied exactly the same rule 5 years ago, when it eliminated the opportunity of local tax avoidance under the Atomic Energy Commission statute. In the bill now before the Senate, I hope Congress will adopt exactly the same reasoning, and will pass the bill of the Senator from South Carolina.

I now yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If Congress adopted the reasoning of the court, the bill would not be passed.

But, as a practical matter, who finally pays the tax, whether the work be done directly by the Government or by someone employed by the Government? The Government pays the tax, because the amount of the tax is placed in the bid. It is a very practical consideration. Then, what good will come from the passage of the bill if, as a practical matter, the Government will have to pay the tax? Will the only benefit be the one which will accrue to the State from the Treasury of the Federal Government? Is that not in effect what we shall be doing if the bill is passed?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall try to answer the Senator's question; then I shall be finished.

I think when the Government of the United States desires to make a purchase from a private individual or firm, it ought not to be able to clothe that individual or that business with immunity from his payment of State or local taxes. I do not believe that a person who does business with the Federal Government should be placed in a preferred situation, so far as State and local tax laws are concerned. Thus, I look forward to voting in favor of the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the bill (S. 6) to make certain that private contractors doing business with the United States Government shall not be immune from State or local taxation on their business activities solely on the ground that a provision in the contract with the Government names such private contractors agents of the United States in the procurement of tangible property of any kind for use in the performance of the contract.

Under a long established doctrine of constitutional law, the Federal Government enjoys sovereign immunity from State and local taxation, and no State or local taxing authority may levy a tax on the Federal Government, its agencies or instrumentalities without the express consent of the Congress. As a result of a very broad application of this doctrine, State and local taxing authorities were, for many years, unable to levy any taxes

upon purchases made by private contractors in the course of their performance of Government contracts and were thus deprived of much needed revenue.

In 1937 the Supreme Court of the United States reviewed this doctrine and its history and upheld a State gross receipts tax on a Federal contractor's earnings, holding that the tax was not laid upon the Federal Government, its property, officers or any of its instrumentalities; nor was it laid upon any contract of the Federal Government. (*James* v. *Dravo Contracting Co.* (302 U. S. 134).) The Court held further that the fact that the State tax might increase the costs of the Federal Government did not render it constitutionally objectionable.

In 1941, the Supreme Court further narrowed the broad doctrine of immunity in upholding the constitutional validity of a State sales tax levied upon a private contractor performing work for the Government on the ground that the contractor and not the Federal Government was the actual purchaser of the property sought to be taxed by the State. Once again, the Court pointed out that Federal sovereignty does not spell immunity from paying added costs attributable to the taxation of those who furnish supplies to the Government and who have been granted no tax immunity. (*Alabama* v. *King & Boozer* (314 U. S. 1).)

Summarizing the situation following these decisions, we find, Mr. President, that immunity of the United States Government from State and local taxation was interpreted, in the constitutional sense, to refer only to immunity from the direct application of State and local tax laws; that it did not mean that the United States was constitutionally immune from increases in costs which are occasioned by the fact that those with whom it does business are required to pay State and local taxes; and that private, independent contractors doing work for the United States are not, by virtue of that status alone, immune from generally applicable State and local taxes. Thus, the Supreme Court has upheld the validity of both State sales taxes and State gross receipts taxes upon Federal contractors on the ground that such taxes did not interfere in any substantial way with the performance of Federal functions, and that the taxes in question were not laid on any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities.

It was against this background, Mr. President, that in 1954, the Supreme Court held that an Arkansas gross receipts tax law, which levies on sellers a 2-percent excise tax on the gross receipts from all sales in the State, was unconstitutional as applied to the transactions there involved, in which private contractors procured in Arkansas two tractors for use in constructing a naval ammunition depot for the United States under a contract with the Navy Department which provided that in procuring articles for the accomplishment of the work the contractors shall act as purchasing agent for the United States, title to the articles purchased shall pass directly from the seller to the United States, and the United States shall be directly liable to the seller for the purchase price. (*Kern-Limerick, Inc.* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110).) The Court held first, that the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 authorized the use by the Navy Department of purchasing agents and the delegation to them of authority to act on behalf of the United States; and, second, that since the contract with the Navy Department specifically provided that the contractor was to act as the purchasing agent for the United States, which was the real purchaser, the State was actually levying a tax on an instrumentality of the Federal Government which it could not do constitutionally, in the absence of express consent by the Congress.

Mr. President, the basic objective of this bill is to prevent the immunity of the Federal Government from attaching to what is essentially a tax levied on the private contractor or his supplier through the use of the purchasing agency provision. It would in no way invalidate such contracts; nor would it in any way prevent agencies and departments of the United States Government from entering into such contracts. Furthermore, nothing contained in this bill would encroach on long-existing, well established Federal immunities from local taxation.

S. 6 simply provides that if an agency or department of the Federal Government does enter into one of these so-called purchasing agency contracts, the business activity of the private contractor will be subject to the same State and local government taxation as are all other similar business activities which are carried on between private business organizations. In other words, all this bill would do is to restore the taxability by the States of private contractors engaged in performing Federal contracts to the status it enjoyed prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Kern-Limerick case.

Now at this point, I desire to make it perfectly clear that this bill does not constitute an attack on the Supreme Court of the United States or on the Court's decision in the Kern-Limerick case. Certainly, I would not want to say that the Court might properly have held differently than it did in the face of the facts before it. As a matter of fact, the Court, in a decision handed down Monday, March 3, said:

> In such circumstances the Congress is the proper agency * * * to make the difficult policy decisions necessarily involved in determining whether and to what extent private parties who do business with the Government should be given immunity from State taxes.

This statement was made in the case of City of Detroit, et al., against the Murray Corporation, et al., in which the Court refused to a Government contractor immunity from an ad valorem tax based on possession of property, the title to which was vested in the United States.

What this bill would do is strike down a vicious practice engaged in by certain Federal agencies and departments for one purpose and one purpose alone—the use of the purchasing-agency contract to avoid payment of State and local taxes.

Mr. President, I believe that every Member whose privilege it is to serve in this great body is well aware of the dual nature of his responsibilities. As Members of the United States Senate, we owe a duty to the people of this great Nation to safeguard the Federal Treasury. At the same time, we owe an equally important duty to the people and governments of the States which we represent. Many of us in this body have been privileged to serve as State or local officials. During that service, we have become acutely and painfully aware of the serious fiscal problems which confront State and local governments. Their sources of revenue are limited, but the demand for services goes on.

Where do the State and local governments obtain the funds necessary to enable them to operate and to perform essential services for their citizens? Largely from the taxpayers, of course. The latest available statistics reveal that in 1956, our States derived approximately 75 percent of their revenue from taxes; and that sales and gross receipts taxes, now in use by 33 States, supplied some 23 percent of total State tax yields.

Whereas State governments look to sales, gross receipts, and income taxes for their primary sources of revenue, local taxing authorities rely, to a very considerable extent, on the property tax. We are all aware of the fact that the Federal Government's real property holdings have been increasing at a very rapid rate, and every time that the Federal Government acquires an additional parcel of real property, be it land, improvements, or both, the revenue sources of local taxing authorities are, to that extent, diminished. Recent studies reveal that the Federal Government owns more than 409 million acres of land, or 21.5 percent of the total land area of the United States. These studies also reveal that the real property owned by the United States within the continental limits of the United States, consists of 12,689 installations, containing 336,545 buildings, covering a total of some 2.16 billion square feet. The total cost of the land is $2.5 billion and the total cost of buildings, structures, and facilities amounts to $33.7 billion, or a total of $36.2 billion, the great bulk of which is not subject to taxation.

In order to meet the ever-increasing demands of their taxpayers in the face of continuing Federal acquisition of real property with its consequent denial to local taxing authorities of vital revenues, local taxing authorities have been forced to turn to the States for help. In 1950, the States paid their local governmental units $4,217,000,000; in 1954, the amount was $5,679,000,000; in 1955, it was $5,986,000,000; and in 1956, the total amount paid was $6,538,000,000.

I cite these figures to demonstrate what is, in fact, well known—that the needs of State and local government are growing constantly, and that the Federal Government is continuing to cut down the source of actual and potential revenue available to these taxing authorities. They are doing this first by acquiring property which is then taken

off the tax rolls; and second, by using a type of contract which enables private contractors to assert the immunity of the Federal Government, with respect to activities which would otherwise be taxable.

Mr. President, full hearings were held on the pending bill. Appearing in support of the measure were representatives of various State tax commissions and State tax departments, State and local assessors, and the National Association of Tax Administrators. These are the men who are faced with the problems of operating and financing State and local governments each day. These are the men who are in possession of the facts. During the course of these hearings, the committee received testimony from official sources, that in five States alone—Tennessee, Washington, New Mexico, California, and Indiana—$5,506,000 worth of sales and gross receipts taxes are in dispute, and the accrual rate of additional disputed taxes in these five States is estimated at more than $5 million annually; and these figures involve the activities of only one Federal agency, the Atomic Energy Commission in just five States. Where do these figures come from? They may be found in a memorandum submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission to the Solicitor General of the United States in connection with the litigation pending in the United States Supreme Court. They are reprinted on page 19 of the hearings on State taxation of atomic-energy contractors held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 82d Congress, 2d session.

In the State of Washington, it is estimated that if all Federal construction, building and manufacturing contracts were to carry purchasing agency clauses, the loss would amount to at least $2.5 million annually. In New Mexico, the loss is estimated at $500,000 annually and in North Dakota, it is estimated at $200,000 annually.

Mr. President, these are small amounts of money to the Federal Government. But to the States, they represent very substantial sums of money which are urgently needed by the States in the conduct of State business and in furnishing assistance to local governmental subdivisions.

At these same hearings, the only argument made by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense, in opposition to the pending bill, was that it would result in additional costs to the Federal Government. Some estimates of probable cost were submitted, but they were admittedly nebulous and based only upon projections and possibilities. In connection with the cost estimates, two points must be considered: First, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the immunity of the United States from State and local taxation does not mean immunity from increased cost resulting from taxes imposed on those with whom the United States does business; and second, as a matter of sound fiscal policy, it makes no sense for the Federal Government to take the position that it will keep its costs down by depriving State taxing authorities of that which is rightfully theirs and which private contractors would be required to pay if they were doing business with private persons. It would make as much sense if we enacted a law requiring all private businessmen doing business with the Federal Government to forego their profits in order to keep the cost to the Federal Government down. Such a law would probably be unconstitutional, in any event.

I believe we must bear in mind the fact that when a State or local taxing authority is permitted to tax private contractors doing business with the Federal Government, we are not taking money out of the Federal Treasury; what we are, in fact, doing, is putting into the State treasuries money which is rightfully theirs, in accordance with the provisions of State law, and in the manner in which it was done prior to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Kern-Limerick case.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to emphasize once more that the basic issue which is raised by this bill is whether a private contractor doing business with the Federal Government should be immune from State and local taxation on his business activity in connection with that transaction solely on the ground that a provision in the contract with the Government names such private contractor an agent of the United States for the purpose of procuring tangible property for use in the performance of the contract.

After reviewing the testimony presented at the hearings and evaluating the arguments both in support of and in opposition to the enactment of S. 6, the committee concluded that opponents of the bill failed to present any compelling reason for exempting from State and local taxation private contractors doing business with the Government whose business activity would otherwise be subject to such taxes, solely because the private contractor has been named an agent of the United States in the procurement of property required for use in the performance of that contract.

Finally, Mr. President, I desire to reemphasize the following important facts:

First. The pending measure is not intended to, nor will it, in any way encroach on long-existing, well-established Federal immunities from State and local taxation. Its sole purpose and its sole effect is to eliminate the rule established by the Kern-Limerick case, and to restore the rule which existed prior to that decision.

Second. A distinction must be made between taxes imposed directly on the Federal Government and the indirect effect of taxes imposed on private persons which result in increased costs to the Federal Government. As previously noted, the Supreme Court of the United States has held consistently that the fact that the economic burden of a tax imposed on private contractors doing business with the Government is passed on to the United States does not make it a tax on the United States. I repeat the words of the Supreme Court in a leading case on the subject:

> Federal sovereignty does not spell immunity from paying the added costs, attributable to the taxation of those who furnish supplies to the Government and who have been granted no tax immunity.

Third. Aside from the legal and constitutional questions, as a matter of sound policy and economics, a relatively small increase in the costs to the Federal Government resulting from the imposition of State taxes on private contractors can offer no possible justification for depriving a State and local governments of needed revenues which would be forthcoming and payable if the contractor were doing business with a private business organization, rather than with the United States.

Fourth. S. 6 does not involve any payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to State and local governments, nor is it in any way connected with various pending proposals on the subject.

Fifth. S. 6 refers only to situations in which a contract between the United States and a private contractor specifically names the private contractor as the agent of the United States for the purpose of making purchases required in the performance of the contract. It does not invalidate such contracts, nor does it in any way prevent agencies and departments of the United States Government from entering into such contracts. Nor will it affect in any way or subject to taxation the activities of any purchasing agent who is, in fact, an officer or employee of the United States. It affects only private contractors who, by the terms of their contract with the Federal Government, are named as agents thereof for the purpose of making purchases required in the performance of the contract.

Mr. President, this is a simple bill. Its enactment is clearly in the public interest which requires that our State and local governments remain solvent and in a healthy financial condition. If State and local governments are continually deprived of needed revenues, resulting from the encroachment of the Federal Government in the face of ever-increasing demands by their citizens for essential services, our Federal system is in danger of breaking down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 6) was passed.

REPLY TO ATTACK ON SENATOR NEUBERGER BY THIRD-CLASS MAIL USERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a bitter attack upon me has been issued by the 3d-class mail users, under date of February 21, 1958. The attack criticizes me for my support of a 5-cent rate for first-class mail, and particularly because of an increase in the 3d-class rate from 1½ cents per piece to 2½ cents. This is the so-called junk mail category.

The attack accuses me of bowing to the Postmaster General when I changed my mind on the issue of mail rates. It

also refers to me as the greatest of all culprits regarding the increase in the third-class mailing rate. I am attacked for having abandoned my earlier position of opposition to postage-rate increases for reasons still unknown.

Mr. President, I did not think there were any reasons still unknown after my extensive speech of February 25 on this whole issue, but I shall explain the reasons again today.

I sat through lengthy and thorough hearings on the postage rate question. I entered the hearings very definitely inclined against substantial rate increases.

But in those hearings, the Postmaster General and his staff made an effective, factual and forceful case. The mail-user groups, including the third-class users made a case which seemed to me weak, ineffective and occasionally even deceptive. As a result, I changed my mind and came out in favor of sizable increases in all classifications of postage rates.

I believe that a Senator is of scant value to his country if he has a closed mind on fundamental issues. Would the third-class-mail users, as citizens, expect a Senator to champion their cause if he were persuaded their cause was wrong? What respect would they, or anybody, have for such a Senator?

Mr. President, it is true that the administration has long applied heavy pressure to persuade us to favor a substantial increase in postal rates. The pressure has come from the White House and from the Postmaster General. To my knowledge, there was nothing improper or immoral about the pressure.

The Postmaster General called personally at my office on several occasions, and each time he tried to convince me on the basis of the facts. He made no threats, advanced no pledges, voiced no offers. He brought to my attention the Post Office deficit of $700 million, and he emphasized my own sponsorship of a postal pay-increase bill costing some $270 million, which, I believe, is merited and much needed by our postal workers.

In addition, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], stressed to me personally the fact that his committee would have to appropriate nearly $1 billion annually to cover the postal deficit. The Senator from Arizona emphasized that this was $1 billion less for such other governmental projects as I am interested in, as, for instance, the John Day Dam on the Columbia River, Federal aid to schools, the National Cancer Institute, and similar undertakings.

Mr. President, I was moved by these logical appeals from the Postmaster General and from the distinguished and beloved President pro tempore of the Senate. They convinced me that I should change my mind on the question of postage rates. Accordingly, I did so. I have no apologies to make. I feel I would be less than faithful as a Senator if I shut my mind to logic and to facts. As the votes in committee and in the Senate showed, reasonable men could and did differ on almost every aspect of what postal-rate structure should be adopted. They can differ in reasonable terms. The third-class-mail users have the right to express the disappointment they feel about their own special interests in the bill we passed last week. But before they gave vent to their disappointment in circulars referring to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as having "lost control of Democrats NEUBERGER and SCOTT," and to the junior Senator from Oregon as having "sold out to the Postmaster General," I think they might have counted to 10.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF BRUCELLOSIS PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I feel certain that farmers in States like my own State of Oregon were heartened by the Senate action taken yesterday in approving a 2-year extension of the brucellosis program.

The fight to eradicate brucellosis in Oregon has been waged relentlessly and with encouraging success in recent years. If this fight is carried on without any relaxation of present efforts, Oregon should be virtually a brucellosis-free area in the not too distant future. However, we have been seriously concerned lest any suspension or diminution of the program that this time could mean the loss of all that has been gained through the joint expenditure of State and Federal funds.

As has been stated frequently, if the eradication campaign can be maintained at the level of recent years, it in the long run will cost less in achieving the final objective of a brucellosis-free country than a program of inadequate financing. Certainly, once eradicated, the cost of maintaining that position will be a considerably smaller figure in the regular budget.

My reason for mentioning budgets, Mr. President, is that this year's program was seriously threatened by a reduction of Federal funds in the last quarter that has already forced drastic curtailment of Oregon's program, and if carried further could imperil its future.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture has been forced to substitute technicians for veterinarians in carrying on the brucellosis eradication campaign. This is not the direction a program should take, if a goal of complete eradication is to be achieved.

Mr. President, illustrative of what is happening is a news release which appeared in the Wallowa County Chieftain, of Enterprise, Oreg., on February 27, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this news story printed in the RECORD. I also have a statement from Mr. Lawrence Geraghty, president of the Oregon Dairymen's Association, which was directed to members of the Oregon State Legislature on the subject of brucellosis eradication. I ask unanimous consent that it, too, appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CHANGES DRAFTED IN BANGS CONTROL

Drastic changes in procedures and payments under the cooperative brucellosis testing program in Oregon will become effective March 1, this year, the State department of agriculture announced on February 20.

The changes are the result of a heavy cut in the Federal share of the cooperative funds anticipated to carry the State through to the certification goal set for June 30, 1959.

The adjusted program calls for a reduction in Federal indemnities for reactors to match the State payment of $8 for grade cattle and $12 for purebreds. This will also be effective March 1. Some counties have a voluntary indemnity program in amounts similar to or under the State level.

This revised program will not affect the free vaccination and testing on farms and ranches until each county is certified to be free from brucellosis.

One phase of the revised program requires livestock auction markets in eastern Oregon to make available approved, separate clean pens on and after March 1, for purposes shown below.

All counties except Hood River east of the Cascade Mountains, and also Jackson County, are designated as range counties. Hood River and all other counties are classed as dairy counties.

In no event will testing be required or paid for by cooperative funds if cattle are going to slaughter or to an approved quarantine feed lot. Neither will free vaccinations be administered for female calves in auction yards if the calves go directly to slaughter, or to an approved quarantined feed lot.

Otherwise, these differences will prevail between range counties and dairy counties for eligible cattle going through livestock auction markets:

In range counties, brucellosis tests will be free on cattle originating from noncertified counties and going through Federal or Federal-State approved saleyards. Testing of cattle originating from negative herds located in certified counties will not be required or paid for at these yards. But the Federal and Federal-State yards must keep animals from certified counties in separate clean pens to prevent mixing with other animals. If segregation pens are not provided, cattle must be tested at the yard and the cost borne by the auction market or owner or purchaser.

In dairy counties the brucellosis cooperative funds will pay for the testing of eligible cattle going through Federal and Federal-State approved saleyards if the animals are going directly back to a farm or ranch.

In all saleyards not Federal or Federal-State approved, wherever located, testing is now paid directly or indirectly by the yard. This practice will continue at these yards.

In another change, blood testing of animals not under the milk ring test will be required only once each 3 years, with the exception that dairy cattle owned by raw milk producers or distributors must still be blood tested at least once each 6 months.

A final provision of the new regulations say that in range counties coming up for recertification before June 30, 1959, the certification may be renewed by retesting at least 20 percent of the eligible cattle in at least 20 percent of the herds in the county once every 3 years. (An original certification holds for a 3-year period).

OREGON DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Corvallis, Oreg., December 20, 1957.

To Members of the Oregon State Legislature:

Subject: Brucellosis eradication.

Because of a change in the Federal and State cooperative brucellosis eradication program, it became desirable to change the

Oregon law to make the cooperative program more workable. This was done by the last legislature. To date over 75 percent of the cattle and herds in the State have been tested and we should, within the next year, have completed testing to the extent that the State can be accredited as modified, certified brucellosis and tuberculosis free. However, there is some indication that Federal funds for this program may be reduced before the job is completed. The following resolution by the Oregon Dairymen's Association is called to your attention:

"5. Whereas there is danger that because of military preparedness hysteria, Federal appropriations for brucellosis control may be drastically reduced, and since the present level of Federal funds for this program are necessary for its survival in Oregon: Be it

"Resolved, That the Oregon Dairymen's Association urge our Congressional delegation to see that Federal funds are sustained so that the excellent progress made in the elimination of this disease is not lost and our whole livestock industry put in jeopardy; and further be it

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressional delegates, all State legislators, the Governor and State newspapers."

LAWRENCE GERAGHTY, *President.*

PROTECTION OF RED SALMON FISHERIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1310, Senate Resolution 263, favoring negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the red-salmon fisheries. My purpose is to have the resolution made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 263) favoring negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the red-salmon fisheries.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND ON THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE DINNER FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have issued with reference to the Anti-Defamation League's dinner for Members of Congress on March 3.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND ON THE ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE DINNER

I have no intention of being present at the Antidefamation League's dinner for Members of Congress on March 3. The plan to recognize the 85th Congress "for distinguished contributions to the enrichment of our heritage of freedom" because of the enactment of the so-called civil-rights law is an insult to those Members of Congress who stood firm against this nefarious legislation.

It is inconceivable to me that a law that abridges the fundamental right to trial by jury can be regarded as enriching our heritage of freedom. Just the opposite is true.

I shall not attend a dinner to celebrate the prostitution of the Constitution.

PROPOSAL TO CURB THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the March 1, 1958, issue of the National Review there appears an excellent article entitled "A Bill To Curb the Supreme Court," written by Mr. L. Brent Bozell. Mr. Bozell has admirably summed up some of the reasons for supporting Senate bill 2646, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. The purpose of the bill is to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in several fields having to do with internal security.

Because of the great importance of this measure, and in view of the admirable manner in which Mr. Bozell has presented his case, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point 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 National Review of March 1, 1958]

A BILL TO CURB THE COURT

(By L. Brent Bozell)

This surely qualifies as one of the major surprises of our yet young year: The 85th Congress is giving serious consideration to Senator JENNER's bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. When JENNER introduced the bill last summer, its chances of getting Congressional support looked like Stassen's of becoming President. Congress had its back up over recent Court decisions, true; but in this age of moderation a proposal to strip the Court of all of its power in certain areas was hardly comme il faut. And though the bill was approved by the Subcommittee on Internal Security[1] in August, the outlook remained unpromising: Capital observers (including this correspondent) felt sure the full Committee on the Judiciary would give it a cold shoulder when Congress reconvened.

We were wrong. The Judiciary Committee is currently split in two over JENNER's measure. It has decided to return the bill to the subcommittee for further hearings and has agreed to take a final vote on it no later than March 10. Starting this week (February 18) the subcommittee will devote full time to testimony on the bill. There are signs of genuine concern in liberal quarters: Senator HENNINGS is said to be urging a number of legal experts to testify; the ADA, which doesn't need mobilizing, will be on hand; the Washington Post has already opened up its editorial guns.

This is not a measure, however, that cleanly divides liberals from conservatives. That it took more than conservative votes to tie up the Judiciary Committee is one indication. But here is the disconcerting note: There are two views about JENNER's bill, even within the conservative community.

1. The objection to the bill most commonly heard in lay circles is that it smacks of the liberals' method of dealing with institutions that do not do their bidding. Is the Jenner bill very different, the argument runs, from Roosevelt's Court-packing plan? In the thirties, we conservatives vigorously opposed attempts by the political branches of the Government to punish the judiciary for making unpopular decisions. How justify a volte-face by conservatives in the fifties? While this argument represents a commendable concern for consistency—a consideration one seldom finds liberals worrying about—there is, it seems to me, an obvious and decisive difference between the two situations. The Supreme Court, before Roosevelt tried to pack it, was insisting upon strict adherence to the Constitution. Conservatives opposed efforts to force the Court to deviate from the Constitution. Today the Supreme Court is violating the Constitution in case after case. Senator JENNER's bill seeks to enforce judicial observance of the Constitution. The common denominator in the two situations is allegiance to the Constitution.

2. Even so (the argument continues), the Jenner bill seems to strike at the foundations of our prized separation of powers doctrine; granted that the Warren Court has decided many important cases erroneously, is this sufficient warrant for Congressional intrusion into the judicial sphere? But the point, surely, is that the Supreme Court has already crossed the boundaries that are supposed to separate the branches.

JENNER's bill is defensive; it seeks to push the judiciary back into its own territory, thus restoring the constitutional plan. The Constitution provides that all political powers belong to the legislative and executive branches (Federal and State). The Supreme Court, however, has taken to making political decisions; it has done so in every one of the cases to which the Jenner bill is addressed. While it may be wise for the executive branch to confine its security program to sensitive employees; for the States to leave subversion to Federal authorities; for schools to hire teachers and bar associations to admit lawyers, who refuse to answer questions about Communist activities; these are questions for the political branches to decide. And it is the duty of the political branches to recover their power to decide them. It is their duty to us as citizens. For we have a constitutional right to popular control over our political affairs.

3. But this answer frequently invites a further objection. The Jenner bill, it is said, is not the broad, lofty assertion of the political branches' prerogatives, vis-a-vis the judiciary, that we are told is desirable. The bill deals with a highly arbitrary group of cases, Communist cases, which were selected, no doubt, because of their notoriety; this proposal, on the face of it, is punitive legislation designed to discredit and humiliate the Court.

FOR INTERNAL SECURITY

The second objective of the Jenner bill, of course, is to protect the country against the internal conspiracy. The Warren Court has brought down, or rendered ineffective, nearly all the anti-Communist bulwarks that public authorities have so laboriously erected over the past 20 years. The result is a national crisis. It would call for drastic remedies, quite aside from the need to discipline the Court. (As a matter of fact, the one valid criticism of JENNER's bill is that it does not deal comprehensively with the internal security problem. Cases involving Federal prosecution of subversives are unaffected.)

Several other aspects of JENNER's selective approach should be noted. It does not, for one thing, put the Supreme Court out of business: the Court's power is unaffected in the vast majority of cases that ordinarily come its way. For another, it does not place the Communist cases beyond judicial review. The highest courts of the States would have final say in subversive cases arising under their laws. The circuit courts of

[1] The Jenner bill would deny jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in all cases involving State antisubversion measures (an answer to the Court's decisions in the *Nelson* and *Sweezy* cases), the Federal security program (the *Cole* case), prosecutions for contempt of Congress (the *Watkins* case), measures directed against subversion in the school (the *Slochower* case) and State bar admissions (the *Konigsberg* case). Cf. column August 24, 1957.

appeal would have the last word in the Federal cases with which the Jenner bill deals. And finally, as to the Communist cases, the bill simply puts the Supreme Court on probation: should the Court show signs of having learned its lesson, Congress could, and probably would, restore the power the Jenner bill takes away.

4. But these considerations, in turn, raise yet another objection. Is not the Jenner bill a mandate for judicial anarchy in the field of subversion? How is uniformity in law interpretation and law enforcement to be achieved without a central authority to bring the various courts into line? The objection sounds good, but fails, I think, on a moment's analysis. Three types of cases affected by JENNER'S proposals require construction and evaluation of State laws. Centrally imposed uniformity in this area is not only unnecessary; it may be quite undesirable. To be sure, such cases may involve an interpretation of the Federal Constitution. But State supreme courts, presumptively, are as capable as a Federal court of reading and construing the document. And if the Minnesota Supreme Court happens to read the document differently than the Michigan court, where is the national loss? And where is the loss to the individual citizen of either State who would, after all, be put on notice by the Jenner bill that the final adjudication of his rights will come henceforth from St. Paul or East Lansing, rather than from Washington?

The other cases affected by JENNER'S bill—security program cases and Congressional contempt citations—are bound to originate, for reasons of venue and jurisdiction, in the United States District Court in Washington. The final court of appeal, therefore, would always be the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia, and uniformity would follow as a matter of course.

5. One hears the argument, finally, that there are (or, more often, "there must be"), other, less drastic ways of bringing the Court into line. Well, what ways? The suggestion most frequently advanced is that Congress enact corrective legislation in each of the areas where the Court has transgressed. But in many cases—three of the types to which the Jenner bill is addressed—Congress simply has no power to reverse the Court. The Watkins, Slochower and Konigsberg cases all turned on the Court's highly imaginative definition of "due process of law." Congress has no authority to interpret the due process clauses of the Constitution; more exactly, the Court has no obligation to pay any attention to Congress' interpretation.

Let us make no mistake about what the Jenner bill tries to do. One of its objectives is, indeed, disciplinary. The idea is to chasten the Court, to make it behave. In recent years, demonstrably, the Supreme Court has been a law unto itself: it has usurped the lawful powers of other bodies; it has disregarded constitutions and statutes; it has run roughshod over judicial precedents—the precedents it has not chosen to ignore, it has distorted and misrepresented. The Court, in a word, needs to be disciplined. For these purposes, an object lesson might do the trick. Which lesson? It so happens that many of the Court's most flagrant transgressions have occurred in the internal-security field—Senator JENNER cannot be blamed for that. What could be more reasonable, then, than that this field should be the one singled out for the object lesson?

Note, moreover, how the language of the Constitution lends itself to such selectivity—indeed almost invites Congress, when it deems such action to be in the national interest, to carve out limited areas from the Court's normal jurisdiction. After vesting the whole judicial power of the United States in one Supreme Court (and in whatever lower courts Congress might establish), article III turns around and qualifies the grant: "the Supreme Court," clause 2 of section 2 provides, "shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." The provision is a classic instance of the Constitution's built-in checks and balances. It was the framers' way, invoked today by Senator JENNER, of giving the peoples' representatives in Congress permanent power to keep the Supreme Court in bounds.

ATTEMPT TO CLARIFY

The Nelson and Cole decisions would seem to hold more promising opportunities for reversal since they were based on an alleged intent of Congress. Why can't Congress simply clarify its intent? Well, consider: In title 18 of the United States Code, the title that contains the Smith Act, Congress provided: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the several States under the laws thereof." In the Nelson case, however, the Court held that Congress intended the Smith Act to deprive the States of jurisdiction to enforce their sedition laws. Similarly with Cole: I remember sitting down with one Senator a couple of days after that case was decided, trying to think up language for new legislation that would clarify Congress' intent to permit the President to extend his security program to nonsensitive agencies. The Court you see, had said that the language already on the books—i. e., that the security program might be extended "to all other departments and agencies of the Government as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary"—meant that the President could not extend the program to these other departments.

The point is not so much that more explicit words are not to be found. But rather that Congress, with this experience of judicial perversity in cases where the Court is determined to reach a preconceived conclusion, cannot afford to rely on mere professions of intent; after the new permissible legislation has been implemented, and processed through the courts, the Supreme Court will undoubtedly have thought up a new device for frustrating the Congressional will.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of the Committee on the Judiciary, has just completed its hearings on the bills and resolutions on the subject of Presidential inability, which have been submitted to the committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, it has been my pleasure, as well as my duty, to preside over each of the hearings. I have been impressed by the consideration which has been given to this subject matter by the witnesses who appeared before us. I have likewise been impressed with the sincere conviction of each of them.

I did not expect that at the outset there would be unanimity of opinion with respect to the problem of whether to proceed by statutory means or by means of a constitutional amendment. I was not surprised, therefore, when some of the witnesses advocated the submission of a constitutional amendment, while others urged that a statute would be sufficient. Those who believe that a statute would be sufficient have based their contention upon the language contained in article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power—

to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The supporters of the statutory approach say that this authority fills in the gaps in the language of the Constitution which provides for succession at times of Presidential inability. The provision relating to Presidential inability is set forth in article II, section 1, clause 6, as follows:

In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

One of the gaps in the provisions of clause 6 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, is in the case of a determination of whether the words "the same" have reference to the word "office" or to the words "powers and duties of the office." If, under this language, the Vice President succeeds to the Office of President, it is indeed problematical whether he may thereafter be removed from that Office by a recovered President. If, on the other hand, the words "the same" be construed to refer to the "powers and duties" of the Presidency, then it would be possible for the President, upon his recovery, to reassume the powers and duties of the Office. The determination of this construction is made more difficult by the precedent set by Vice President Tyler in 1840, when, upon the death of President Harrison, he assumed the Office of the Presidency, and became President in fact, rather than acting President. While this action involved the assumption of the Office based upon death, and not upon inability, it is thought by many to be controlling, since the clause under discussion refers to four separate contingencies, including death and inability, in the same context. Thus, it is said that whatever devolves upon the Vice President by reason of death, likewise devolves upon him by reason of inability, resignation, or removal.

The precedent set by Vice President Tyler has since been followed by six other Vice Presidents in the history of this country. Thus, regardless of whether the action of Vice President Tyler might originally have been contested on the basis of the language of the Constitution, the precedent is so firmly established as to cause considerable difficulty for those who contest otherwise.

The first gap in article II, section 1, clause 6, therefore, is in connection with the determination of what devolves upon the Vice President during periods when the President is incapacitated. From this logically evolves the second gap, namely, as to whether the President may reassume the powers and duties of his office, after his recovery. The third gap involves a determination of the individual or group upon whom lies the responsibility for making a determination of

inability, or at a later time, the determination of recovery of the President.

I refer to these as gaps because in the Constitution there is no express language which provides a concrete answer to those who seek to follow its provisions. These gaps present difficult questions—questions not easily soluble, but questions which must be answered in order to avoid paralysis, or perhaps even chaos, at a time when such provisions must be utilized by reason of necessity.

Laying aside for the moment a statute which might outline a permissive approach, to assume that a statutory approach is permissible, is to say that the Congress may determine: First, what will devolve upon the Vice President; second, who will determine that the President is disabled; third, who will determine when the President is recovered; and fourth, whether, and upon what conditions, the President may resume the duties of his Office. Any mandatory approach cast in the form of a statute must assume that the necessary and proper clause of the Constitution, which I have previously quoted, supplies the Congress with authority to transfer the determination of the issues of inability and recovery from one of the coordinate branches of Government to the other, or to an independent commission composed of members of one or the other of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government, or to individuals not otherwise connected with the Federal Government.

As I have earlier suggested, from article II, section 1, clause 6, it is not precisely clear who, or what body, has the authority to determine the existence of Presidential inability, let alone to determine the issue of the recovery of the President. Some persons think that, under the present provisions of the Constitution, it is incumbent upon the Vice President to determine when the President is disabled. Others, including some who testified before the subcommittee, feel that the Constitution is ambiguous on this point and does not give a clear and distinct answer. From my own examination, it appears to me that when the Constitution says "the same shall devolve on the Vice President"—it means that whenever a situation involving the President's health—mental or physical—becomes apparent, it is incumbent upon the Vice President to determine whether the President is unable to exercise the powers and duties of his office, if the President himself has not theretofore so declared. If the President does not so declare and if it is, as I believe, incumbent upon the Vice President to make that determination when circumstances suggesting it arise, then any statutory determination would be limited, either to a declaration of the existence of such a power in the Vice President, or to suggestion of a permissive procedure which the Vice President might adopt in order to support his ultimate decision.

When the discussion before the subcommittee was in terms of a mandatory approach which might have transferred the power to determine inability from the Vice President to some other individual or group, almost all of the witnesses suggested that the safest procedure was to adopt a constitutional amendment. The Attorney General, in his appearance, made it quite clear that he thought that the power to determine Presidential inability lay with the Vice President at any time the President had not made a declaration of his own inability. He further made it clear that, in his judgment, the necessary and proper clause did not confer upon the Congress the authority to transfer that determination from the Vice President to any other individual or group, either within the executive branch or outside of it. The present president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, who spoke not for the bar but for himself, also made it clear that any contemplated transfer of the authority to determine inability from the Vice President could be made with safety only by means of a constitutional amendment. Similar expressions were given by other witnesses of considerable legal standing. In the face of these expressions of doubt concerning the ability of the Congress to provide by statute for the solution of this problem, it would appear unwise to propose any solution to this problem through a statutory approach.

But, there are, in addition, two other considerations that need to be examined. One is that the sufficiency of Congressional power in this area, of necessity, could not be determined until a situation had actually arisen in which the President was disabled. The uncertainty involved would undoubtedly create difficult moments for this country, for the Presidency is an office of vast powers and tremendous influence not only at home but throughout the world. The wrangling, the pulling and hauling, that would result at such a time are not difficult to imagine. This certainly is one of the substantial defects in any statutory plan for the solution of this problem. But there is a second consideration, as I have suggested. The people of the United States, after all, have probably the greatest stake in any determination which may be made toward the orderly succession and operation of the Presidency. The method, therefore, which provides the greatest opportunity for expression by the people is, it seems to me, the method most to be desired. The statutory approach, while an expression of the Federal officers elected by the people, does not give as great an opportunity for self-expression by the people as does the submission of a constitutional amendment, which requires participation not only by the elected Federal officials, but also by elected State officials. Lacking any provision in the Constitution for referendum, this is as close to an expression of the people of the United States as it is possible for us to get under our constitutional system. In so basic a decision, involving so important an office, the procedure which would result in the most thorough review, and I think, therefore, the widest acceptance by the people, is the procedure which should most recommend itself to the Congress.

And so, Mr. President, after hearing the considerable testimony which has been presented to the committee and after examination of the views which have been submitted, I have come to the conclusion that the proper and desirable method of proceeding to a solution of this problem is by constitutional amendment.

Having resolved in my own mind this immediate issue of procedure, however, it still becomes necessary to determine the substance which any such amendment should contain. The question of what officer or group should make the determination of inability thrusts itself immediately into consideration. The Constitution, I believe, now places in one man, the Vice President, the power to determine when a President is disabled, if the President himself does not so determine. This, however, is a tremendous responsibility. In the two previous instances in which a President of the United States has been disabled, our Vice Presidents, far from being usurpers, have failed to exert the power which the Constitution had conferred upon them and have refrained from exercising the prerogatives of the Presidency. This reluctance to act may be traced to doubt on their part of the public acceptance of such an act, especially when it was not manifestly clear that the President, upon recovery, could resume the functions of the Presidency. Undoubtedly, public acceptance is a prime necessity, as far as the Vice President is concerned, before he undertakes any assumption of the prerogatives of the Presidency. So long as the Vice President retains the sole decision as to the disability of the President, he suffers a distinct possibility that any action by him may fail to gain public acceptance. It is my thought, therefore, that a group now in existence should be available to consult with the Vice President and to indicate assent to his assumption of the Presidential prerogatives. Such wider participation in this critical decision should serve to reassure a Vice President otherwise hesitant to act.

While I thought originally that this group might utilize the services of some leaders of the Congress, I am now convinced that the acceptable method and the best that we could get passed is to provide assistance of the heads of the Departments to the Vice President, with Congress acting in case of disagreement. These officers are most constantly in touch with the President and, therefore, have more intimate knowledge of his abilities to carry out the functions of that high Office. They are likewise, in most instances, of the same political persuasion as the President, and so there is less likelihood of political bias entering into their advice. They are, in almost every instance, responsible officials who have been subjected to the scrutiny of the Senate of the United States before assuming their office. They are in daily association with business, with agriculture, and with labor. They are in constant touch with our foreign and domestic problems. In brief, they represent as fair a cross section of knowledge of the economic groups which comprise this Nation as it is possible to secure in a small body. The heads of the executive departments, being 10 in number, are a small enough group to act with dispatch, and a large enough group that

it is not likely they will act with undue haste.

And so, Mr. President, I have come to the conclusion that if a President fails to declare his inability, the Vice President, with the written advice and consent of a majority of the heads of the executive departments, should be permitted to declare his inability. The Vice President should thereupon be permitted to assume the powers and duties of the Office of the Presidency as Acting President, and he should be permitted to serve until the President has recovered.

When the President is recovered, because he is the officer elected by the people for that Office, I believe he should be permitted to resume the exercise of the powers and duties of his Office, provided, however, that he should give notice to the people of the United States of his intention to do so in sufficient time to enable the public to determine for itself that he has recovered. The minimum period for this purpose would seem to me 1 week, and if, during that time, it was clear to the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet that the President was not really able to resume the exercise of the powers and duties of his Office, I believe those individuals should possess the power to so declare. Upon their declaration, the matter should be submitted to the Congress for its determination.

If the Congress is not in session, I believe it should be incumbent upon the Vice President to call it into session, and if the inability of the President is still pronounced, I would expect that partisan considerations would be laid aside and the Vice President, the Cabinet, and the Congress could act with dispatch to prevent a disabled President from resuming his Office. The Congress, by its inaction, however, should not be permitted to delay the resumption of the powers and duties of the Office of the Presidency by the President.

The considerations which I have tried to outline here, which have resulted from my further examination of this question after the extended hearings, brought me closer to the suggested proposal of the Attorney General than I had heretofore been, and so, in cooperation with one of the members of our subcommittee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I attempted to find language on which we could agree, which would follow substantially the outline of the proposal submitted by the Attorney General. I am now prepared to introduce a joint resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution to carry out the suggestions which I have just disclosed.

Before I do, I think I should make this additional expression. On the two previous occasions, in which the Congress has found this problem of some imminence, the advocates of action have failed to provide any solution because they could not agree upon a single proposal. This lesson suggests that if there is to be any solution at this time, there must, of necessity, be an agreement amongst those who propose a change, on the provisions of that change.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, I wish to compliment the Senator from Tennessee for consummating this proposal for a constitutional amendment. It is the distillation of many proposals which have been pending before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think we have contrived a rather happy solution which is at once agreeable to the administration and I believe ought to prove agreeable to the Congress as well. It is very simple in its approach. If an additional statute is necessary, that could be accomplished sometime; but to make a refinement of the organic law it is my considered judgment, and that of others, that it must be done by constitutional amendment.

I think this proposal comes very close to the specifications prescribed in the last testimony from the president of the American Bar Association.

I would like to remain and hear the rest of my friend's statement, but we have a somewhat running controversy in the Appropriations Committee just now, and I shall probably have to absent myself from the floor; but I ask unanimous permission to have printed in the RECORD, following the statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, my own statement on the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. DIRKSEN's statement appears in the RECORD following the conclusion of Mr. KEFAUVER's remarks.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Illinois very heartily. Before he returns to the Appropriations Committee, I wish to say that this matter has been worked on and considered on a nonpartisan basis, by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is a member. It has been considered very thoroughly. The knowledge and diligence of the Senator from Illinois at the hearings, and in further consideration of the various amendments, have contributed much to what I agree with him is the best solution we can get. I know the committee, the Congress, and the public are all very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his very substantial contribution to the joint resolution which will be introduced shortly.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the testimony adduced before the committee was well rounded. We had testimony either in person or in the form of memorandums from former President Hoover, former President Truman, some very distinguished lawyers, including the president of the American Bar Association, and a good many political scholars, who have given a great deal of attention to the matter. From all the material we have winnowed this kind of device, which we think will best meet all the problems that may arise in this field.

I am delighted indeed that the President of the United States has been so uninhibited about the matter. When the first illness beset him, he gave the country a blow-by-blow account. He has had no inhibitions about it whatsoever. He is anxious indeed that this course be pursued in order that we may clarify the provision in the Constitution. I think the country is fortunate, and the Congress is fortunate, that the President, with the utmost of good will, has followed this matter in the hope that some remedy like this can be contrived.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks and I agree with him fuly.

Mr. President, I do not harbor any idea that the proposal which I intend to introduce in co-sponsorship with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Senators HRUSKA, HENNINGS, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, LANGER, JENNER, WATKINS, and BUTLER, will solve all the problems inherent in a disability of the President, nor do I expect that it will be immune from criticism. I do not believe that it is possible, in any constitutional amendment certainly, and perhaps not even in a statute, to dissipate all doubts concerning contingencies which may arise at a time when the President is disabled. I can only suggest that I believe that this proposal is the most satisfactory which can be fashioned which has a reasonable opportunity for adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. I recommend it to the attention of the Members of the Senate and to the public as well. I hope that it may serve as an instrument to lift this question from its present impasse and propel it toward an early resolution.

As Senators will recognize, my discussion is pertinent throughout to the agreement that has just been announced and which has been entered into between the President and the Vice President.

As I have just stated, I am doubtful that portions of the problem, and in particular that portion dealing with how the President reassumes office at the conclusion of his disability, can be resolved by a statutory approach.

An agreement is subject to all the limitations of a statute, and, in addition, the Chief Executive does not possess anything akin to the powers conferred upon Congress by the necessary and proper clause of the Constitution. Therefore, it goes without saying that I am doubtful that this problem can be solved by an agreement on the executive level. It is my belief that a constitutional amendment is required.

The Executive is to be complimented for doing the best he can short of such an amendment. The very fact that he and his colleagues in the executive department have felt it necessary to enter into such an agreement emphasizes the necessity for going ahead and handling the problem in a fundamental way—in a constitutional way.

Any agreement is subject to the language of the Constitution itself and I think it much better to write that language into the Constitution. The only test of the agreement that could ever arise would be in a period of emergency, and that is what we are trying to avoid.

For this reason, I think we should launch the constitutional amendment this year, which will solve this problem in a fundamental way by spelling out

within the Constitution itself the method of determining this problem.

The statement by Senator DIRKSEN previously ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

I am happy to be a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] of a proposed amendment which so closely parallels the approach suggested by the distinguished Attorney General. I am also glad to rise at this time and speak on behalf of that proposal.

For some time now the matter of a course of action to be taken at the time when a President is disabled has been under discussion for the reason that a President of the United States has had the forthrightness and the candor to submit to a public discussion of his health, and the matter of the operation of his office if his health should be so impaired that he could not continue temporarily to exercise his responsibilities. While we as a Nation have known days of greater anxiety so far as a President's health is concerned, and likewise so far as the operation of the Office of the Presidency is concerned, we have never before had a condition in which the President himself has urged not only full discussion of the problem, but action as well. If in this atmosphere we, the elected representatives of the people, cannot agree upon a solution to meet the contingencies which arise when a President is disabled, I doubt if we will ever be able to do so.

It is fortunate for our Nation that we have had, not only the benefit of the good will of the President in seeking a solution to this problem, but also his active advice as transmitted to the Congress through the office of the Attorney General of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who just spoke, has set forth a host of substantial reasons why the constitutional amendment approach suggested by the administration is to be preferred over a statutory approach. I would not at this time seek to dwell at length upon those arguments except to indicate that I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that the proper method of procedure is by means of constitutional amendment. By doing so, I am confident that we will obviate substantial difficulties which might arise if a statutory approach were adopted.

Even after agreement is reached upon the proper mechanism for accomplishing the desired end, however, it is necessary to agree upon some formula by which the President may surrender the functions of his office temporarily, or by which he may be compelled to surrender the functions of his office, should he fail, or be unable, to take the initiative. I am not overly troubled, nor do I think other Members of Congress will be, over permitting a President to temporarily relinquish the duties of his office upon his own determination so long as the President is free to resume the powers and duties of his office upon his recovery. If this were our only problem, its resolution would not likely be difficult.

Where difficulty arises, however, is in arriving at a selection of the individual, or the group on who should be placed the responsibility for determining the incapacity of the President, if the President fails to, or is unable to, make such a determination. In the considerable discussion of this problem which has been had throughout the United States, it has become commonplace for individuals studying the problem to suggest a solution involving 1 of the 3 coordinate branches of Government, or a Commission to be composed of representatives of 1 or more of them. Each of these proposals has something to recommend it. Each of them, likewise, presents some difficulty. I think it highly unlikely that we could present any proposed solution here which would satisfy everyone, or meet all of the contingencies which conceivably might arise in a situation where a President is disabled. So, our search as individuals must be, as it has been in the subcommittee, to reach a solution which would meet the most serious of the contingencies, and yet present the greatest opportunity for adoption. I think we have come up with such a proposal.

Before I discuss the details of it, I want to discuss the alternative suggestions which have been made and suggest the reasons why I prefer the solution which was ultimately reached.

It has been suggested that whenever a President is disabled and fails to announce his disability that the Congress of the United States be called upon to determine whether the President is unable to perform the powers and duties of his office. The Congress has been suggested because it is the only body in existence which is composed of officials elected by the people, the thought being that since the Presidency is likewise an elective office, an elective body should determine when and in what circumstances a President should be succeeded, even temporarily, by the Vice President.

However, Mr. President, we are all aware that when a situation arises in which a President is unable to announce his own disability, the need to act with dispatch may be imperative. Since the Congress—large body that it is—may not be in session, the assembling of its Members may take days, days during which crucial decisions must be held in abeyance.

In addition, it must be remembered that the Congress is not at all times of the same political persuasion as the President of the United States. Whenever the Congress is not of the same political affiliation as the President, any action on the part of Congress removing the President from office, even temporarily for disability, may occasion suspicion that the action was motivated by partisanship. I want to make it clear that I am not one of those who feels that the Congress would fail to act in the utmost of good faith, but we must constantly keep in mind that whatever solution is adopted, it must be one calculated to gain the acceptance of the American people.

The Congress, therefore, while representatives of the people, is not well adapted to make the determination required because, first, it is not always in session; second, its size prohibits immediate action; and third, its actions may be suspect as politically motivated. There may be additional reasons, Mr. President, but these have been sufficiently persuasive in my own mind to suggest that the Congress should not make the determination—at least it should not make the initial determination of inability on the part of the President.

Others have suggested that the Supreme Court should be the proper tribunal to determine inability of the President. The Supreme Court has the advantage, being sufficiently small, that it could act with dispatch. It is not always in session, but by reason of the compactness may be summoned without too much delay. It membership being appointed for life, its decisions on presidential inability would hardly be suspected as being politically motivated. Furthermore, our courts are many times called upon to determine the capacity of a given individual and, while the instant decision may involve the capacity of a high-ranking officer of government, to wit, the President, it is essentially no different from the determination that the courts may be called upon to make in the proving of any will, or any contractual instrument.

While these considerations might recommend the Supreme Court, there are other considerations which mitigate against the use of that body to determine Presidential inability. First of all, the Supreme Court, not ordinarily being in close contact with the President would not possess intimate knowledge of the manner in which the President has, to that date, been fulfilling the responsibilities of his Office. Secondly, the members of the court may be of different political philosophies from the President of the United States and this factor may cause some loss of confidence in its judgment of this matter. Thirdly, the initial determination of inability is largely a political question and the court has for years refrained from acting as an arbiter on political questions.

There has been some support in and out of Congress for creating a special disability commission, to be composed of members of one or more of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government. One of the chief difficulties with this type of a proposal is the one pointed out by the Attorney General. The mere existence of the commission and its attempted operation could serve as a harassment to a President of the United States who did not consider himself disabled to the extent that he could not discharge the functions of his Office.

Of the existing branches of government the executive branch would seem best qualified to make a determination of the inability of the President when the President himself did not, or could not, do so. At the present time the Constitution places the determination of inability in an officer of the executive branch, the Vice President of the United States, but experience has demonstrated that a Vice President, out of an excess of caution, will fail to act when action is required in order to avoid a charge of usurpation of the presidential powers. The Founding Fathers, at the time they chose the Vice President to make this decision, did not know that an official family within the executive branch would ultimately be created, composed of the heads of the executive departments of government, commonly referred to as the Cabinet. In short, the institution of the Cabinet was unknown. However, any proposal giving voice to the Cabinet in the determination of this issue would have the benefit of leaving the determination within the branch of government where the Founding Fathers placed it. It would effect, therefore, the least radical change. In addition, it would utilize a small compact body, well acquainted with the day-to-day operation of Government and the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his Office. They would be persons who ordinarily would be of his own political persuasion, so that the question of political bias would not be apt to enter into the determination.

While it is true that the members of the Cabinet are not elected and, therefore, not responsible to the people, they are individuals who have been subjected to the examination and scrutiny of the Senate before confirmation and they could be counted upon to agree to the temporary removal of the President for disability, only in the event that they were convinced beyond all doubt that the President was in fact disabled. While some may suggest that the members of the Cabinet might be hesitant to replace the President, even temporarily, since they owe their initial appointment to the President, I think we should accord to the Cabinet the same respect that we would to ourselves if a decision of this magnitude and impact were placed upon our shoulders.

After examination of all these considerations, I find myself in agreement with the basic provisions of the administration's proposed amendment to the Constitution which provides that the President may announce his own incapacity, and when he does so, the Vice President becomes Acting President during the period of his disability. It also provides that if the President does not declare his inability and the Vice President and the

Cabinet, by majority vote, determine that he is unable to exercise the powers and duties of the office of the Presidency, the Vice President may become Acting President during the period of the President's disability.

The administration proposal originally provided that when the President had recovered sufficiently he could resume the Office of President upon his own declaration. This has been somewhat modified by the proposal submitted to the Congress recently. Under the modified proposal the President might resume the duties of his Office when he declared himself to be well, but if the Vice President and the Cabinet disagreed and stated in writing that he was unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, the Congress would then be called upon to determine the question of inability. This, I think, is an appropriate function for the Congress. Participation by the Congress would only occur in the event there was disagreement among the members of the executive branch of the Government as to the ability of the President to perform the powers and duties of the Presidency.

Likewise, I think it is appropriate that at such times the President should be permitted to recover his Office pending the determination of the issue by the Congress, for we all know that if it were otherwise, and the debate on the issues were prolonged, the President might be out of Office for a considerable period of time. Yet his is the Office and it was he who was elected by the people of the United States.

However, I think that the amendment here proposed adds one new desirable suggestion not previously embodied in the administration proposal. The new suggestion is that the President not resume the powers and duties of his Office until such time as 7 days have elapsed from his announcement of his recovery. This, Mr. President, would permit an orderly transition of the reins of government from the Vice President to the President. It would permit the people of the United States to adjust themselves to this change. It would, likewise, serve as a protective interim during which time, by combination of executive and legislative action, a mentally incapacitated President might be persuaded from returning to Office, although he had theretofore announced his own determination in writing that he was able to resume the powers and duties of his Office. In the extreme case, perhaps the Vice President, the Cabinet, and the Congress could act to prevent the resumption of the powers and duties of the Office of Presidency in the unlikely contingency that a mentally incompetent President would persist in attempting to regain the powers and duties to his Office.

This is an issue which transcends political consideration in the less attractive sense of that term. It affects the highest elective office of our land. It deals with the orderly transition of the executive power of the United States, an authority well-nigh incalculable in modern days. We can fail to act, of course. Then, in some future crisis, this Nation might somehow muddle through. But being apprised of the risk of such a procedure, and having been presented with a rare opportunity to act, it would be unthinkable to subject the Nation to the risk involved in muddling through.

We could likewise adopt a statute on this subject, but having done so, we could not rest assured that we had accomplished anything. For until a crisis occurred, the validity of the statute could not be tested.

It would seem to me that when the Attorney General and others of substantial legal authority have advised us that a statute would, or may be, unconstitutional, that this fact alone should suggest the inappropriateness of proceeding by statute. When legal opinion is divided concerning the sufficiency of a statute, and the legal test of that statute could only come in a period of great turbulence, we would be well advised to shun the statutory approach.

Furthermore, I believe in being practical and I believe that when the Attorney General has suggested that he would propose that the President veto a bill as unconstitutional, we should react to reality and propose that the matter is solved by constitutional amendment.

The proposal which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has offered, in cosponsorship with other Senators, including myself, results from careful and prolonged consideration.

It takes cognizance of the many thoughtful statements that were presented to the subcommittee. It represents a position which can be supported by members of the administration, for it is consistent with the basic ideas which have been presented to the Congress by administration spokesmen. It is a recommendation which, if adopted, can serve to allay major uncertainties which now confront us whenever a President becomes disabled. It is functional; it is feasible; and it should, in my judgment, be adopted to remove from the Constitution an ambiguity which has heretofore caused us concern, but which may hereafter cause us injury.

I want to stress my gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee for the nonpartisan way in which he has approached this problem. I am confident that if all of the Congress will maintain this nonpartisan approach that we can, in the favorable atmosphere created by the candor of the President of the United States, withdraw this issue from the realm of our concern.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution, on behalf of myself and the other Senators who have been mentioned as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, was honored by the awarding of the honorary degree of doctor of laws at Howard University here in Washington yesterday, March 3, 1958. I am sure that the host of friends and admirers of former Senator Lehman join in their congratulations to him on this occasion. No one in public life deserves this honor more than he, and no one in public life better represents the ideas and concepts for which Howard University stands.

The address which our former colleague delivered at Howard University yesterday is one of the greatest addresses on the subject of civil rights which I have ever read. In spirit, tone and conviction, it represents the very best of Senator Lehman's good life and his long championship of decency and equality of opportunity for all of our citizens. His talk deserves the study and approbation of each of his public-spirited fellow citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of former Senator Lehman's address, which is in fact literally an encyclopedia of information on this very vital issue, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON RECEIVING THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY DURING EXERCISES OBSERVING THE 91ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNIVERSITY, MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1958

I am very grateful for the dignity you have conferred upon me. I thank the trustees, the officers and the faculty. There are few honors I have received in my lifetime which I value more than this one.

I am proud to be here on what you call Charter Day, the anniversary of the grant by Congress of a charter to this great institution. I consider this a significant occasion, and feel highly privileged to participate in it in any way.

This university represents principles and purposes which rank high among those I have always cherished and by which I have always tried to live. It has always represented to me one of the beacons of hope for progress in the most essential direction I know—justice and equality for all our citizens. There is no more critical goal for America.

This university is much more than just an educational institution—although it would, of course, wholly justify its existence if it were only that. Its increasing excellence in teaching and training its students in the professions and the arts is a source of pride to all its friends.

I need scarcely tell you how important it is for us to have more lawyers, more doctors, more engineers, more scientists, more scholars, and above all—more teachers. The fate of freedom in the world may depend in part on our ability to turn out an adequate number of trained people in these and other fields.

But Howard University also functions in other vital ways. It serves as a center of research and scholarship, adding greatly to the sum of the most precious resource we have—knowledge. It serves as a great social laboratory for the analysis and development of fact and theory, and as a spawning ground for ideas.

These are services to the Nation whose value is beyond price.

Much as the Nation needs more doctors, scientists, scholars, and teachers, today, there is one still even greater need, although a related one. That need is for leaders.

Where there is no vision—and no leadership—the people perish, to paraphrase a famous verse in the Bible. Today, the survival of civilization and of mankind hang on a thread—largely, I believe, because of the lack of truly inspired leadership in our land and elsewhere—not only at the highest level, but at almost every level.

Leaders equipped with ideas are needed today to arouse us to our dangers, to propose the means to overcome those dangers, to mobilize the people for sacrifice and action—and then to act.

We need this kind of leadership not only to meet the problems of war and peace abroad, but the problems of an economic and social nature at home.

Today, I am going to talk about just one of our Nation's problems—one in which I think you at Howard University are particularly interested, but one with which the entire country and the entire world are also deeply concerned. I refer to civil rights. This is a problem with which I have been

concerned ever since I was a youth, and to which I have been privileged to devote a major share of my energies throughout my adult years.

Here let me say that although I am in the twilight of my own life, I shall always continue to be a soldier in the struggle for equal civil rights—which is part of the noblest struggle there is—the eternal struggle for human justice.

The struggle for human justice is ancient as well as eternal. It began long before the dawn of recorded time. It went on in the land of the Bible, in the time of Abraham and Moses, and Herod and Jesus. It raged in Greece around the figures of Socrates and Plato; in Rome, around Cicero and Brutus; in France, around Voltaire; in Switzerland, around William Tell. It has gone on in every period, among almost every people. I believe it will continue as long as men remain on this earth—even until Judgment Day.

The hope of human progress lies in the expectation that this struggle will move steadily forward to higher ground, always centering around new issues and new objectives in the constant effort to eliminate injustice and inequality among men.

What we call the civil-rights struggle today is just the current phase of the eternal quest for social justice.

I know it is completely unneccessary for me to tell you, assembled here today, that the fight for civil rights is not a fight for special privileges for some, but rather a struggle for equality for all.

All of us here know that the civil-rights struggle did not begin with the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, nor even with the issuance of the historic report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947—President Truman's Committee, that is. This struggle in America began centuries ago, soon after the first slaves were brought to these shores. It has continued in varying forms, in the political arena and on the battlefields of the Civil War, until the present day.

The institution of slavery was the predecessor of the institution of segregation; the two are of the same nature. Segregation is not much more than a substitute for slavery.

Of course segregation is not the only denial of civil rights being practiced in our land. It is, however, one of the most blatant. It is the strong point against which the Supreme Court started to move in 1954.

Since the Supreme Court decision, there has been a quickening of the struggle—even some outbreaks of violence. In some areas, resistance to school desegregation has stiffened. In those areas, there is almost today defiance of the supreme law of the land. It might even be called anarchy—or subversion.

Today, in the light of sputnik and of Soviet advances in the fields of science, there is an aspect to this situation which is almost incredible. We have suddenly realized that our school system is inadequate to the challenge of the cold war. Some of the most vital engagements in this war are being lost in the schoolrooms of America. We know we have a critical shortage of all types of school facilities, and particularly of elementary schoolrooms. Nowhere is this shortage more critical than in the South. Yet some Southern States continue to maintain two separate sets of schools for the purpose of segregation. In some of those States, laws have recently been passed authorizing the abolition of the entire public-school system if threatened by desegregation.

In my judgment, to shut down the public schools, on whose optimum functioning our national survival depends, in order to uphold the unconstitutional and immoral practice of segregation, is not only incredible but borders on the treasonable—in a fundamental, if not in a legal, sense.

The spirit which gives rise to such moves is small and narrow.

Yet in this aspect of our national life, there are some northerners, as well as southerners, who continue to cry for gradualism—another word for maintaining the status quo. I say that these regressivists who want to stand still or go backward are puny men trying to halt relentless tides. These tides will not stop for any man.

These so-called gradualists wring their hands and ask you to have patience. But the memory of every Amercan Negro encompasses more than 100 years of slavery before the Declaration of Independence, 77 more years of slavery in this land of liberty after 1776, and 90 years of segregation, after the Emancipation Proclamation.

And now it is almost 4 years since the Supreme Court decision. How much patience must one have?

What does patience mean against this background of 300 years of waiting?

I believe that among the truly heroic folk of America must be numbered those patient men and women of the Negro race who have so long endured the degradation of segregation, and still work with restraint and reason to achieve their goal of simple equality of treatment as American citizens.

What an epic of indomitable courage and patience was written by the humble people of Montgomery, Ala., in the historic bus strike 2 years ago.

But, in my judgment, the greatest heroes of all must be written down as those little schoolchildren, in Little Rock and in many, many other places less renowned, who have walked the gantlet of hate and prejudice to break the trail for the onward march of brotherhood.

What courage they have showed. What faith has moved them—those little boys and girls, as they have walked, in many a town and village, up to those all-white school steps into the eye of the whirlpool? In almost every case I have heard about, these children have acted with grace and dignity, with the simple conduct of people who quietly move mountains. These are true heroes and heroines.

When reference is made to the monumental problems of the South involved in desegregating, I like to think of these young people, and of the millions like them. They are the personification of the right to equality we are fighting to secure. They are the symbols of the struggle for freedom and equality in America today. But they are more than symbols. They are fighters.

They are fighting not only for their own rights, but also for the rights of all other Negro children, for the rights of the children of every minority group, and, finally, for the freedom of each and every one of us.

Those children are front-line fighters. All Americans should pay them homage. They should inspire each one of us and all of us to greater and more vigorous efforts on this crucial front. The example of these young heroes and heroines—and of their patience—should put to shame those timid men who say that we are moving too fast and have too little patience.

The timid souls, including, I regret to say, some in the top leadership of our Government, have a regrettable tendency to identify themselves as a kind of third force in the arena of struggle. They seem to consider themselves as neutralists in the cold war over civil rights.

Speaking surely only for myself, but hopefully also for the majority of the American people, I cannot either be or pretend to be neutral in this struggle.

This is not a battle between two equal and opposite forces in our country. This is a struggle against oppression. It is a struggle to uphold not only the letter of the Constitution, but its spirit, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence as well. And what is even more, the spirit of America.

How can I be a neutral in this situation?

The NAACP and the Urban League, for instance, have been unfairly branded in some quarters—and I am thinking of responsible quarters which should know better—as the spokesmen of an extremist viewpoint. In my judgment, this is a false indictment and I am glad to call it so. In my judgment, these organizations are the spokesmen for a truly moderate viewpoint. The NAACP and the Urban League are responsible champions of the law, amici curiae, in the truest sense of that classic Latin phrase.

These organizations of citizens do not speak only for Negroes. They speak also for that vast number of white people in our country, both north and south of the so-called Mason and Dixon line, who advocate no more and no less than equal justice under law for all Americans.

It is important to understand that the fight for civil rights is being carried on by white people as well as by Negroes. It is important that the victims of oppression know that they are not isolated and alone. It is important, vitally important, that the struggle for justice be carried on, not only by the victims of injustice, but also on their behalf.

In carrying on this struggle, I believe that we must bear constantly in mind the problems of the oppressors as well as the oppressed.

Many, if not all of them, are, in my judgment, unwilling oppressors. Consciously or unconsciously, most of them will, I believe, rejoice when freed from their end of the chains.

Identifying myself with the victims of segregation does not preclude me, and should not preclude the rest of us, from sympathizing with and trying to understand the problems and point of view of those on the other side of the wall.

They carry a heavy burden, too. They must be helped to free themselves of it, and as Reverend King, that young and inspiring spiritual leader of Montgomery, has so movingly said on so many occasions, they must be loved.

Hate will not accomplish our ends. Love and the spirit of brotherhood—even for the erring brothers—will.

There are many in the South—I do not know how many, but I believe very, very many—who are truly men of good will. They do not know how to extricate themselves from their present dilemma. Let us help show them the way.

There is much to be done at all levels. But we are assembled today in Washington, the seat of the Federal Government. Therefore I suggest a program of Federal action as follows:

1. Congress must proceed promptly to enact legislation in affirmative support of the Supreme Court's finding that school segregation is unconstitutional. School districts, which are willing to desegregate, must be encouraged and assisted to do so. The courts must be given further statutory tools to help attack the problem of those States which are totally recalcitrant. The Attorney General's office must be equipped with the authority to seek injunctions in such cases.

2. Congress must protect all basic rights. It must pass legislation insuring all citizens against discrimination in education, travel, employment, and use of public and publicly-supported facilities.

3. Congress must act to protect such organizations as the NAACP and the Urban League from harassment and persecution by State governments.

4. The Senate must amend its rules to outlaw the filibuster.

5. The President must broaden his actions. He brought physical force to bear on

the Little Rock situation. He is long overdue in applying moral force. The President must act now to exercise moral leadership and rally all men of good will in the North and South for the great tasks ahead. In Little Rock, the situation is deteriorating. It is deteriorating elsewhere, too.

There is a crying need for positive leadership—for firm, strong voices from among our elected officials to speak and act with zeal, not out of political necessity but out of deep conviction. We need leaders who are deeply moved by compassion for the suffering of those who have been segregated as well as by consideration for those white citizens who are disturbed and distressed by the abolition of segregation.

Such national leaders will be heard and followed. Such leadership will be successful in meeting the problems I have described.

The word I hear from Capitol Hill is that the Congressional leadership of both parties feel that enough was done in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957. No further consideration is to be given to civil rights legislation at the present session. To be sure, last year's act was indeed a step forward—although only a short step. It was the first Civil Rights Act passed by Congress since 1875. But the present session of Congress must be importuned to move further and faster. A public demand that will be heard in the halls of Congress must be made. That is the only way. That is a job for all citizens, not just for organizations with lobbyists in Washington.

In fact, the entire civil rights struggle, in all its phases, is everybody's job.

All citizens must accept it as a part of their duty to their country to help meet this challenge. Every citizen cannot only demand Federal and State action, but can also, himself, help ease the tension between the races, and can help quiet fears and eradicate prejudices among whites and Negroes alike. Both Negroes and whites share this vital obligation.

We in the North have our special responsibilities—to rid our own house of unofficial but effective segregation and discrimination.

All segregation and discrimination—official and unofficial—must go. Liberty and equality for all our citizens must prevail.

In the world community today, there are great differences in race, color and creed. To advance or even tolerate the fiction of the superiority of one race over another can lead only to international discrimination, reprisal, repression and conflict.

I wonder how many of you read the letter from the little Vietnamese girl to the editor of the Washington Post, printed on the front page of the Post last week?

Do you remember question No. 8? It read: "Why are there still a lot of white Americans do not get along with black Americans? Do they still have the impression that black Americans are their slaves? I think America is a democratic and free country, so such a colored separation must be ended. The trouble at Little Rock. Do you think that was a big shame hung over America?"

This was one of the questions asked by this teenage girl from Vietnam in her letter to Mr. Al Friendly, the managing editor of the Washington Post. The language of her question was not good English as we know it, but it was truly eloquent.

Similar questions, in different languages, have been and are being asked of Americans and America in many quarters of the globe.

We Americans must answer these questions. I hope that the day will come soon when we will be able to say to this girl and others that the evil conditions referred to no longer exist.

I hope that this day will be very soon. We can make it come sooner if we dedicate to it all our efforts and energies, and if all men of good will, under inspired leadership, will lend themselves to this great task.

It is unnecessary to magnify the problem, nor is it wise or possible to minimize it.

We move in what we hope and believe to be God's way to solve one of the fundamental problems of human existence—the problem of achieving brotherhood in the midst of conflict.

Abroad the forces of totalitarianism press with increased vigor their challenge to the Free World. To meet this challenge, freedom, justice, equality and brotherhood are the brightest banners we have. Let us raise them, for the whole world to see. Let us march forward under them, with unflinching hearts, to attack the forces of darkness, hate, prejudice, and fears, wherever they may be—at home and abroad.

AWARD OF AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY SILVER MEDALLION TO 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last night it was my great privilege to attend the annual award dinner sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. The occasion was the Award of the America's Democratic Legacy Silver Medallion to the 85th Congress for its distinguished contribution to the enrichment of our heritage of freedom in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Mr. President, this medal has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of American ideals. Previous recipients of the award have included many of our Nation's most distinguished personalities and foundations. The list is an impressive one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Nineteen forty-eight: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Darryl Zanuck, Dore Schary, Barney Balaban, Charles E. Wilson.

Nineteen forty-nine: Harry S. Truman.

Nineteen fifty: J. Howard McGrath.

Nineteen fifty-one: Henry Ford II.

Nineteen fifty-two: Herbert H. Lehman.

Nineteen fifty-three: Dwight D. Eisenhower

Nineteen fifty-four and nineteen fifty-five: Carnegie Corp., Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation.

Nineteen fifty-six: Herbert H. Lehman, James P. Mitchell, Charles P. Taft.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This year, Mr. President, the award was accepted on behalf of the 85th Congress by the distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself, on behalf of our colleagues in the Senate, and Representatives EMANUEL CELLER and KENNETH KEATING for their colleagues in the House.

An impressive group of Senators and Representatives was present to witness the presentation.

Mr. President, I want to pay special tribute to the officers of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for their hard and consecrated work, not only in connection with this annual award, but for the day-in-and-day-out constructive activities of B'nai B'rith. The Anti-Defamation League is and has been the guardian of civil liberties and civil rights. It continue to be a powerful force for freedom, equality, and justice. I mention particularly the chairman, the Honorable Henry E. Schultz; the national director, Benjamin R. Epstein; the president of the national commission, Philip M. Klutznick; the executive vice president of B'nai B'rith, Maurice Bisgyer; and the Washington representative, Herman Edelsberg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of the officers of the League of B'nai B'rith be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the names of the sponsors of the award dinner also be printed at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

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

OFFICERS OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Hon. Henry Edward Schultz, chairman.

Joseph Cohen, Jefferson E. Peyser, Max J. Schneider, vice chairmen.

Herbert Levy, secretary.

Benjamin Greenberg, treasurer.

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director.

Bernard Nath, chairman, executive committee.

Paul H. Sampliner, vice chairman, executive committee.

Hon. Meier Steinbrink, honorary chairman.

Barney Balaban, A. G. Ballenger, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Leon Lowenstein, William Sachs, Benjamin Samuels, Melvin H. Schlesinger, Jesse Steinhart, honorary vice chairmen.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION

Philip M. Klutznick, president, B'nai B'rith.

Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president, B'nai B'rith.

Hon. Robert L. Aronson, Melvin A. Block, William P. Bloom, Hon. David Coleman, Maurice N. Dannenbaum, Samuel Daroff, Hon. Henry Epstein, Samuel L. Fendel, Herman Fineberg, Joseph M. Finkle, Jerome J. Friedman, Edward Goldberger, Frank Goldman, Abe Goldstein, Lester Gutterman, Samuel J. Halpren, John Horwitz, Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, Mrs. Hy Kornbleet, Harold Lachman, Mrs. Arthur G. Laufman, Richard Lederer, Jr., David H. Litter, Louis Matusoff, Edward Miller, Philip Mitchel, Alan R. Morse, Hon. Stanley Mosk, Norman Newhouse, Hon. David A. Rose, Edward Rosenblum, Mrs. Arthur G. Rosenbluth, Nelson Stamler, Morris L. Strauch, Mrs. Harry Strauss, Hon. Sidney Sugarman, George J. Talianoff, Samuel Tarshis, Allan Tarshish, Hon. Lenore D. Underwood, Mrs. Hyman C. Weisman, Mrs. Albert Woldman, Harry Yudkoff, Louis Zara.

STAFF DIRECTORS

Nathan C. Belth, press relations.

Oscar Cohen, program.

Arnold Forster, civil rights.

Alexander F. Miller, community service.

J. Harold Saks, administration.

Lester J. Waldman, executive assistant.

Herman Edelsberg, Washington representative.

SPONSORS

Richard Abel, Columbus, Ohio.

A. David Abrams, Beckley, W. Va.

Sol Bernstein, Waterbury, Conn.

Melvin A. Block, New York City.

Paul Broida, Parkersburg, W. Va.

Morris Cafritz, Washington, D. C.

N. M. Cohen, Washington, D. C.

Samuel Daroff, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bernard Ehrenreich, New York City.

Lee Filer, New York City.

Herman Fineberg, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Henry J. Fox, Chevy Chase, Md.
Leopold Freudberg, Washington, D. C.
Morel J. Fuchs, New Rochelle, N. Y.
Edward Goldberger, New York City.
Aaron Goldman, Washington, D. C.
John Goldwater, New York City.
Benjamin Greenberg, New York City.
Harry Jacobs, Wilmington, Del.
Sam Jonas, Washington, D. C.
Joseph Kaplan, Boston, Mass.
Garfield I. Kass, Washington, D. C.
Joel S. Kaufman, Washington, D. C.
A. S. Kay, Silver Spring, Md.
Milton W. King, Washington, D. C.
Samuel Kramer, New York City.
Milton Kronheim, Sr., Washington, D. C.
Harold Lachman, Chicago, Ill.
Richard Lederer, Jr., New York City.
Herbert Lee, Boston, Mass.
Phillip Leff, New York City.
Carl Levin, Washington, D. C.
Bernhart Levy, Washington, D. C.
Herbert Levy, Chicago, Ill.
Sidney Lipkins, New York City.
Samuel Lopinsky, Charleston, W. Va.
Irving Louis, New York City.
Alfred May, Detroit, Mich.
Lawrence Nathan, Chevy Chase, Md.
Joseph Ottenstein, Washington, D. C.
Benjamin Reeves, New York City.
Victor Riesel, New York City.
Maurice A. Rosenthal, Chicago, Ill.
Max Roth, Charleston, W. Va.
Harold Rubinstein, New York City.
William Sachs, New York City.
Melvin H. Schlesinger, Denver, Colo.
Armund Schoen, Chicago, Ill.
Henry E. Schultz, New York City.
David Schwartz, New York City.
Hershel Seder, Chicago, Ill.
Frederick W. Straus, Chicago, Ill.
Ben Strouse, Baltimore, Md.
Louis Taxin, New York City.
A. Raymond Tye, West Newton, Mass.
Morton H. Wilner, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Excellent addresses were delivered, Mr. President, by the president of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Philip M. Klutznick—who, by the way, has a record of great service to his country, most recently as a delegate to the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations—and by the Honorable Henry E. Schultz, chairman of the Anti-Defamation League. A poem by Reginald Rose entitled "An Act of Congress," was recited by the noted stage and screen actor Franchot Tone. Brief acceptance speeches were made by the four Representatives of the 85th Congress to whom I have already referred.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts from my own remarks in accepting this award be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CIVIL-RIGHTS AWARD

(Excerpts from remarks by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in accepting the 1957 America's democratic legacy award, March 3, 1958)

On behalf of the Senate of the 85th Congress, I am happy to join Senator KNOWLAND in accepting the 1957 America's democratic legacy award sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. Certainly the 85th Congress distinguished itself by enacting the first civil-rights legislation in 82 years. I believe that it justly deserves this medal which has been awarded annually since 1948 to an American citizen or institution for the practical advancement of our American ideals.

As you know, I have been a staunch supporter of civil-rights legislation for many years. As an American, as well as a Senator, I feel encouraged by the action of the Congress last year in this critical testing area for democracy. When I say that I am encouraged by this action, of course, I am not saying that I am satisfied. The 1957 Civil Rights Act was a step in the right direction.

But it is not the end of the fight for improved civil rights—it is the beginning.

By civil rights we mean the personal, political, and economic rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution and the law, and implicit in our democratic way of life—rights and privileges which are morally the heritage of every human being, regardless of his membership in any ethnic group. To be specific, I believe these rights include the right to education; the right to housing; the right to the use of public accommodations, of health and welfare services and facilities; and the right to live in peace and dignity without discrimination, segregation, or distinction based on race, religion, color ancestry, national origin, or place of birth. These are the rights and privileges without which no individual can participate freely or completely in our democratic society. These are the rights which the Government has the duty to defend and expand.

This great issue of human rights goes far beyond partisanship, touching as it does, the very life of our democracy in the North, the South, the East, or the West. I know full well that civil rights is a charged issue, infused with emotionalism. We know that some people would prefer not to face these problems. But the fact of the matter is that the problems are facing us.

Human rights is not basically a social issue, an economic issue, a political issue, or even a legislative issue. It is primarily a moral issue. It is for that reason that I feel as I do about it. I know, of course, that it is an issue, and a very real one, in all of these other contexts. Most particularly, in the past few years it has become an issue which has begun to affect with a sudden and dramatic impact the conduct of our foreign policy. Just as Lincoln decided upon the emancipation of the slaves, not only as an act of justice but also as a military necessity, so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on these grounds. Bigotry, discrimination, and intolerance are subversive today in a literal way. They are un-American. They lend themselves to political, social, and moral weakness. Brotherhood and equality of opportunity must now become central aspects of the image that we cast abroad.

Nevertheless, world reaction is an insufficient motivation to impel us to take the great strides which are required of us. We shall not convince others if our motivations are essentially tactical or political in nature. Our proper response, both to the Kremlin, which is waiting for us to falter, and to the millions of people in Asia, and Africa, who want to believe in us, but are undecided, is to do what we should have done anyway to make this Nation, in Lincoln's words, the "last best hope of earth."

It is undeniable, of course, that we have made great progress during the past 100 years—from the Dred Scott decision, which totally denied the Negro the protection of our laws, to the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case, to the 1957 civil rights bill, which affirmed the right of the Negro to full protection of the law. It has been a long fight, in which the power of American principles has slowly overcome the imperfections of American practice. It has been a long process of remolding old attitudes and reestablishing old truths. And it is not yet finished.

Primarily, the 1957 Civil Rights Act was designed to protect the right to vote. However, the act also established a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government and provided for a new Assistant Attorney General to head the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. I mention these other aspects because I regret the excessive delays which have occurred during the past months in selecting and nominating appointees to fill these posts. Precious time has been lost. Now that nominations have been sent to the Senate for confirmation, however, I hope that the Senate will not add to the delays but will proceed speedily to complete the confirmation process.

In this connection I also wish to call attention to the bills which are still pending in the Senate committees. These bills include many which I have introduced in various sessions of the Congress for the last 10 years—bills covering such subjects as anti-lynching, anti-poll-tax, FEPC, and prevention of discrimination in interstate transportation. There is also the admirable new bill introduced by Senator DOUGLAS and several other Senators of whom I am one. This new bill would give effect to the constitutional guarantees under the 14th amendment, of equal protection of the laws. It would do so by cushioning the effect of law with extensive provisions for persuasion, inducement, and community compliance. I would like to believe that the second as well as the first session of the 85th Congress will make history by passing this improved civil rights legislation.

The challenge of civil rights has never been stated more eloquently than in the complaint of a Negro student a generation ago: "If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I am ignorant, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me my color. I have no possible protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness, hatred, and despair. I am a Negro-American. All my life I have wanted to be an American."

This is why prejudice and discrimination cost too much for democracy to afford. This is also why history was successful in making a claim on the first session of the 85th Congress, and why it will continue to exert its claim on future Congresses.

Certainly it is as true today as it was in 1948 at the Democratic National Convention when I said: "Let us forget the evil passions, the blindness of the past. In these times of world economic, political, and spiritual—above all,, spiritual crisis, we cannot—we must not, turn from the path so plainly before us. * * * Let us walk out of the shadow of States rights into the bright sunshine of human rights."

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM ANNOUNCES WORLD PRESS CONGRESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, exchange of knowledge is basic to the development of mutual understanding, and the latter is essential to world peace.

To further such objectives, the University of Missouri has announced plans for a press congress of the world to be held next January on the campus at Columbia, Mo.

The timing of this 3-day convention coincides with the 50th anniversary of the world's first and finest school of journalism—that of the University of Missouri.

However, this event is more than the celebration of an anniversary. As Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the university,

stated in announcing this significant event:

A press congress of the world, bringing together the editors and publishers of newspapers from all the free nations of the world, great and small, can go a long way toward solving some of the misunderstandings which hold world peace in the balance today.

I ask unanimous consent that the University of Missouri press release announcing the congress be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLUMBIA, MO., February 14.—President Eisenhower's plan for a worldwide cultural conference to seek new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together fits perfectly with a plan of the University of Missouri to sponsor a press congress of the world on the campus here early next year. University President Elmer Ellis said today.

"We feel that it is only fitting and proper that those engaged in the field of mass communications should be the first to implement President Eisenhower's suggestion with action," President Ellis said.

President Ellis pointed out that the university recently announced a proposed world press congress for January 12, 13, and 14, 1959, as a part of a year-long program celebrating the golden anniversary of journalism education here on the campus where the world's first school of journalism was established in 1908.

"Only last week," Doctor Ellis said, "James Wright Brown, of New York, the noted American journalist and chairman of the board of the national publication, Editor and Publisher, accepted the post of honorary chairman of the forthcoming press congress. Active chairman is Charles Nutter, managing director of International House in New Orleans, and Dr. Frank L. Mott, dean emeritus of the School of Journalism is cochairman.

"We believe," said President Ellis, "that a press congress of the world, bringing together the editors and publishers of newspapers from all the free nations of the world, great and small, can go a long way toward solving some of the misunderstandings which hold world peace in the balance today.

"Certainly these journalists, who help mold the opinions of their peoples and who have the responsibility of interpreting the rights and privileges of free peoples everywhere, can save the lives of millions if they can sit down together and talk over our mutual problems," Dr. Ellis said.

President Eisenhower's plan for a worldwide cultural conference to which Dr. Ellis referred was voiced publicly by his administrative assistant, Sherman Adams, in a speech at a Dartmouth College national alumni dinner in New York City on February 5. Adams said the President was considering some such conference, and that he had "asked some able people to consider how such a project might be initiated."

"Who is there," Adams asked his audience, "who can say that a convocation in this country of scholars, historians, artisans, theologians, educators, sociologists, philosophers, artists and musicians—representatives of the cultural pursuits of all the human race—meeting each other in their respective groups could not suggest new and better ways for human beings to exist peaceably together and to reap the greatest rewards from man's scientific discoveries?"

Commenting on the significance of a Press Congress of the World over long distance telephone today, Morris E. Jacobs of Omaha, Nebr., general chairman of the 50th anniversary celebration, said "It is a wonderful coincidence that we have planned a revival of the Press Congress of the World just at this time when the President of the United States calls for a worldwide conference of cultural leaders."

Jacobs pointed out that the first world press meeting was conceived and implemented by the late Walter Williams, the man who also conceived and established the world's first school of journalism at the University of Missouri, and who was its dean until he was elected president of the university in 1931.

This first world press parliament was held in connection with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition (the World's Fair) which was held in St. Louis in 1904. A St. Louis newspaper of May 19, 1904, carried a story of the press parliament in which it said, "Walter Williams of Columbia, country editor, is responsible for bringing together the greatest convention of newspapermen the world has ever known, and will ever know unless the press parliament is made permanent." More than 5,000 newspaper editors from all over the world, including 33 foreign nations, came to the meeting in St. Louis.

Walter Williams had been appointed press commissioner of the World's Fair by ex-Gov. David R. Francis, who was president of the World Fair Commission. He traveled around the world interesting leaders of various countries, the rulers as well as newspaper publishers, in the convocation of press men of the world.

Although the press parliament at St. Louis was, as intended, only a one-time affair, it served as a pattern for the first press congress of the world as an organization meeting at the Pan-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915. Walter Williams was elected president of this congress.

The second session of the organization was held in Honolulu, October 11 to 20, 1921, with Mr. Williams presiding. United States President Warren G. Harding served as honorary president of this congress. Mr. Williams was reelected president, and presided over a third meeting of the congress in Geneva and Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1926.

Because of the international political situation and a growing isolationist trend, a fourth meeting, scheduled for Melbourne, Australia, in 1931, was canceled.

MEN IN THE AIR AND MISSILES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week there was published an article entitled "Men in the Air and Missiles." The article was written by a man who generally is considered to be the wisest and most experienced of all living airmen, Gen. Carl Spaatz.

Since the launching of the first sputnik, public interest has been generated in unmanned, guided, and ballistic missiles, to the point where some, including Mr. Khrushchev, predict that even now the manned air vehicle is, or soon will be, obsolete.

No doubt the wily rulers of the Soviet Union, because of their lead in missiles, would hope that we agree. But nothing could be further from the truth; and the Spaatz article presents conclusively the reasons why that is so.

Anyone interested in having this country adopt the proper policies and programs for national security should read this article with care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Spaatz' article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEN IN THE AIR AND MISSILES

(NOTE.—Against the background of today's preoccupation with earth satellites and guided missiles, Gen. Carl Spaatz, USAF, retired, has taken a hard and long overdue look at the role of the airplane in the age of the missile. A contributing editor of Newsweek, General Spaatz was Air Force Chief of Staff when he retired in 1948, and since then has served on top-level defense committees. In the following commentary, he evaluates the continuing importance of the airplane and the reasons for it.)

A manned airplane already has been flown 1,900 miles an hour and climbed to an altitude of more than 100,000 feet (the Bell X-2). And the scientists whose genius produced these results feel that they are merely on the threshold of their eventual achievement.

They foresee the time—and not very far distant—when a manned plane, operating in the twilight zone between the earth's atmosphere and outer space, will be capable of making 6 trips around the world in less than 24 hours.

Further experiments in speed and altitude flight are being conducted, as the earlier ones have been, by the Air Force in cooperation with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), a highly effective agency whose members are appointed by the President and whose work is financed by the Government.

Details of the characteristics and performance of the latest planes of the X series, which hold the present records and will soon break them, are military secrets. But enough information has been released to suggest that the manned plane of the future will be an important weapon—perhaps the most important in our arsenal.

MAN HAS THE EDGE

Recently, public and official preoccupation with earth satellites, missiles, and the rockets that propel them has fostered the presumption that any total war of the future will be exclusively a duel between rocketeers firing missiles across oceans and continents at centers of power in the contending nations. The fact is that victory, insofar as there can be such a thing as victory in such a war, won't necessarily be won by the side with the biggest and best intercontinental ballistic missile.

When finally perfected, the ICBM will be an indispensable weapon, but not, as it has been called, the ultimate weapon. Because of its speed, development of an effective defense against it will not be easy. But I have no doubt that eventually it will be done. If the history of warfare proves anything, it proves that sooner or later defense always catches up with offense.

THE ICBM'S PROBLEMS

However, this generally is overlooked: The ICBM still is an experimental weapon. It will not be operational for several years. And even when it does become operational, it will be a highly imperfect weapon. Until a multitude of scientific problems are solved, it will not be nearly as accurate as the bomber is now. As the test firings at Cape Canaveral have demonstrated, it doesn't always perform the way it is supposed to. And, as the test firings have also demonstrated, unlike the bomber, it is not capable of instant, massive retaliation. It takes an inordinately long time to fire a missile.

Quite aside from this, the ICBM, for a long time, will be a highly vulnerable weapon. It must operate from fixed bases which can be zeroed in by the enemy. The Strategic Air Command, in contrast, now keeps one-third of its force in the air at all times; any sudden attack would not touch

them; and they would be able to retaliate at a moment's notice.

For the predictable future, the manned aircraft must still be our first line of defense. It will always have the advantage of unpredictability. It will be guided from within by human intelligence and human hand. It can change its course in flight, approaching its target from any direction and at any level (at the moment low-level approach is harder to defend against than high level). It can be called back before its bomb load is released in case of a false alarm.

THE FUTURE AIR FORCE

To understand the potentialities of tomorrow's high-speed, high-altitude aircraft—almost a space ship—one must think of the atmosphere as an inverted ocean. As submarines, traveling far beneath the surface of the seas, will be the mainstay of the future navy, so the new airspace vehicle will become the backbone of the future air force.

The plane now envisioned will be capable of flying to its target, releasing its bomb load, photographing the results of the raid, and returning to its home base in a matter of hours. Its height and speed will make it a difficult target for antiaircraft rockets. Some will be knocked down but tactics of employment will insure that necessary numbers penetrate to their targets.

Because the Soviet Union will be equipped in the immediate future both with manned bombers and missiles, we not only must have both in our arsenal for retaliation but we also must be prepared to defend our territory against both.

AIR TRANSPORT'S ROLE

Even today's airplane, repeated statements to the contrary notwithstanding, is far from obsolete either as a weapon or as a transport auxiliary. For the time being, our Strategic Air Command is the guarantor of our security because it is still capable of retaliating with almost total destructive force if we or our allies are attacked. Its usefulness will continue even after antiaircraft missiles are much more highly developed than they are now. For example, it wouldn't be necessary to penetrate Moscow's defenses to attack Moscow successfully since missiles can be launched from manned airplanes at points far distant from their target.

As for transport, the airplane's future is not only assured, it is the future. More and more, the airspace around the earth will become an ocean over which passengers and freight can be carried quickly and efficiently. There will be no barriers of land or sea. Military personnel and equipment will all be airborne in time.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORE AT THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, because of his devotion to duty, the Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ALBERT GORE, has earned in this body and throughout the Nation a reputation as a Senator who speaks with knowledge and conviction on matters of great interest to the prosperity and future development of our country.

For this reason, Mr. President, on last Saturday night, March 1, it was a great pleasure and opportunity for 1,500 Missourians to hear him speak at the St. Louis County Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. This was the greatest rally ever held by St. Louis County Democrats, and all of us who attended were richly repaid by the thought-provoking address it was our privilege to hear.

In his remarks, Senator GORE pointed up the role of leadership now being exercised by the Congress, and particularly by the United States Senate.

Never have I seen a more attentive or a more appreciative audience. Never have I heard a more timely address given at a political meeting.

Therefore, Mr. President, believing that the members of the Senate and the rest of the American people would like to have an opportunity to read the speech, which on that occasion was delivered by Senator GORE, I refer to page 3296 in the RECORD of yesterday, March 3, on which page that great address has been inserted at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most crucial problems facing the American people today is the crisis in our educational program. It presents a challenge which we must face squarely and meet without delay.

A whole generation is growing up in schools with overcrowded classrooms, staffed by underpaid teachers, and lacking the most elementary equipment for science training. The most promising talent among our youth often is lost because no one seeks it out or because a bright youngster lacks the money for higher education.

The educational crisis calls for an all-out attack on two fronts. First, we must strengthen and revitalize our elementary and secondary schools. It is here that youthful imagination must be stirred and a solid foundation built. Secondly, we must see to it, through adequate scholarship assistance, that the most capable high-school graduates go to college, adding to our precious reservoir of human skill and knowledge.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND TEACHERS' SALARIES

I am proud to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators in the sponsorship of S. 3311, the School Assistance Act of 1957. It provides for grants to States to be used by them for school construction or teachers' salaries, in whatever proportions they choose, with no strings attached. This is Federal aid without Federal control, a principle I strongly support.

The bill proposes to authorize appropriations in the amount of $25 per school-age child for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958. The amounts will increase $25 per school-age child each year until a total of $100 per school-age child is reached.

I am glad also to be a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], an alternative to the Murray bill, designed to achieve the same purpose, which authorizes a billion dollars a year to the States to enable them to raise the level of educational standards nationwide and to equalize in part the educational opportunities among the States.

The specific arrangements, it seems to me, are not so important as getting sufficient help to the States, and getting it to them now.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

The second attack on our educational shortcomings must be made at the level of higher education.

I was privileged to join with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators in sponsoring S. 3187, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which would award 40,000 new scholarships in each of 6 years. The emphasis in the bill is placed on science, where the Nation's needs are most urgent. This is about four times the scholarship aid provided by the administration's woefully inadequate proposal.

Again, this bill involves no Federal control. The States will be given the scholarships on the basis of school-age population and will establish their own standards for awarding them. In addition to scholarships, the bill provides funds for teacher-training institutes in the summer, and matching funds for guidance and counseling as well as construction of science facilities.

THE STATES NEED HELP

The combination of these two attacks on our backlog of educational needs promises to bring some much-talked-about, but long-postponed, results. I am well aware, however, that this is only a beginning.

Something should be done to help the teachers themselves. I have supported enthusiastically the proposal to permit a teacher to deduct from gross income up to $600 for any single year's expenses incurred in furtherance of his education.

But one fact stands out above all others: The States need help. Their sources of income are relatively inflexible. Property taxes in many States are as high as they can go. Sales taxes raise money, but they take most from the people least able to pay. The Government of the United States, with its great income-raising resources, must lend a hand.

I have always believed, Mr. President, that education is primarily a responsibility of the States. I am sure that education ought to be controlled at home, not in Washington. But the crisis we face in the cold war of the classrooms is not a crisis of the States. It is a crisis of the Nation, and to fail to meet it would be a national catastrophe.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when a junior Member enters the Senate I am always interested in the political philosophy that he will demonstrate in the course of his service in the Senate.

I have listened this afternoon to 3 junior Members of the United States Senate in terms of seniority, 2 Democrats and 1 Republican, and I wish to say that I am proud to be associated with them.

I desire particularly to comment on the remarks of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], because since he has been in the Senate he has stamped himself as a constitutional liberal. He has demonstrated by proposed legislation which he has either introduced or cosponsored that he shares the basic tenet of the political philosophy of constitutional liberals that one who serves a free people in the Senate has the duty to see to it that every effort is made to translate

into legislation the needs of the people in keeping with the general welfare clause of the United States Constitution.

Let me say to the teachers of Wisconsin, let me say to the parents of Wisconsin, yes, let me say to the schoolchildren of Wisconsin this afternoon, that the junior Senator from Wisconsin has already made a singular contribution to proposed educational legislation in the Senate, and those of us who have been seeking for many years to enact legislation which would cause the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities, in cooperation with the States, in connection with education, have found in the junior Senator from Wisconsin a very valuable ally.

The brief speech the Senator made this afternoon on education, as he announced his cosponsorship of the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], is but further evidence of his determination to do what is possible to see to it that Russia does not get ahead of the United States in trained brainpower.

I not only wish to congratulate the junior Senator from Wisconsin, but I wish to commend him to the voters of Wisconsin, which happens to be the State of my birth and my youth.

I will say it is my impression that the junior Senator from Wisconsin has already indicated that he will carry on in the tradition of a noted progressive Republican from Wisconsin, the senior Bob La Follette, who, also, on great issue after issue affecting the interest of the people followed the high road of constitutional liberalism. I am satisfied that if the voters of Wisconsin will keep in mind always that it is what men vote for in the Senate that counts, and it is what they sponsor and urge by way of legislative adoption in the Senate that determines the kind of Senators they are, there is no question that the junior Senator from Wisconsin will be in this body, as I hope and pray he will be, for many and many a year to come.

When I stress the matter of a voting record, I wish to invite attention to the fact that when I was a boy in high school I used to listen to the famous speeches and to note the votes of the then senior La Follette. He impressed upon me in those days, as I have been heard to say so many times in the Senate Chamber, that it is not what a politician says but how he votes that determines his caliber as a Senator, because unless what he says can be squared with his voting record, then I would say, as the senior Bob La Follette used to say to the voters of Wisconsin, "Don't swallow what he says unless what he says corresponds to his voting record."

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has already demonstrated by his voting record in the Senate that he can be counted upon to square his votes with his speeches, and vice versa. I want to congratulate the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, for the additional contribution he has made in the Senate this afternoon to the great cause of needed educational legislation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, 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. 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.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been urged by quite a number of my colleagues to set the record straight in regard to an article which was published in the January 11, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article was entitled "It All Comes Out of Your Pocket," and was written by Leslie A. Miller. Among the Members of the Senate who have requested that I set forth the facts are our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]; the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]; and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The article entitled "It All Comes Out of Your Pocket" attacks the Congress of the United States and the Army Corps of Engineers in connection with Federal expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control.

The article is full of innuendoes, half-truths, and inaccuracies. Many of the Members of the Senate have already read this article, and a number of them have suggested, as I have just stated, that I answer the article, in order that the American people may have a better understanding of the need for resource development in this country.

On February 12, 1958, I wrote to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post, referred to the article, and stated that it was so misleading and inaccurate, as it relates to the civil works of the Corps of Engineers, that in my opinion it required an answer. I requested equal space in the Post to make an appropriate reply. Under date of February 18, 1958, I received from Mr. Merrill Pollack, associate editor, a letter stating that they did not feel they could afford to allow me equal space in which to reply to the article, but that I could reply in the "Letters to the Editor" department; and they requested that my comments be kept to a minimum, preferably 200 to 300 words.

On February 25, I wrote to the editor of the Post a letter for the "Letters to the Editor" department. In the letter I acknowledged his right as an editor of a free press to print or withhold from the public such information as he deemed desirable, but that in this case I felt his judgment was not well founded. I then commented on 1 or 2 items in the article written by ex-Governor Miller, and pointed out the tremendous increase which can be expected in our water consumption in the next 17 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the correspondence I have had with the editor of the Saturday Evening Post.

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

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

Mr. BEN HIBBS,
Editor, The Saturday Evening Post,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. HIBBS: The article by Leslie A. Miller, as told to Sidney Shalett, entitled "It All Comes Out of Your Pocket" appearing in the January 11, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, has been called to my attention.

This article is so misleading and inaccurate as it relates to the civil works of the Corps of Engineers, that in my opinion, it requires an answer. The article does a grave injustice to the corps, whose uniformed and civilian employees are a dedicated body of public servants.

Frequently, similar articles published in popular magazines have been answered in technical publications such as the Engineering News Record and Civil Engineering. Unfortunately, such rebuttals fail to reach the majority of the people that read the original articles, and to all intents and purposes the original statements go unrefuted.

In order that this subject may be placed in its proper perspective in the minds of your readers, I desire equal space in your magazine to reply to this article.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works.

THE SATURLAY EVENING POST,
THE CURTIS PUBLISHING CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 18, 1958.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I'm sorry to say that we do not feel we can offer you equal space in the Saturday Evening Post to reply to the article by Leslie Miller. It has been our experience that a rebuttal article, appearing weeks or months after an original work, usually does not attract much public attention.

On the other hand, our readers do look for such material in our Letters to the Editors department, and that is where we customarily publish any criticism of the material we print. If you would like to reply to Mr. Miller's article, we would be happy to promise you some space in the letters department. However, we are seriously limited for space there and we would have to ask you to hold your comments to a minimum—preferably 200 to 300 words.

The letters department, incidentally, is one of the best-read features in the Post.

Yours truly,

MERRILL POLLACK,
Associate Editor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
February 25, 1958.

Mr. BEN HIBBS,
Editor, Saturday Evening Post,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. HIBBS: I wrote you on February 12, 1958, concerning the article of Mr. Leslie

A. Miller appearing in the January 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I stated that this article is so misleading and inaccurate as it relates to the civil works of the Corps of Engineers that, in my opinion, it requires an answer, and I requested equal space in your magazine to reply to this article.

Under date of February 18, 1958, I received a reply from Mr. Merrill Pollack, associate editor, stating that you do not feel that you can offer equal space in the Saturday Evening Post to reply to the article by Mr. Leslie Miller, but promised some space in the letters department and requested that my comments be held to a minimum, preferably two to three hundred words.

I certainly uphold your right as an editor of a free press to print for the information of the public, or withhold from the public, such information as you deem desirable. In this particular case, I am in total disagreement with the conclusion you reached, and regret that you do not consider the water problems of this country of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the American people. Under the circumstances, I have no alternative but to accept such space as you have allowed me for a partial rebuttal of the article of Mr. Miller, and will rely upon such other means as there may be at my disposal to answer the article in more detail.

I will endeavor to hold my comments to a minimum, and request that you print my letter in its entirety.

Mr. Miller states that "Federal expenditures on river and harbor developments began in 1824. Actual disbursements and authorizations from that year to the present already stand at some $35 billion and future projects have been proposed that would bring the Nation's waterways bill to a staggering total of $70 billion." The author's statement would indicate that he is talking about navigation improvements on rivers and harbors. However, the figures quoted apply to the water resource development activities, including power generating and transmission facilities of all Federal agencies which includes: the Corps of Engineers river and harbor, flood control, and multipurpose propjects; Bureau of Reclamation irrigation, water supply and power projects; Bonneville Power Administration; Bureau of Indian Affairs development of irrigation on Indian lands; the Southwestern Power Administration; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the International Boundary and Water Commission, Department of State, in its international obligations; and the flood prevention and pilot watershed projects of the Department of Agriculture.

I believe it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of water and water resource development in its relationship to our future economic growth. The Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy, dated December 23, 1955, pointed out that the estimated use of water in this country in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day, and that based on a population estimate of 200 million by 1975, the estimated requirements would be 350 billion gallons per day. If you consider the revised estimated population of this country in 1975, the estimated water requirement would be between 400 and 450 billion gallons per day, considerably more than double the 1950 requirement, and this is just 17 years away.

It will soon be too late to provide the needed facilities on other than a crash program unless the public is aware of the critical water problem which faces us in the next decade.

I believe you will now understand why I was disappointed when you felt that a reply to Mr. Miller's article would not attract much public attention.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, while the Saturday Evening Post is so interested in publishing an attack on waterway improvements which are an investment in America's future, and in playing up those improvements as something coming out of the taxpayer's pocket, it might be well to point out that last year there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 12, page 15861, exhibit 2, prepared by the United States Post Office Department, which estimated the annual revenues and costs in connection with mailing of selected leading magazines. The tables show that for the Saturday Evening Post the estimated postal revenue is $3,488,000 annually. The estimated postal cost is $9,557,000. The difference is a loss to the Post Office Department of $6,069,000, which is really, actually, and truly money which comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. That is an unadulterated subsidy. Yet, Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post had the temerity to incorporate in the article a reference to a little project costing approximately $33,000. I shall discuss it later.

Mr. President, the estimate of $6,069,000 as the loss to the Post Office Department as a result of carrying the Saturday Evening Post in the mails may be too conservative. I note from page 2505 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1958, in connection with the remarks of Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, the following paragraph:

> Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Robert MacNeal, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., testified before the Senate committee that my amendment to the postal rate bill would cost his company $22 million a year more postage to mail the 320 million copies of their two major publications, the Saturday Evening Post and Ladies' Home Journal.

That amendment would have limited the annual second-class postal subsidies to $100,000 per individual publisher.

I had prepared a reply to the article in the Post. It was written, Mr. President, in an informal style, for publication. Since I have been denied an opportunity to use the facilities of the magazine to inform the American people on this important aspect of Federal expenditures, I wish to take this opportunity to make my reply, for the information of the Senate and the rest of the American people.

My reply is as follows:

AND WHAT DID YOU BUY?

I was somewhat disturbed over the article by Leslie A. Miller, as told by Sidney Shalett, entitled "It All Comes Out of Your Pocket," which appeared in the January 11, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I say "somewhat disturbed" because the vast majority of the people in the United States live reasonably close to creeks, rivers, lakes, oceans, and other bodies of water. A moment of reflection on their part as to the benefits derived from Federal investment in water resource development in their area would of necessity invoke an air of skepticism in their reading of the remainder of the article. My concern, therefore, is directed primarily to the individuals who are not fortunate enough to live close to the water.

In the first place, the article is misleading and calculated to discredit the Congress and the Corps of Engineers. It appears that little or no attempt was made to verify figures, and give a true picture of the subject discussed.

A typical example of an attempt to lead the reader astray can be found by comparing the first caption for the article with the first paragraph. For instance, the lead caption is, "A Former Governor Sounds Off Against an Abused Congressional Pastime: Spending Huge Sums for Improving Navigation on Minuscule Waterways."

Mr. President, the phrase "minuscule waterways" means "petty waterways". I had to look up in the dictionary the meaning of the word "minuscule," in order to be certain just what it did mean.

I continue my reply:

That caption in the article immediately leads the reader to believe the article is an attack on navigation. However, in the first paragraph the author states, "Federal expenditures on river and harbor developments began in 1824. Actual disbursements and authorizations, from that year to the present, already stand at some $35 billion and future projects have been proposed that would bring the Nation's waterways bill to a staggering total of $70 billion." Let us examine these figures in a little more detail. Actual appropriations for navigation projects since 1824 have totaled $5.8 billion. The balance of authorization for navigation projects amounts to $3.1 billion. It is obvious therefore that that is not what the Governor is talking about. In an earlier sentence he referred to pork-barrel legislation concerning rivers and harbors and flood control. Perhaps he has included flood control in his figures. To date, the Congress has appropriated $5.4 billion for flood-control purposes, and the balance of authorization is $1.5 billion. Let's total the appropriations and the authorizations for both river and harbor and flood control and see what we get—some $15.8 billion. The figures for appropriations to date include the cost of maintenance from 1824 through 1958, as well as surveys and all other costs chargeable to this type of work. If you consider construction only, including the cost of approved projects for which only partial monetary authorization has been approved by Congress, $11.6 billion has not been appropriated, which, with the $11.2 billion appropriated, makes a total of $22.8 billion including all maintenance.

Let us speculate a little further. Oh, yes; the Governor was a member of the Hoover Commission task force. Perhaps that gives us a clue. The report of the task force, which included appropriations for construction through fiscal year 1954, discussed a $30 billion program of water resource development by all Federal agencies. On that basis, perhaps a $35 billion figure would be reasonable as the total cost of the authorized water resource programs of all Federal agencies, when allowance is made for subsequent authorizations since 1954, and for price escalation.

The route which must be followed to conjure up the $70 billion figure is, frankly, too tortuous for me to follow at

this time. However, when Senators consider the future requirements for the expanding population of this country, it may not eventually be an unreasonable figure, and I suppose if we set a date far enough in advance and include all types of water resource development, including those that are wholly reimbursable to the Federal Government, some day we shall reach the Governor's figure. But the important thing is that neither the $35 billion nor the $70 billion figures have any relationship whatsoever to improving navigation on minuscule waterways, to quote the article.

COMPOSITION OF THE WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM

The Hoover Commission task force, at page 6, included in the Federal water resource development program the activities of the following agencies:

Agency:
Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers:

Estimated total cost of construction program (in millions)

Flood control	$11,221.2
Rivers and harbors	8,110.3
Department of the Interior:	
Bureau of Reclamation	6,761.2
Bonneville Power Administration	581.8
Southwestern Power Administration	27.1
Southeastern Power Administration	3.1
Bureau of Indian Affairs	98.5
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,011.1
Department of State: International Boundary and Water Commission	69.7
Department of Agriculture: Flood control and flood prevention	180.2
Total	30,064.2

EVALUATION OF OUR ASSETS

Let us now examine what we have purchased under the Corps of Engineers navigation program, and that is an important thing, Mr. President. May I say there was not one word about it. The article was silent on the benefits derived from the various projects Congress authorized, which were built by the Corps of Engineers and also by the Interior Department.

The physical facilities include: 266 excellent harbors with depths of from 30 to 45 feet, whose total commerce reached a record high of 495.6 million tons in 1956, an increase of 14 percent since 1955.

Great Lakes system, including 100 lake harbors that provide general depths of 21 feet. These harbors include 4 (Duluth-Superior, Chicago, Toledo, and Detroit) of the 10 leading ports of the United States. As a result, this great system provides a navigable waterway about 1,500 miles in length, which carried bulk commodities of the industrial Midwest to the tune of 110 billion ton-miles of freight in 1956.

Inland and intercoastal waterways, which include the improvement, in varying degrees, of some 22,500 miles of waterways, provide the most extensive inland navigation system in the world. Traffic on this waterway system had reached a total of 109 billion ton-miles in 1956, which represented an increase of 32 percent since 1954. Along the Ohio River the investments in new industrial development since World War II are approaching the $15 billion mark. The resultant increase in Ohio River traffic since the end of the war has been outstanding. The record 76.4 million tons handled in 1956 is about double the 1946 figure, and about 30 percent more than the traffic handled in 1954.

Under flood control, the project for the protection of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River has been under construction since 1928, with an expenditure of $1 billion. On general flood control the corps has completed or has under construction 543 projects. These projects prevent average annual flood damages of $426 million. The estimated cumulative damages prevented by these projects to June 30, 1957, total $8.66 billion.

Nothing is said about that in the article. Nothing is said about hydroelectric power. Yet that is included in the $70 billion figure referred to. Let me give the Senate and the American people the facts on that point. That is what I ask be done by the great publication known as the Saturday Evening Post.

Hydroelectric power: 22.6 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity were generated at Corps of Engineers projects in fiscal year 1957, and there was deposited in the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, $63 million in fiscal year 1957, with a total to date of $300 million.

Since most of these projects are rather new, may it be well to consider one of the earlier projects that have a longer history. The first power was placed on the line at Bonneville Dam in June of 1938, and the last of 10 units in December of 1943. The total cost of this project, including maintenance, was $100.8 million, of which $71.7 million was chargeable to power.

To date—listen to this, Senators—$58.6 million has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts during an average period of 18 years. In other words, that project has almost been paid for to date.

Water supply and streamflow regulation: The Corps of Engineers is providing about 2.7 million acre-feet of water in 16 reservoirs, in the interest of domestic and industrial water supply which serves over 38 towns and cities in fiscal year 1957. The deposit in the Treasury for this storage facility amounted to $516,000 in 1957, and $9 million cumulative.

Irrigation storage: A total of 2.6 million acre-feet of water for irrigation purposes was provided in fiscal year 1957. The deposits in the Treasury from this source amount to $1,182,000 during fiscal year 1957 and a cumulative figure of $2,623,000.

Public recreation use of project areas: Total attendance for the calendar year 1956 exceeded 71 million visitor days, in contrast with 54 million in 1954.

Returns from leases and concessions amounted to $1.6 million in fiscal year 1957, and have totaled $11.8 million. While these sums are deposited in the Treasury, by law 75 percent of such sums are paid to the States in which the land is located.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The irrigable area encompassed by Federal reclamation projects was 7,658,801 acres as of January 1, 1957. The installed generating capacity at Bureau of Reclamation projects totals 5,031,550 kilowatts. To date—that is, since 1903 through fiscal year 1958—the total cost of this program has been $3.7 billion, and the balance to complete projects now under construction is $1.5 billion. Actual repayments to June 30, 1957, have been $8 billion.

All of the reimbursable portions of the Federal investment in these projects, as so designated by the Congress, will be repaid by the water users and project beneficiaries. In addition, these projects have created permanent new farms and communities founded on irrigation of arid and semiarid lands from which, since 1940, the Federal Treasury has received some $3.2 billion in additional income and excise taxes.

Irrigation projects constructed or rehabilitated by the Bureau of Reclamation have produced $12.3 billion worth of farm crops since the first reclamation harvest in 1906. The value of crops grown on reclamation projects in 1956 was $951.6 million. More than 150 different crops are grown on these irrigated farms, including many scarce and valuable commodities not produced in commercial quantities elsewhere in the United States. Only under irrigation in the sun-bathed Southwest can we get dates, avocados, and olives in ample supply.

I believe that the only way to evaluate the reclamation program is to take a project that has been in operation over a period of years and see what it means to the area and the Nation.

SALT RIVER PROJECT

The Salt River project at Phoenix, Ariz., now in its 50th year of operation, has produced $1.5 billion of food and fiber for the Nation. Out of the trackless desert, irrigation built a community that supports half a million people. The value of crop production has been multiplied twentyfold since 1910, property values have risen 1,900 percent, and population multiplied by 33 times. This project, lying within the Nation's limited area of subtropical climate, has provided fresh winter vegetables and citrus fruits, dates, nuts, olives, and melons which have revolutionized the American diet.

The original investment of the United States has been completely repaid by the water users. In addition, some $250 million of Federal income and excise tax revenue has been taken out of the project vicinity since 1940—25 times the value of the original loan for project construction. Senators do not see that fact mentioned in the Saturday Evening Post article. It is left out.

The Salt River project construction repayment contracts total $24 million—$14 million of this obligation has already been repaid to the United States Treasury and repayments are current.

THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The total capital investment of the Government in the Bonneville Power Administration transmission system is $457 million, and the estimated cost to complete the facilities now under construction will require an additional $19 million for a total investment of $476 million. Accumulated cash receipts from power operations returned to the Treasury amount to $226.8 million, of which $112.1 million is credited to repayment of the transmission system. The balance is credited to Corps of Engineers or Reclamation projects and is included in the figures reported for those agencies. In addition, the Bonneville Power Administration has deposited in the Treasury $131.4 million for the cost of operation and maintenance, $81.2 million and interest expense on the Federal investment of $50.2 million. In other words, total deposits in the Treasury to June 30, 1957, amount to $358.2 million.

The significant point in this program, where all of the public and private power is pooled and distributed through a common grid system, is an effective net gain in capacity to meet peak loads of 600,000 kilowatts.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The total Federal investment in the transmission facilities to December 30, 1957, is $24.5 million, and an additional $1.9 million will be required to complete facilities under construction, for a total cost of $26.4 million.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Only one transmission line was constructed by the Southeastern Power Administration, and it was later sold at a price which fully reimbursed the Federal Government for its investment in the facility.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The total estimated cost of irrigation facilities on Indian lands to June 30, 1957, was $88.2 million and the estimated cost of completing such facilities on Indian lands is $78.9 million. As of June 30, 1957, there were 870,000 acres under irrigation. The value of crops raised on these lands in calendar year 1956 was $55.2 million. The cumulative value of crops raised on irrigated Indian lands from 1944 through 1956—13 years—was $563.3 million.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The total installed capacity of the integrated power system of TVA consists of 3,602,235 kilowatts of hydro and 6,287,250 kilowatts of steam for a total of 9,889,485 kilowatts. For the third consecutive year more than half of the power sold by TVA went into AEC and other defense agencies.

About 2 billion ton-miles of traffic moved on the improved Tennessee waterway in calendar year 1956.

The flood-control storage in the system of reservoirs operating in the January 1957 flood reduced the crest at Chattanooga from 54 feet to 22½ feet and prevented damages estimated at $66 million at Chattanooga. With the damages averted in Chattanooga reached a cumulative total of $120 million. The total for the basin reached $132 million, which is 70 percent of the investment of $184 million in the flood-control features of the TVA multiple-purpose system.

Let me summarize the investments.

The investment of June 30, 1957, for the power program was $1,436,265,433. In this regard, the investment of Treasury funds as of June 30, 1954, was only $164,415,676.

The repayment of June 30, 1957, for the power program was $240,131,519. The repayment figure includes $65,072,500 applied to the liquidation of the funded debt and $175,059,019 paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

The investment to June 30, 1957, for the nonpower program was $600,497,197.

The repayment to June 30, 1957, for the nonpower program was $37,776,996.

The total investment to June 30, 1957, was $2,036,762,630, and the total repayment to that date was $277,908,515.

THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

The Federal expenditure for construction by the Commission totaled $7,828,000—1955–58. Since 1953, when the Falcon Dam was placed in operation, the flood damages prevented in the Rio Grande Valley in the United States are estimated at $55 million. This exceeds the United States share of the cost of the dam. In addition, it has provided water for domestic use for an area in this country that has a population of nearly 400,000 people, irrigation water for 700,000 acres, and the revenue from the United States share of the power amounted to $683,172 through December, 1957. Other projects accomplished with the funds provided include items required to fulfill treaty obligations and for the protection of land on the United States side of the border, correction of health hazards as well as the establishment of gaging stations to provide a basis for determining the national ownership of the boundary waters available to each country under the 1944 water treaty.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Included in the water bill Mr. Miller discusses is the Federal cost of some 983 floodwater-retarding structures installed or contracted for; 7,507 sediment-control structures installed or contracted for; stabilization of 207,500 acres in critical areas; contour farming on 1,900,000 acres of land; stripcropping on 63,000 acres; terracing 67,000 miles; 5,000 erosion control structures, and the planting of 44,000 acres of trees.

A recent example of the value of this type of work can be found in the Upper Trinity Watershed in Texas. Land conservation measures had been applied over a wide area, and 138 upstream dams built, when unprecedented storms struck the area in April and May 1957. It is estimated that these upstream measures prevented damages of $1 million to crops, pastures, livestock, homes, buildings, roads, bridges, and utilities in valley bottoms in tributary watersheds. In addition to run-off held back by conservation practices on farm and ranch lands, the dams temporarily held enough water to have covered 122,000 acres to a depth of one foot, and they trapped enough sediment to have covered 3,000 acres to a depth of one foot.

These locally sponsored programs supplement downstream dams and other developments on major rivers by Federal construction agencies. These programs are coordinated with other Federal programs through field consultation and exchange of mutually useful technical data.

It is readily apparent that we have a large investment, and I use that word advisedly, in physical facilities that are producing great benefits to the American people and will continue to do so for many years in the future.

BACKLOG OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

Such references as: "Already there is admission that even the insatiable Corps of Army Engineers, which the late Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes once described as the most powerful and most persuasive lobby in Washington, has been fed more than it can digest, and the corps has on its books approximately 3,200 active projects with a total estimated cost of $16,715 million and 626 deferred and inactive projects involving another $2.5 billion," are misleading. I suppose these figures are about right. However, it is implied that it is undesirable to have this large backlog of authorized projects on the books. I am sure the Governor recalls the leaf-raking and make-work projects of former Secretary Ickes' WPA and PWA days during the depression of the 1930's. I believe, and I think it is generally accepted, that there should be a large backlog of planned and worthwhile public works which can be prosecuted as permitted or required by the national economy to meet the expanding needs of the Nation or as a measure to combat unemployment. The program is, and should be, a dynamic one which is reviewed and supplemented in keeping with the needs of our times.

With reference to the portion of his comments dealing with the inactive projects, the corps has weeded out of its inactive program those projects which are of questionable justification or need and carries them as deferred or inactive. The Governor sees no harm in this procedure, but suggests that Congress take action to deauthorize such projects. At this point I find myself in partial agreement with him, at least to the extent that there is no harm in identifying these inactive or deferred projects. A clear understanding of why these projects are carried as inactive would not lead one to the inevitable conclusion that Congress should take action to deauthorize the projects. Many of these projects have been deferred because of changed local conditions between the time of authorization and the present time. The very factors which now indicate the desirability of deferring these projects could, in the not-too-distant future, with further changes in the economy of the area, indicate the desirability of their early construction. If such were the case, many years and taxpayers' dollars would be

lost in the resurvey and reauthorization of these projects.

SURVEY REPORTS

I was intrigued with the author's apparent effort to be objective with respect to review of survey reports, wherein he states that spokesmen for the corps say that approximately 50 percent of projects reviewed—in number, not dollar volume—are turned down. So I asked the corps about these figures because there is a decided implication that this percentage figure would not be true if it were based on dollar volume of proposals submitted. I find that such an implication is completely without basis. The Corps of Engineers informs me that during fiscal years 1956 and 1957 the dollar volume of unfavorable reports would have exceeded 50 percent of the total estimated costs of the projects contemplated.

JOSIAS RIVER, MAINE

The author then critically discussed several projects. While I have no desire to refute or attempt to justify each and every project, a few of these picked at random for further examination produced some rather interesting results. The author states that—

> One of Senator DOUGLAS' most devastating attacks on waterway pork occurred some years ago, when Senator HAYDEN challenged him to point out just one piece of fat. Senator DOUGLAS solemnly advanced on Senator HAYDEN, bearing an atlas and a large magnifying glass. Pointing out that the bill contained a $33,000 item for improving the Josias River in Maine, where Senator DOUGLAS had grown up, he declared, "I have never known of the Josias River, though my family has been a seafaring family along the coast of Maine for some 300 years."

I suppose it is both unfortunate and typical of the author that he did not bother to investigate the facts. The Chief of Engineers recommended improvement of the channel of the Josias River at Ogunquit, Maine, to provide a depth of 5 feet at mean low water and a width of 40 feet, at an estimated first cost of $64,000, subject to the condition that local interests, among other things, contribute one-half of the initial cost, but not to exceed $32,000. The district engineer reported that Ogunquit is nationally advertised as one of the 22 world-famous sport fishing centers, and that local interests stated that this advertising was unsolicited. Apparently, someone is doing an excellent business in selling magnifying glasses, since the Maine Tuna Club located here numbers among its membership many nationally known personages.

Obviously, for an expenditure of $63,000 no extensive navigation facility could be provided. A review of the project document shows that the project was justified on the basis of providing protection for sport and commercial fishing activities at this community. Recreation is a major industry in New England and with such an abundance of game fish off its coast, game fishing has been stressed to attract sport fishermen to its waters.

I have an abiding faith in the business ability of New Englanders. I felt, therefore, that if they were willing to contribute one-half of the cost of this project it must be a pretty sound investment. My curiosity got the best of me, so I asked the charming and gracious senior Senator from Maine for factual information on any benefits that might have accrued to the community as a result of this improvement. I found that Senator SMITH had already called the article by Governor Miller to the attention of Mr. Littlefield who formerly was chairman of the Perkins Cove Improvement Committee of the Village of Ogunquit and had received a reply from him.

In order to be conservative, Mr. Littlefield considered only the lobster catch. Before the improvement this activity was not carried on during the winter months. Now they can work all year, and the lobster catch during the winter months alone is well in excess of $28,000. He reports that it is safe to say that the increase in the value of the lobster catch alone in 1 year would be as great as the cost of the Federal improvement.

Aside from that, Mr. President, since I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, I believe that any community, such as this community in Maine, where people go to the expense of building fishing boats and renting them to visitors, can claim that such activity constitutes a business which is good for the community, and that it is important to provide facilities so that the business can be carried on. For that reason, and for other reasons as well, this project was provided.

Mr. Littlefield further stated that, although he was unable to obtain a satisfactory estimate of the herring catch, it would be substantial, and excluding sport fishing, in a good year the tuna catch is worth at least $5,000.

In my opinion modest expenditures of this type at fishing villages are of tremendous importance to the local economy of the village and surrounding area.

Governor Miller goes on to state that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] reiterated his suspicion that the Josias River folks were angling for a freshwater anchorage for the motorboats and sailboats of summer residents. Yes; that was a part of the justification for the project as set forth in the report of the district engineer. It is strictly in accord with the Fletcher Act, approved February 10, 1932, where such traffic is defined as commerce. In such cases local interests are required to contribute 50 percent of the cost of construction. Is this a far-fetched interpretation? I do not believe so, when we consider that the major portion of the income of the residents of Ogunquit is derived from recreational activities. Yes; recreation is a business enterprise and with the continual shortening of the average work week, this business becomes larger and more important to the well-being of the American people.

No one seems to criticize the expenditure of Federal funds for recreational purposes in national parks and national forests, but when modest sums are expended for such purposes in connection with waterway improvements, there are those who look askance at the expenditure. In this connection, I suppose few people realize that there are more visitor days enjoyed at Lake Texoma on the Red River in Texas and Oklahoma than in any of the national parks, or that the visitor days at all the corps reservoirs exceed the visitation at all the national parks.

We have considered a small project. Now let us take a big one and look at the facts. The author refers to the "hydra-headed proposal to develop the Arkansas River Basin for navigation, hydro-electricity, flood control, and numerous other purposes, including recreation, municipal and industrial water supply, draining, soil conservation—in short, the works. Congress already has authorized $1,200,000,000 and this is just a starter. There are related proposals for developing the entire Arkansas-White-Red River basins extending into seven States. An interagency committee estimated the total cost of all Arkansas-White-Red River proposals advanced to date at more than $5 billion and the scope is constantly growing."

That is what appears in the article. Now let us consider the facts.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The present estimated cost for the comprehensive plan of improvement for the Arkansas River Basin is $1,103,800,000 for which only partial monetary authorization has been provided. The plan will provide more than 8 million acre feet of storage, of which 3,857,000 acre feet are for flood control and 98,700 acre feet for municipal and industrial water supply. The plan includes the installation of 320,000 kilowatt of hydro capacity, together with 512 miles of navigable channel. The Arkansas River is the last major stream in the United States which has not been developed for navigation.

The entire development of our country has been centered around its navigable waterways. More than half the people of the United States reside in metropolitan areas of 150,000 population or over. More than 80 percent of the persons living in these areas in 1950 resided in cities located on navigable water. This situation is not unique or peculiar to our country, as it is evident that the economy of a country is directly proportional to the use and development of its water resources. This fact has been brought home to me time and time again as I have traveled through various countries of the world. Sceptics and those deliberately biased will say that navigation on the Arkansas River is a dream which will never come to pass. Such people no doubt are ignorant of both the history and potential of this great river valley. Perhaps few of them realize that a century ago, waterborne cargo valued at $5 million annually were discharged at one point alone on the Arkansas River in Oklahoma. Nor do they realize that there are deposits of from 35 to 55 billion tons, depending on the criteria used, of bituminous coal in the Arkansas River Basin in close proximity to the Arkansas River, which can and will move by barge and thereby stimulate the economy of this great region. Incidentally, a great portion of this coal is actually owned by the Federal Government. This region

has all the requisite elements for industrial growth save one: river transportation.

Will this part of the country respond to Federal development of water resources? Let us see what has been accomplished in this area, principally on tributary streams.

The Federal Government has constructed or participated in the construction of 14 flood control and multiple purpose reservoirs in the State of Oklahoma during the past 20 years. The total cost of this group of projects through June 1957 amounts to $191,500,000. The estimate of benefits in fiscal year 1957 include: Flood damages prevented, $14.1 million; power generation, $700,000; water supply, $200,000; returns from leases and concessions, $300,000. Flood damages prevented represent an indirect return to the Federal Government, since losses from flood damages are deductible on income tax returns. The National Park Service has estimated that the value of park facilities is worth $1.26 per visitor per day. To be conservative, if we assume a value of $1 per visitation, the benefits from these reservoirs amount to about $16 million a year. Think of it. Oklahoma, with a population of 2.2 million in 1950, records over 16 million visitations a year at these reservoirs. Obviously, many of these visitors traveled great distances to enjoy the recreational facilities afforded by these beautiful bodies of water, which would indicate that $1 per visitation is a conservative evaluation of their worth to these visitors. The total benefits from these reservoirs in fiscal year 1957 are estimated at $31.3 million. On this basis it is evident that the American people are getting a benefit of $31.3 million a year on an investment of $191.5 million. I do not believe they did too badly.

PORK, RUSSIAN STYLE

Another typical example that the author is completely oblivious to what is going on around him can be found in the following paragraph:

> This year, of course, the Russians having soared into scientific ascendancy over the United States with their prior conquest of space, the need for diverting pork barrel millions into research and national defense channels is even more urgent. It seems an act of sabotage to waste one unnecessary dollar that could be used to help us catch up in the race for scientific supremacy.

The consultant to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recently prepared a report on Relationships of River and Related Resource Development Programs of the United States, Soviet Russia, and Red China. That study points up the tremendous importance which the Soviet Union has placed on water-resource development. It cannot fail to demonstrate the fact that the Soviet officials have recognized the major role which water plays in the economic strength of a nation, nor do I presume for a moment that its leaders have completely overlooked the military significance of the development of its vast river valleys. I have visited Russia during each of the past 3 years. Last year I traveled extensively within the Soviet Union for 33 days. I visited cities never before seen by an American Government official and talked with and came in contact with literally thousands of Russian people. During this period I had the opportunity of inspecting hydroelectric projects in Siberia. On the Angara River alone Russia is building one hydroproject which is over 50 percent larger than the biggest installation in this country. The largest one they are building is on the Yeniesi River, into which the Angara River flows. The Russians are now in the process of building another project which will be double the capacity of the largest hydroelectric installation in the United States.

An interesting article was published in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, September 22, 1957, written by the military and aviation editor, Mr. Ansel E. Talbert. He stated:

> The increasing rate of Soviet construction of new channels and waterways, particularly in the Asiatic portion of its territory, is acting to ease the enormous strain on the overworked and militarily vulnerable trans-Siberian railroad.
>
> Within the next few years, inland "arterial waterways" are likely to connect up all the major industrial and administrative centers of the Soviet Union. As envisioned by Soviet strategists, they eventually will enable submarines and all but the largest ships of the Red Navy to pass from any sea or ocean at the borders of the U. S. S. R. to another along safe inland waterways protected by defensive jet fighters and missiles.

I am becoming a little sick of having the tag "pork barrel" placed on water-resource development projects in this country. No one would accuse the Russian leaders of squandering money on such projects if they were not convinced that the development of these resources is essential to the well-being of their country. The American taxpayer is asked annually to pick up the check for river and harbor, flood control, irrigation, power, and other resource-development projects in foreign countries under the Mutual Security Act on the basis that such projects are essential to the economic development of those countries. Yet the same individuals who cry "We cannot afford this pork barrel," when Congress appropriates money for the development of America, urge even larger appropriations for foreign aid.

ADVANCES VERSUS CONTRIBUTIONS

Did the author check the facts, or did he grasp at a straw when he cited this horrible example:

> The United States Comptroller General recently cited to Congress a curious example of seeming indifference to the taxpayers' welfare wherein the Corps of Engineers actually refused a contribution proffered to the Government by a benefiting private company. At Oswego, N. Y., one company alone stood to save $435,000 annually through harbor improvements. "The company offered," the Comptroller General related, "* * * to advance $100,000 to the Federal Government to commence work on the project. Despite its willingness * * * cash contributions toward the construction cost were not recommended by the Chief of Engineers because the benefits to the company were considered to be savings in transportation costs that would be passed on to the ultimate consumer.

I suppose the author should know the difference between a contribution and an advance. Both the author and the General Accounting Office seem to use these terms interchangeably, which has the desired effect of misrepresentation. The Comptroller General's report considered the offer of the St. Regis Paper Co. in July 1948 to advance $100,000 for the Government to start construction on the work authorized by the 1948 act, as a local contribution toward that work; whereas it was merely an offer to advance funds for planning the Federal project. The advances are repayable in all cases. There have been many projects in which advances were made in the manner I am now describing.

Although the Chief of Engineers has authority to accept advance of funds, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate have admonished the Chief of Engineers not to accept such funds since the acceptance would in effect start a project which had not been examined and approved by the Congress for initiation at this time. If the Chief of Engineers were to initiate projects with advances made by local interests, it would place those communities that are financially able to raise money in a preferential status for the initiation of Federal-resource projects.

A moment ago, when I mentioned advances, I meant advances which had been made, to my knowledge, for projects which were authorized. I remember that the Congress provided funds to repay those advances.

OBSTACLE COURSE OF A PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT

The author has continually referred to authorizations and appropriations as pork-barrel legislation. I think it might be well at this time to consider briefly the procedures a project must go through before the first shovelfull of dirt is turned. To begin with, a survey must be authorized, either by an act of Congress or, if a previous report is made, by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of either the House or Senate. This constitutes an authority to make a study, but no funds are available. The engineers must seek an appropriation from Congress to make the investigation. Once funds are provided, a public hearing is held to determine the desires of local interests. The technical personnel of the district office of the Corps of Engineers then makes a detailed survey of the physical and economic factors involved and determines the estimated cost. It then determines the annual carrying charges, which include interest charges, amortization of the investment as well as the cost of maintenance and operation, for comparison with the annual economic benefits expected to accrue from the construction over the economic life of the project or 50 years, whichever is the lesser.

In this connection, it should be noted that their economic ratios are conservative since most of the projects will not have approached their economic life by the end of 50 years. The report of the district engineers is reviewed by the division engineer and a public notice is issued to all interested parties advising them of the findings of the district and

division engineers. They are informed as to where they may have access to the report and are invited to submit any comments they may have to the board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington. At this time, if a public hearing is desired, arrangements for such can be made with the Board of Engineers. These reports are reviewed critically by the Board's technical staff and considered at formal Board meetings. After the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has completed its review, a report is then submitted to the Chief of Engineers where the report is again reviewed. The proposed report of the Chief of Engineers is then furnished the Governors of the affected States, the Department of the Interior—if the project involves the use of waters west of the 98th meridian—and all other interested Federal agencies. They have 90 days in which to submit their comments to the Chief of Engineers. After considering these comments, which become a part of the report, the Chief of Engineers completes his report and submits it to the Bureau of the Budget for information as to the relationship of the report to the program of the President. After review by the Bureau of the Budget, the report, with all accompanying papers, including the views of the Bureau of the Budget, are submitted to the Congress, and the report is printed as a public document.

Prior to authorization of a project the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate hold extensive public hearings at which all interested people, both proponents and opponents, of recommended projects are given an opportunity to be heard. After a bill has been enacted by the House and Senate and agreement reached in conference, the bill is transmitted to the President for his approval. After approval of the bill by the President the project becomes authorized and is a part of the backlog of authorized projects. At this point, it may be well to state that the preparation of these reports is in strict compliance with detailed instructions and criteria prepared by the Agency based on the uniform criteria issued by the Bureau of the Budget in circular letter A–47.

Starting with an authorized project, the first step is to secure an appropriation for advanced planning. Such detailed planning may cover a period of anywhere from 1 to 4 years, depending on the scope of the project involved. As the plans progress and more information becomes available as to foundation conditions and other physical factors, the estimated cost and the ratio of cost to benefits are periodically brought up to date in the annual presentation of the budget request to the Committees on Appropriations. When all the detailed planning has been completed, appropriations may be requested for the initiation of construction. Each year the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate give careful and individual examination of each project, its cost, its benefits, its physical features, and the amounts requested.

Mr. President, I can certify to that. Last year I spent more than 2½ months holding hearings, and heard 889 witnesses on these various projects. I know what the work amounts to. We examine the projects; and we minutely scrutinize every one, to find out what "bugs," if any, exist in connection with it.

Undoubtedly there is more time, careful planning and coordination with local, State and Federal agencies devoted to the development of projects in the water resources program than practically any other field of Federal expenditures. Appropriations for water resources development should properly be looked upon as investments rather than expenditures.

THE ART OF FORECASTING

I have attempted to show that the water resources program of the United States is a well-planned and well-conceived program and an activity which provides an impressive return on the investment. I do not want to leave the impression, however, that every project recommended by the Corps of Engineers produced the benefits or stimulated the economic development contemplated in the original report. That would ascribe superhuman ability to predict the future which no one can expect the corps or any other Federal agency to possess. Adequate planning for public works improvements requires a prediction of economic growth and development at least 50 years into the future. Obviously, some few projects did not develop as anticipated. It doesn't mean that the funds were wasted. Some good resulted from the construction of those projects. These are the exceptions. Others have developed beyond expectation, with the result that those projects proved to be inadequate for the job they were called upon to do. In these cases, the net result is that far greater benefits were obtained in a shorter period of time than was originally anticipated. For example, the navigation dams on the Ohio River previously mentioned, designed to accommodate traffic of 13 million tons, are now handling 76.4 million tons. While they are not only inadequate for the job they are required to perform, they are actually holding back the natural development of commerce on the Ohio River. On some of these locks and dams reconstruction to meet current needs is now underway.

Mr. President, I am proud of the part I played in providing funds for at least 4 of these projects in the past 4 years.

By and large, the corps has an excellent record of anticipating future requirements in project areas.

IMPORTANCE OF WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

I believe it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of water and water resource development in its relationship to our future economic growth. Going back to the Hoover Commission task force, of which the author was a member, this very startling statement appeared in the report dated June 1955, which, I believe, places water in its proper perspective:

> The United States uses more water than it does all other materials combined, averaging some 1,200 gallons for each person each day. In 1950 this amounted to about 1,800 tons of water for each person as compared to the 18 tons used of all other materials, including food.

In a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, dated December 22, 1955, there is a very comprehensive outline of the problem relating to water resource development. Included in that report is an estimate of the use of water in 1950 of 185 billion gallons a day. Based on a population of 200 million by 1975, the estimated requirements would be 350 billion gallons a day. That was probably a pretty good estimate in 1955; but this is 1958 and the statisticians are now predicting that the population of this country will be 230 million by 1975. On this basis, using the same per capita consumption, the requirement would be 400 billion gallons a day, which is more than double the 1950 requirement. We are now considering appropriation requests for 1959. In other words, we have 17 years to survey, plan, and construct facilities to meet this requirement. Mind you, Mr. President, water utilization is only one phase of the problem. With the increased growth, additional navigation facilities, power facilities, and flood control works will be required to meet the expanding needs of our growing population. It will soon be too late to increase the tempo of this program to meet the anticipated requirements for 1975. We have a responsibility to conserve and develop our water resources for our children. Yes, some day we may reach that staggering figure of $70 billion for water resource development of all kinds, not only for improving navigation on minuscule waterways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Although the Chair may be violating the custom of the Senate that the Presiding Officer is not supposed to make a comment following the delivery of a speech by a Senator, the present occupant of the chair wishes to thank the Senator from Louisiana for the information he has made available to the Chair this afternoon, and to compliment the Senator from Louisiana for his devastating and unanswerable rebuttal of the reactionary propaganda published by the Saturday Evening Post. The Chair hopes that all those interested in preserving the natural resources of the United States and in having them developed for the benefit of all the people, so that our country will not fall behind Russia, will read the speech of the Senator from Louisiana. If they do, they will find it to their profit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

PROBLEMS OF FINANCING THE CONSTRUCTION OF MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may read some opening remarks, and then may offer, for the RECORD, a statement by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] with reference to the problems of financing the construction of merchant vessels.

The opening statement by the Senator from Maryland is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

It is necessary that I return to a hearing being conducted by the Internal Security

Subcommittee, and thus I am unable to deliver a speech I have prepared relating to the problems of financing the construction of merchant vessels. These remarks are timely, since the Senate will soon consider H. R. 10881, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1958, which contains a provision relevant to this problem.

I therefore wish to have my statement printed in the body of the RECORD. I take this occasion to express the hope that my colleagues will give this analysis their earnest consideration.

Mr. President, as I have already indicated, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

PRIVATE FINANCING OF MERCHANT VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

The privately owned merchant marine of the United States is facing tremendous financing problems in connection with the imminent replacement of a major portion of its presently operating merchant fleet. The large majority of the vessels now engaged in both our coastwise and foreign trades are of World War II vintage, built mainly during the 1943–46 period, and are now well on their way to economic obsolescence.

In terms of their generally accepted normal useful lives, these war-built vessels will have reached the end of the line within the next 5 to 8 years. Agreements now in effect with 15 companies which operate, under operating-subsidy contracts, on some 31 essential trade routes throughout the world, require that approximately 300 vessels will be replaced within the next 7- to 8-year period. Present estimates place this replacement cost at approximately $3 billion.

In addition to the above replacements so vital to the foreign trade of our Nation, a similar necessity faces the operators in the coastwise and offshore trades, as well as those in the neglected but highly important tramp trades. These last-named are the bulk carriers, which carry the Nation's coal and surplus agricultural commodities to all the world. They face cutthroat competition from the low-wage foreign bottoms, and have been able to continue in operation, the relatively few that have continued, almost entirely because of the percentage of Government-financed cargoes reserved to them under the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act, passed during the 83d Congress.

Under provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Federal Government is authorized to finance new-vessel construction for citizens, less a downpayment of 12½ or 25 percent by the owners, at an interest rate of 3½ percent over a 20-year period. Incidentally, such vessel financing as has been done has been quite lucrative for the Government, netting about 1 percent per annum over the average cost of Government borrowing.

Recently, however, the policy has been to require private financing of commercial vessels. To meet this requirement the Congress enacted, in 1954, Public Law 781, which I helped to develop and sponsored in the Senate, in order to encourage and facilitate private financing of new-vessel construction. This Private Ship Financing Act, as it has come to be known, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to insure 90 percent of the cost of construction, and so on, less the owner's downpayment of 25 percent (or, in certain cases, 12½ percent). As to special-purpose vessels certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national defense, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to insure 100 percent of the principal (75 percent or 87½ percent, as the case might be, of the total cost of the vessel) and interest.

Some of us were apprehensive that the 90 percent guaranty would not achieve its intended goal of attracting investment funds for ship construction purposes. However, the Bureau of the Budget was adamant on this point, so the sponsors agreed to give the measure an opportunity to gain some experience. Events proved that a 90 percent guaranty was not sufficiently attractive, in view of the admitted uncertainties of vessel operations, to bring forth investment funds in any quantity. Therefore the law was amended in the 84th Congress, to provide the 100 percent guaranty demanded by the interested financial establishments.

As so amended, title XI of the 1936 act is doing the job—or, at least, has brought forth the funds needed to commence the vessel replacement program. As of February 5, 1958, vessel mortgages covering 26 vessels have been issued by the Maritime Administration, for a total of $181,605,000. Insurance premiums received here totaled $828,000 as of January 31, 1958.

But—and this is the point to which I wish to address myself particularly—there has been one default under the program, and some concern and uneasiness have been generated because the Maritime Administration did not have in hand, available for immediate payment, the funds required to redeem the defaulted loan, which amounted to $3,947,986. Insurance premiums in hand, as I stated, approximated only $828,000. Of this amount the lender, the Prudential Insurance Co., was paid $604,913, leaving an unpaid balance which, with interest, will amount to $3,472,751 as of the end of February.

It is regrettable—and yet, on the other hand, possibly fortunate—that this default, one of the very, very few of its kind in the extensive experience of the Federal Government in the field of maritime insurance, should come at an early stage of this new program before time had been allowed to accumulate a sizable reserve.

Still, there is not the slightest reason for uneasiness or concern because the defaulted loan could not be redeemed immediately. Standing behind the mortgages and loans covered by the provisions of the statute is the good faith of the United States, as expressly stated in section 1103 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to wit, and I quote: "The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of interest on and the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage and loan insured under this title."

As instance of this good faith, the House Appropriations Committee has included in the second supplemental appropiration bill, 1958 (H. R. 10881), now before the Senate, authorization for the Maritime Administration to transfer funds from its vessel operations revolving funds into the Federal ship-mortgage fund in order to redeem defaulted mortgages, with the provision that such transfers be repaid from the ship-mortgage fund as soon as practicable consistent with the status of this account.

On this same point of good faith in the matter of redemption of any defaulted loans or mortgages, the House report on the 1958 second supplemental appropriations bill notes that while this bill confines to the current fiscal year, the Maritime Administration's authority for transferring funds to the ship-mortgage insurance fund, it is made clear that need for such authority subsequent to June 30, 1958, will be considered during hearings on the Maritime's regular 1959 budget.

Assurance to prospective investors in new vessel construction covered by title XI loans and/or mortgages is afforded also in section 1109 of the 1936 act, which authorizes to be appropriated, for the purpose of the Private Ship Financing Act "the sum of $1 million and such further sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

No appropriation was asked, or authorized at the time Public Law 781 was enacted because, frankly, there didn't seem to be any real need for it. The Federal Government's experience in the field of maritime insurance had been almost completely free of defaults. I might say here also, that it had been a most profitable experience as well—which may surprise some Members of the Congress and the general public as well, who mistakenly believe that Government is always giving to the United States maritime industry and getting little or nothing in return.

Take the matter of Government war-risk insurance, which was found necessary to initiate in both world wars when commercial vessel insurance was unavailable because of the extraordinary hazards. The War Risk Insurance Bureau, a World War I agency, showed an operating profit in excess of $17,500,000 as reported by the 1923 annual report of the Maritime Commission.

During World War II the premiums paid on war-risk vessel insurance exceeded the amount paid to claimants by more that $130 million, according to figures furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. After the War Damage Corporation (originally the War Insurance Corporation) ceased operation in January 1947, all matters pertaining to the agency were transferred to the Treasury Department, Defense Lending Division and when that corporation was discontinued, I am informed, there was approximately $225 million on hand, representing the profit after settlement of all claims.

I cite these records of past performance in the field of Government maritime insurance simply to dispel any misconceptions that may be in the minds of anyone concerning Government's part in this program of vessel loan and mortgage insurance. It is not in any sense a giveaway program. It is not something being handed to the ship operators on a silver platter.

This insurance of vessel loans and mortgages is absolutely essential to the vessel replacement program which Government requires of the subsidiary operator for two reasons.

First, the Federal Government refuses to finance the construction, despite the authority set forth in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

Second, private investment firms will not supply the huge amonts of capital required without the type of guaranties provided by Public Law 781, 83d Congress.

Furthermore, the cost to vessel owners for replacing their vessels to meet Government requirement is considerably more under a program of private financing. Instead of the 3½ percent interest rate authorized by the 1936 Act, owners must pay the going commercial rates, presently about 5 percent. In addition, they must pay to the Maritime Administration certain fees, maybe 1 percent, more or less, on the average principal amount covered by the Government insurance, and another one-half percent of the original principal amount as an investigation fee.

Another point to be borne in mind by any who may be fearful that Government may be "rooked" under this program, is that risk of loss to the Government in case of a default is at a minimum. To undertake construction, and to secure a construction loan or vessel mortgage, the ship operator must make a down payment of one or several million dollars. Each year of the vessel's operation he must reduce the amount covered by insurance by 5 percent. All of these payments are in excess of any balance due in case of default. Government normally could expect to sell any defaulted vessel for at least an amount necessary to cover redemption cost.

Right now, I'll admit, the world market for vessels is at a record low, and the defaulted S. S. *Carib Queen*, if put on the market, might not attract a bid sufficient to cover the Government's interest. However, to conserve the Government's investment, the Maritime Administrator has stated that he will offer the vessel for charter until the market improves, thereby reimbursing the Government partially while awaiting a more propitious time to dispose of the vessel.

I have thought it desirable to speak on this matter today, to help allay any fears that may exist among representatives of banking or investment firms which are the potential sources of the additonal millions of dollars that will be needed over the next 5 or 6 years to finance new vessel construction. To them I can say, with all sincerity, and with fullest confidence that the program of construction loans and vessel mortgages initiated under Public Law 178, 83d Congress is as sound as the Government of the United States, whose faith is solemnly pledged to the payment of each mortgage and loan insured.

Could anyone ask for a better guaranty?

ALLEGATION REGARDING CERTAIN SENATORS IN ARTICLE ON TELEVISION STATION MATTER INVOLVING NATIONAL AIRLINES AND OTHERS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, at this time I desire to say a few words about a press report which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday. It was reporting on a Florida television station matter which purportedly involved the National Airlines and others.

In an article, a Mr. Baker, president of the National Airlines, was reported as stating that the senior Senator from Kansas and other named Senators had contacted the Federal Communications Commission in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, I do not know the basis for including in any such statement the name of the senior Senator from Kansas. In fact, no basis whatsoever exists for any such statement.

The senior Senator from Kansas did not join other members of the Aviation Subcommittee in any communication to the Federal Communications Commission, and he had never contacted with reference thereto any member of the Federal Communications Commission or any of the staff thereof.

Mr. President, I will say that I have seen a copy of the letter of January 22, 1957, signed by certain members of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, requesting the Federal Communications Commission's views concerning certain policy matters relating to the granting of TV licenses. I saw nothing censurable or improper about it, and I feel that the subcommittee was entitled to such information. The letter I had in mind was a letter dated January 22, 1957, and was signed by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, Senator FREDERICK PAYNE, of Maine, and Senator ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to introduce the letter into the RECORD?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall not introduce the letter into the RECORD at this time. I will say to the distinguished Presiding Officer, as I understand, that letter has been offered for the RECORD on the House side, and probably will be offered, at a later time, into the record of this body.

The only possible basis for Mr. Baker or anyone else to indicate that the senior Senator from Kansas had any connection with any phase of this matter was that the then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, George C. McConnaughy, sent to all members of the Aviation Subcommittee a carbon copy of his reply to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kansas has always refrained from indulging in any activity in any way affecting a matter in the bosom of quasi-judicial committees. There is no basis for the statement made by Mr. Baker before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

I wanted to set the RECORD straight with respect to that matter.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate will now stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 6, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1958:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Clarence T. Lundquist, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Francis Collins, O16819, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James G. Stone, Ashland, Ala., in place of K. J. White, transferred.

Grant C. Barham, Bridgeport, Ala., in place of V. P. Mickam, retired.

Robert L. Cockrell, Double Springs, Ala., in place of B. L. Butler, retired.

Alice H. Hyatt, Grady, Ala., in place of S. C. Athey, retired.

Luther W. Bowen, Horton, Ala., in place of J. L. Stephens, resigned.

Harry Y. Dempsey, Jr., Jacksonville, Ala., in place of J. T. Martin, retired.

Carolyn S. Brown, Northport, Ala., in place of W. T. Collins, retired.

Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.

Roy J. Banks, Pell City, Ala., in place of N. R. Shockley, resigned.

Lena Gertrude McConnell, Saint Elmo, Ala., in place of J. H. Henley, removed.

Roy Wesley Rhodes, Tuscaloosa, Ala., in place of H. M. McLeod, removed.

William J. Dobson, Tuscumbia, Ala., in place of H. G. Sockwell, removed.

ALASKA

Victor R. Milligan, Ketchikan, Alaska, in place of P. N. Ripley, retired.

John G. Williams, Sr., Yakutat, Alaska. Office made presidential July 1, 1947.

ARKANSAS

Ferrell S. Tucker, Caraway, Ark., in place of Lea Rea, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Glenn L. Thomas, Baker, Calif., in place of W. M. Anderson, resigned.

Agnes C. Richmond, Beverly Hills, Calif., in place of M. J. O'Rourke, retired.

Jesse Ralph Layton, Fullerton, Calif., in place of F. D. Lowrey, removed.

John P. Anderson, Lakewood, Calif. Office established December 31, 1956.

Everett T. Carpenter, North Hollywood, Calif., in place of B. W. Harris, removed.

COLORADO

Hazel L. Weston, Bristol, Colo., in place of B. E. Osborn, resigned.

Robert W. Martin, Fort Morgan, Colo., in place of W. E. Bales, removed.

Lloyd W. Anderson, Otis, Colo., in place of J. M. Rush, deceased.

FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.

Charles H. Watson, Homosassa Springs, Fla., in place of M. V. Lindsey, deceased.

Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.

Walker A. Stanley, Ponce De Leon, Fla., in place of E. D. Padgett, transferred.

HAWAII

Irene R. Afflerback, Spreckelsville, Hawaii, in place of E. J. Freitas, retired.

IDAHO

Taft P. Budge, Paris, Idaho, in place of L. J. Passey, removed.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

William T. Keenan, Alexander, Ill., in place of F. W. Neal, deceased.

William S. Totten, Alexis, Ill., in place of G. A. Porter, removed.

Gordon L. Smedley, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.

Carl M. Crowder, Bethany, Ill., in place of W. A. Goetz, resigned.

William K. Stevenson, Biggsville, Ill., in place of L. E. Dixon, deceased.

John F. Wooldridge, Broughton, Ill., in place of Winifred Hughes, removed.

Perry C. Harris, Browning, Ill., in place of M. E. Bader, resigned.

Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Walter B. Tregoning, Carterville, Ill., in place of F. J. Rudloff, removed.

Edward J. Kleen, Elmwood, Ill., in place of C. R. Bowers, retired.

Homer T. Smith, Erie, Ill., in place of R. M. Cocking, retired.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

Theron C. Tavenner, Freeport, Ill., in place of J. C. McKinstra, deceased.

Wayne W. Bird, Galatia, Ill., in place of L. L. Riegel, retired.

Ernest Evar Swanson, Galesburg, Ill., in place of D. C. Beatty, retired.

Kenneth L. Pflaum, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.

William C. Newton, Golconda, Ill., in place of M. W. Volle, resigned.

Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.
Floyd T. Huddleston, Hurst, Ill., in place of I. M. Pratt, transferred.
Bayard M. Wright, Lacon, Ill., in place of M. W. Dunn, removed.
Kenneth C. Hall, Lombard, Ill., in place of G. W. Collins, retired.
Roy E. Thomas, Marengo, Ill., in place of C. T. Carney, removed.
Stewart V. Edlund, Mazon, Ill., in place of W. S. Shipley, removed.
Justus A. Gibson, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.
Anthony J. Zucco, Mount Zion, Ill., in place of A. M. Tate, retired.
Alfred E. Leininger, Nauvoo, Ill., in place of P. H. Schenk, removed.
Earl J. Thompson, O'Fallon, Ill., in place of J. L. Anheuser, resigned.
Francis E. Overstreet, Raritan, Ill., in place of E. A. Houtchens, resigned.
Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.
Clarence E. Harden, Tolono, Ill., in place of C. E. Harden, transferred.
Charles L. Baird, Van Orin, Ill., in place of D. D. Clarke, resigned.
Dwight S. Leverton, Winslow, Ill., in place of B. E. Reck, retired.
Raymond J. M. Howard, Yale, Ill., in place of H. W. Hamilton, retired.

INDIANA

Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.
Maurice F. Keilman, Dyer, Ind., in place of L. E. Hoffman, deceased.
James L. Conwell, Greensburg, Ind., in place of C. D. Samuels, resigned.
Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
Ray E. Melick, Oaktown, Ind., in place of E. P. Donnar, retired.
Charles W. Hudson, Solsberry, Ind., in place of E. J. Myers, retired.

IOWA

Adolph L. Opsal, Armstrong, Iowa, in place of M. E. Daries, removed.
Thomas J. Hamilton, Epworth, Iowa, in place of S. J. Callahan, retired.
Joseph E. Link, Farley, Iowa, in place of E. P. Kelly, removed.
Jerry J. Snoble, Hazleton, Iowa, in place of G. E. Sherrer, retired.
Kenneth B. Fairall, Muscatine, Iowa, in place of A. S. Barry, retired.
Charles E. Boyles, Woodward, Iowa, in place of H. C. Calonkey, retired.

KANSAS

Jacob C. Gaeddert, Inman, Kans., in place of J. F. Lambert, transferred.
Lloyd William Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

KENTUCKY

Shirley H. Ashby, Auburn, Ky., in place of J. R. Wilson, resigned.
Frank M. Powell, Danville, Ky., in place of R. D. Stigall, transferred.
Carl B. Marshall, Lewisburg, Ky., in place of E. L. Day, retired.
James E. Morris, Neon, Ky., in place of J. M. Caudill, resigned.
Walton W. Buckman, Simpsonville, Ky., in place of R. A. McDowell, retired.
Arnold D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, Ky., in place of L. D. Rose, retired.

LOUISIANA

Dosia M. Hood, Elton, La., in place of R. W. Monroe, retired.
Robert J. Rossi, Gonzales, La., in place of L. S. Gonzales, resigned.
James E. Fogleman, Morrow, La., in place of J. E. Hicks, resigned.
James H. Smith, Newllano, La., in place of E. O. Joynes, removed.
Myra H. Doughty, Tioga, La., in place of M. M. Clark, retired.
Eck H. Bozeman, Winnfield, La., in place of S. E. Jenkins, retired.
Robert P. Kennedy, Zachary, La., in place of M. A. McHugh, resigned.

MARYLAND

Franklin B. Spriggs, Arnold, Md., in place of E. B. Gardner, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas J. Mason, Clinton, Mass., in place of W. F. McNamara, removed.
Charles M. Thrasher, Natick, Mass., in place of P. V. Casavant, removed.
Cecil H. Evans, West Hanover, Mass., in place of P. J. Hanberry, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Lyle G. Kaechele, Caledonia, Mich., in place of S. G. Beckman, resigned.
Otis E. Howe, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.
Duaine E. Murphy, Eagle, Mich., in place of R. E. Van Driesen, removed.
William A. Burgess, East Lansing, Mich. Reestablished February 1, 1955.
Charles H. Pratt, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.
Ivan M. Vernon, Flushing, Mich., in place of Agnes McKerring, retired.
Dorathea S. Parmenter, Holton, Mich., in place of M. H. Nash, retired.
Bob Lee Baker, Mendon, Mich., in place of M. C. Travis, removed.
Benjamin E. Voorhees, Jr., Midland, Mich., in place of B. F. Bailey, resigned.
Leon B. Crofoot, Mikado, Mich., in place of Mamie Deford, resigned.
Roy J. Murray, Port Huron, Mich., in place of R. J. McIntosh, resigned.
Nellie J. Morrison, Rapid City, Mich., in place of C. K. Guy, removed.
Merle Jean Fester, Riverside, Mich., in place of Lester Kittell, retired.
Eugenie A. Westhauser, Sawyer, Mich., in place of E. O. Samuelson, retired.
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.

MINNESOTA

Ralph Dean Fischer, Brook Park, Minn., in place of S. M. Rasmussen, resigned.
Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.
Leo W. McDonough, Kellogg, Minn., in place of C. G. T. Lydon, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.
Rufus A. Ware, Stringer, Miss., in place of J. G. Ishee, retired.

MISSOURI

Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
David C. Baumann, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhart, transferred.
Lawrence L. Poleski, Saint Ann, Mo. Office established June 1, 1954.

NEBRASKA

John H. Dueker, Bayard, Nebr., in place of J. E. Hunt, removed.

NEVADA

Florence J. Holman, East Ely, Nev., in place of E. I. Hermansen, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Jessie G. Thompson, Moultonboro, N. H., in place of R. E. Goodwin, retired.
Herbert N. Smith, Mount Sunapee, N. H., in place of M. B. Perkins, retired.
Winburn T. Dudley, Union, N. H., in place of J. A. Reed, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Michael Yurcisin, Roebling, N. J., in place of George Majoros, Jr., removed.
Marjorie E. Houghtaling, Vernon, N. J., in place of A. E. Baldsin, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Benjamin H. Roberts, Corona, N. Mex., in place of B. E. Jones, resigned.
Ethel B. Solomon, Mosquero, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Wallace, removed.
William D. Reams, Silver City, N. Mex., in place of J. L. Turner, resigned.
Julius E. Fitzner, Tucumcari, N. Mex., in place of T. N. Lawson, retired.

NEW YORK

Ishmael B. Burns, Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of F. F. Cornwall, retired.
Doris J. Hammond, Millport, N. Y., in place of H. C. Fiala, resigned.
Mary Eva Loomis, Smithville Flats, N. Y., in place of L. L. Fish, retired.
Royden W. McCullough, Wyoming, N. Y., in place of G. F. Powers, Jr., transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wren Hunter Freeman, Alexander, N. C., in place of F. E. Sluder, removed.
Edward Leroy Hobby, Apex, N. C., in place of T. B. Miller, retired.
Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N. C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.
Raymond L. Long, Biscoe, N. C., in place of A. W. Burt, retired.
Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N. C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.
Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N. C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.
Clarence W. Burrell, Canton, N. C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.
Earl W. Miller, Jr., Council, N. C., in place of E. E. Meshaw, retired.
Jay T. Baker, Dallas, N. C., in place of G. L. Friday, resigned.
George O. Petree, Danbury, N. C., in place of M. J. Pepper, retired.
Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N. C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.
Thaddeus H. Pope, Dunn, N. C., in place of Ralph Wade, retired.
Charles A. Brown, Efland, N. C., in place of M. E. Harris, retired.
Lala C. Shell, Elk Park, N. C., in place of B. H. Winters, retired.
Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
Wallace K. Crawford, Hayesville, N. C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
John Perry, Jr., Hendersonville, N. C., in place of Columbus Few, retired.
John F. Mewborne, Kinston, N. C., in place of E. R. Wooten, resigned.
William Oliver Keller, Lake Lure, N. C., in place of E. S. Holliman, resigned.
Dennis G. Clifton, Lumber Bridge, N. C., in place of W. E. McGoogan, retired.
Benjamin Franklin Shannon, Manteo, N. C., in place of C. R. Evans, retired.
Wilton McRae, Maxton, N. C., in place of C. B. Williams, retired.
Harveleigh M. White, Method, N. C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.
Worth T. Hendricks, Mocksville, N. C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.
Ada S. Solomon, Montreat, N. C., in place of J. C. Rice, retired.
Charles Clifton Mock, Pfafftown, N. C., in place of Mamie Pfaff, retired.
Marion H. Boyles, Pinnacle, N. C., in place of W. B. Lane, resigned.
LeRoy A. Self, Pittsboro, N. C., in place of W. L. Farrell, removed.
Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N. C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
Carroll Owen Jenkins, Robbinsville, N. C., in place of W. G. Carver, removed.
Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N. C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
John H. Norton, Stony Point, N. C., in place of D. F. Cockrell, removed.
Nancy C. Harris, Wake Forest, N. C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.
Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N. C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N. C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.

Josiah A. Maultsby, Jr., Whiteville, N. C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.
Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N. C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.
Harry R. Sams, Woodland, N. C., in place of M. G. Blanchard, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.
Anna E. Schlabach, Driscoll, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bruschwein, retired.
Isaac J. Iverson, Fairdale, N. Dak., in place of Edward Lian, retired.
Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.
Mildred L. Knudsen, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga, transferred.
Brownell H. Cole, Valley City, N. Dak., in place of C. K. Otto, retired.

OHIO

Smith B. Applegarth, Barton, Ohio, in place of M. I. Timko, resigned.
Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.
Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Charles B. Smith, Barnsdall, Okla., in place of O. E. Cox, deceased.
Marguerite L. McDonald, Bokoshe, Okla., in place of O. C. Broking, retired.
Mabel C. Heidenreich, Duke, Okla., in place of H. M. Foreman, removed.
Julius R. Griffith, Kinta, Okla., in place of R. L. Cummings, resigned.
Jack H. Justice, Maysville, Okla., in place of B. C. Sparks, transferred.
Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.
John W. Henderson, Tulsa, Okla., in place of G. L. Watkins, retired.
George L. Wood, Union, Okla., in place of M. K. Richardson, deceased.
Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Louis C. Schultz, Blossburg, Pa., in place of J. R. Stratton, removed.
Fay M. Lash, Bobtown, Pa., in place of F. J. Bierer, retired.
Doris G. Evans, Brave, Pa., in place of Gail Wood, retired.
Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
John Blackwood, Jr., Center Valley, Pa., in place of O. W. Gehris, retired.
Harry O. Campsey, Jr., Claysville, Pa., in place of M. D. Blayney, retired.
Clare F. Connell, Coraopolis, Pa., in place of J. A. O'Donovan, deceased.
Claude R. Coons, Covington, Pa., in place of F. W. Haverley, retired.
Bernard N. Murphy, Dushore, Pa., in place of B. B. Deegan, retired.
Lyle T. Streeter, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.
Helen Z. Swanson, Irvine, Pa., in place of C. J. Zuerl, Jr., resigned.
Robert F. Acker, Lake City, Pa., in place of L. A. Gossman, resigned.
Paul E. Kuhlman, Lebanon, Pa., in place of D. E. Walter, removed.
George E. Palko, Loyalhanna, Pa., in place of T. S. Walter, resigned.
Harry S. Kolva, Lykens, Pa., in place of C. M Golden, resigned.
Steve Olen, Lyndora, Pa., in place of M. S. Karlitsky, removed.
Claude B. Faust, Macungie, Pa., in place of F. E. Neumeyer, removed.
Henry L. Haines, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.
Bruce B. DeLong, Mertztown, Pa., in place of E. F. Fox, retired.
Alexander F. Schafhirt, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.
Robert B. Woodring, Milesburg, Pa., in place of M. C. Adams, retired.
Kenneth R. Myers, Millerstown, Pa., in place of R. E. Wagner, deceased.
Mary A. Boyd, Mount Braddock, Pa., in place of N. Y. Phelan, deceased.
Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
Frank W. Hill, New Castle, Pa., in place of W. R. Hanna, deceased.
Edward J. Miller, Newry, Pa., in place of Adam Hoover, retired.
Leo J. English, Oil City, Pa., in place of G. W. McElhatten, removed.
John H. Taylor, Port Royal, Pa., in place of F. E. Bashore, retired.
Mary D. Bacha, Rixford, Pa., in place of W. F. Shuman, retired.
Lester I. Heist, Robesonia, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
Claude B. Arnold, Rome, Pa., in place of R. K. Valentine, retired.
John Kenneth Long, Shippensburg, Pa., in place of C. F. Hockersmith, retired.
Lawrence A. Floro, Smithton, Pa., in place of H. C. Johnston, removed.
Rudolph Simitz, Spinnerstown, Pa., in place of Laura Lancaster, resigned.
John S. Carrier, Summerville, Pa., in place of H. F. Eshelman, deceased.
Robert E. Doebler, Sunbury, Pa., in place of Charles Kline, retired.
Kenneth C. Beener, Valley Forge, Pa., in place of Roy Wilkinson, deceased.
Charles Blaine Strickler, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of B. F. Sherick, deceased.
Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

PUERTO RICO

Efrain Poupart, Las Piedras, P. R., in place of Angeline Frias, retired.
Manuel F. Varela, San Juan, P. R., in place of G. P. DePass, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Raymond C. Holland, Tiverton, R. I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.
Richard M. Stanton, Wood River Junction, R. I., in place of E. A. Hill, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marvin F. Carpenter, Graniteville, S. C., in place of F. L. Zimmerman, retired.
Arace M. Crouch, Wallace, S. C. Office established September 1, 1950.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wayne A. Nelsen, Lake Andes, S. Dak., in place of Ruth I. Kern, resigned.
Helen Olvia Putnam, Quinn, S. Dak., in place of Knute Tennyson, removed.

TENNESSEE

Lee N. Ruch, Belvidere, Tenn., in place of Clyde Zimmerman, transferred.
Billie J. Ross, McEwen, Tenn., in lace of Fred Gentry, transferred.
William Onnie Cox, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.
Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in pl ce of H. B. Fox, deceased.

TEXAS

Walter K. Wood, Albany, Tex., in place of B. W. Bray, transferred.
George D. FitzSimmons, Jr., Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen, removed.
Dudley B. Lawson, Alto, Tex., in place of J. B. Thorn, Jr., transferred.
Albert A. Hubbard, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
Ernest H. Butts, Annona, Tex., in place of M. E. Russell, resigned.
George L. Hanke, Aspermont, Tex., in place of W. M. Robbins, declined.
Marion Lee Neal, Baytown, Tex., in place of N. B. Ballard, transferred.
James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
Noah L. Pruitt, Jr., Bronte, Tex., in place of C. G. Williams, retired.
Joseph P. Hutton, Canadian, Tex., in place of P. V. Bryant, retired.
William Marion Higdon, Canyon, Tex., in place of G. J. Harp, retired.
Benjamin W. Pearce, Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns, deceased.
Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
Marion B. Bone, Colleyville, Tex., in place of T. Y. Stephens, resigned.
Lonnie E. Nordt, Damon, Tex., in place of L. C. Nordt, deceased.
Glenn R. Prater, Dayton, Tex., in place of E. F. Gaston, retired.
John Sleeper, Sr., Elm Mott, Tex., in place of T. F. Gassaway, retired.
William M. Petmecky, Fredericksburg, Tex., in place of R. W. Klingelhoefer, retired.
Billy G. Williams, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.
Jane R. Davis, Fritch, Tex., in place of W. C. Lee, deceased.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
Holman R. Lee, Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.
Lamon Burnett, Hillsboro, Tex., in place of B. C. Jackson, removed.
John Printous Smith II, Humble, Tex., in place of I. M. Horton, declined.
Hugh S. Davenport, Hutto, Tex., in place of Oscar Humphrey, transferred.
Vernon J. Burns, Ingram, Tex., in place of J. A. Leinweber, retired.
C. G. Twilley, Irving, Tex., in place of C. E. Range, transferred.
John C. Sumner, Itasca, Tex., in place of J. C. Martin, retired.
Ronald A. Helfenstine, Kennedale, Tex., in place of Sallie Helm, resigned.
Verner O. Salmon, La Pryor, Tex., in place of H. T. Peace, retired.
Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
Edward H. Leache, McGregor, Tex., in place of J. F. Bennett, Jr., transferred.
Janet F. Young, Mabank, Tex., in place of W. M. Covey, retired.
William M. Turnbough, Meadow, Tex., in place of H. M. Welch, resigned.
Lloyd A. Adams, Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
Coleete O. Brown, Notrees, Tex., in place of C. J. Brown, resigned.
Vernon L. Naul, Overton, Tex., in place of W. A. Gillespie, retired.
Arthur R. Main, Petersburg, Tex., in place of L. M. Brashear, resigned.
Robert C. Watson, Plains, Tex., in place of Cora Read, retired.
Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.
Neda C. Holt, Pyote, Tex., in place of A. J. Sitton, Jr., resigned.
Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
Olen C. Thomas, Ralls, Tex., in place of M. G. Prewitt, retired.
George W. Kemp, Richardson, Tex., in place of W. C. Wallis, transferred.
Jimmy Reid Simmons, Rockport, Tex., in place of M. L. McElveen, removed.
Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
Dollie O. Ryon, Seadrift, Tex., in place of L. R. Ryon, retired.
Alda R. McDougal, Smyer, Tex., in place of S. W. Arnett, deceased.
Herman S. Gray, Somerset, Tex., in place of Walter Kurz, retired.
Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.
Herman W. Hawker, Teague, Tex., in place of W. J. Stringer, retired.
Frederick H. Pearce, Sr., Thorndale, Tex., in place of V. F. Norris, resigned.
Thomas N. Fair, Walnut Springs, Tex., in place of W. F. Sellers, deceased.
R. T. Savage, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.
John W. Word, Whiteface, Tex., in place of D. K. Bowden, removed.

UTAH

Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VIRGINIA

George Paschal Grindstaff, Damascus, Va., in place of W. C. Mock, deceased.

Inez P. Richardson, Fentress, Va., in place of A. L. Humphries, resigned.

Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.

Virginia G. Kiser, Grundy, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.

Joseph F. Downing, Jr., Keller, Va., in place of C. W. Bradford, deceased.

Thelma E. Addington, Nickelsville, Va., in place of R. L. McConnell, retired.

Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.

Joseph E. Bell, Smithfield, Va., in place of V. W. Joyner, deceased.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Charles E. Clarke, Frederiksted, V. I., in place of Adele Berg, resigned.

WASHINGTON

George E. Anderson, Kirkland, Wash., in place of Harvey Lewis, retired.

Walter E. Soehl, La Center, Wash., in place of Edna Smith, retired.

Marguerite H. Riggs, Marblemount, Wash., in place of Mabel Pressentin, retired.

Grace G. Kallenberger, Marlin, Wash., in place of Hans Christoffersen, deceased.

James W. Markel, Omak, Wash., in place of R. H. Mitchell, retired.

Lawrence G. Luzader, Pe Ell, Wash., in place of H. M. Walker, deceased.

Robert E. Olney, Redmond, Wash., in place of L. B. Reed, deceased.

James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.

Josiah F. Lester, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of R. H. Maus, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anna Jean Duncan, Cannelton, W. Va., in place of Roy Palmer, resigned.

Emil E. Frye, Chapmanville, W. Va., in place of D. R. Toney, removed.

Fred E. Wiseman, Charleston, W. Va., in place of J. W. Singleton, removed.

Charles Manning Smith, Charles Town, W. Va., in place of T. T. Perry, Jr., retired.

Alva O. Bailes, Clay, W. Va., in place of Marion Reed, removed.

Fred L. Byrnside, Danville, W. Va., in place of M. C. Ballard, retired.

Jesse J. Martin, Ethel, W. Va., in place of C. T. Lee, removed.

Gordon W. Spessard, Glen Jean, W. Va., in place of C. B. Smith, removed.

Loren A. Hoffman, Grafton, W. Va., in place of H. F. Courtney, deceased.

Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.

Leon D. Rishel, Spencer, W. Va., in place of W. H. Miller, transferred.

Dillard R. Walker, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of W. L. Warden, resigned.

Frederick F. Murphy, War, W. Va., in place of R. T. Hauck, resigned.

Elner F. Stutler, West Union, W. Va., in place of Oma Corder, removed.

John J. Miller, Winona, W. Va., in place of R. L. Pugh, retired.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.

Robert J. Besse, Butternut, Wis., in place of George Heiderer, removed.

Lars J. Peterson, Durand, Wis., in place of N. W. Helgoe, removed.

Alice R. Pietrykowski, Eden, Wis., in place of N. A. Braun, retired.

Roy L. Fergot, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.

Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

Harry E. Koch, Kewaskum, Wis., in place of Frank Heppe, retired.

Stanley I. Andersen, Loretta, Wis., in place of Jennie Ruid, retired.

John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.

WYOMING

George W. Nichols, Big Piney, Wyo., in place of G. L. Barp, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4, 1958:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Marion C. Matthes, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Mississippi.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Don A. Tabbert, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Roy McKinney Amos, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana for a term of 4 years.

Paul Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years.

Harold Sexton, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

To be members of the Commission on Civil Rights

John A. Hannah, of Michigan.
John S. Battle, of Virginia.
Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida.
The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana.
Robert G. Storey, of Texas.
J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Micah 6: 8: *"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."*

Almighty God, our gracious benefactor, Thou hast created and endowed us with a capacity to achieve and accomplish that which is good for ourselves and all mankind.

Grant that in their high office and vocation to minister to the welfare of humanity, our President, our Speaker, and the Congress may merit Thy divine favor and be held in honor by their fellow citizens.

We beseech Thee to bless them with the wisdom and the guidance of Thy spirit as they seek to lift and lessen the burdens which weigh so heavily upon many members of the human family.

Where there is darkness and gloom may they be the messengers of light; where there are fears and frustrations, may they be the ambassadors of courage; where there is cynicism and despair may they be heralds proclaiming a better and brighter day.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5809. An act to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor; and

H. R. 8795. An act to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1041. An act to amend 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;

S. 1538. An act 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;

S. 1706. An act 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;

S. 2114. An act 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 activities;

S. 2224. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property;

S. 2231. An act 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;

S. 2255. An act to amend section 607 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

S. 2283. An act to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2725. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 2752. An act 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;

S. 3016. An act to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates;

S. 3057. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

S. 3341. An act to extend the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years;

S. 3342. An act to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools; and

S. 3343. An act to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

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 ricefield crops, and for other purposes.

FIFTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, this is March 4, a date on which we honor the memories of many former Presidents of the United States who were inaugurated on that particular day. The specific purpose of this brief period this morning is to pay honor to one of those former Presidents.

This is the 53d anniversary of the inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt as an elected President of the United States. All over the country today, by proclamations of governors and mayors of cities, this particular date is being observed; it is being observed as part of a yearlong centennial celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

I think that in a very great sense we are not in this centennial celebration honoring so much a legend, an historical figure from the past, but a fullblooded man, a man who was prominent in our time. Some of us when we were young, some of us when we had reached maturity, many in this House, knew him personally, or were of an age to observe the great things he did for his country.

I believe there is particular significance in honoring such a man whom we can remember, because he was not cast in a plaster mold. We are aware of his strength and of his human weaknesses as well. I think all men appreciate an occasional weakness, if you will, in other men, because it makes us all kin.

A number of Members of this House desire to pay tribute to Theodore Roosevelt today, so I shall not take too much time. It would be difficult to cover the many facets of his great career. We could spend hours on his contributions to conservation, what he accomplished for our armed services in casting the mold, if you will, of the 20th century concept of those forces. We could speak of Roosevelt the soldier, the rancher, the friend of civil service, but I believe above all we think of Theodore Roosevelt as an American.

I might say in passing that today resolutions are being introduced in this House and in the Senate to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4th of this year a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship. That request could stand by itself, but we are asking it this year as a special part of the tribute to Theodore Roosevelt who was so well aware of and who accepted in his life the responsibilities of free citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], who is a member of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as a neighbor of our former President, and representing the district from which he came, I am happy to join today in celebrating the 53d anniversary as President of the United States of this American. He certainly was a great American, and his way of life has become to us the symbol of patriotism, of courage, integrity, and tenacity of purpose.

We have set aside this year, the 100th anniversary of his birth, to revitalize his inspired leadership, his teachings as a citizen and public servant, and his devotion to country.

Because the Fourth of July commemorates the achievement of our freedom as a Nation, it would seem most fitting that on this day as we give joyful thanks for all our blessings, we remember Theodore Roosevelt, the greatest teacher of the essentials of popular self-government the world has ever known.

It is with these thoughts that I join with my colleagues on both sides of the House to propose a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to make July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a rare privilege to be able to say a few words in tribute to our great President, Theodore Roosevelt. It is a fine thing that the House today has set aside this period to honor a man whose mark on history has been so indelibly made and whose many and varied contributions to our Nation have been felt throughout the years.

Theodore Roosevelt lived recently enough to be contemporary. To many this figure is legendary. And he is remembered for one or many of his qualities, be it of leadership, the strenuous life, exemplifying the joy of life, fighting for a cause, or waging war against injustice.

But to me, as a youngster, growing up in New York, I lived a neighbor's distance from this man who inspired in my mind a sort of hero worship. I admired his courage in the hard, uphill fight from frail health in childhood to a rugged man.

And we all recall his ever-timely admonition, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." The words are prophetic and meaningful, even today.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this Theodore Roosevelt centennial observance I would like to point out that the picturesque Badlands of my State are the site of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. This park, established by act of Congress in 1947, contains approximately 71,250 acres of the North Dakota land familiar to Teddy while he lived out there as a young man. One of the real oldtime cowmen of that area, the late John Goodall, remembered Teddy as of slender build, at the time weighing perhaps 145 pounds; very active and demonstrative. Outside of his keen knowledge of parliamentary law and the exactness of his speech, Roosevelt did not appear to be much different from the ordinary cowboys in those days. In later years, Roosevelt returned to the Badlands and spoke to the cowboys he had known. My friend Goodall remembered this statement by T. R.:

No free government can be secure when the officers elected to run that government are either incompetent or dishonest. The Government exists for all the people and not for a special few. No one should ask for a special privilege, but all should be granted an equal opportunity before the law.

Theodore Roosevelt was guided in his life by the very doctrines that he announced there in the Badlands, at Dickinson, N. Dak., in 1884.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in sponsoring legislation authorizing and requesting President Eisenhower to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

It is, indeed, fitting on this 53d anniversary of the inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt as President of the United States, to call upon Americans everywhere to renew their faith in freedom and to accept the responsibilities of free citizens in order that we may maintain our position of leadership in the world.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, 53 years ago today Teddy Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States in his own right. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Theodore Roosevelt was one of the best loved of all the American Presidents.

He was loved because he personified the same bursting energy that was transforming the United States into a great world power. His enormous energies are suggested by the wide range of his activities. He was a voluminous author, a New York City politician, a rancher in the Dakota Badlands, a reform police chief, a cavalry colonel, governor, President, naturalist, explorer, big-game hunter, and first American winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.

He was probably the most athletic President in our history. He led breathless newspapermen on exhaustive hikes over rocks and streams while lecturing them on the benefits of physical exercise. He took jujitsu lessons in the White House. He had boxing matches with his aides. The quiet dignity of the White House was frequently shattered by romps and pillow fights with his sons. "No President," Roosevelt said, "ever enjoyed himself as much as I have." He was probably right. And the American people loved him for it.

Roosevelt's enormous vitality and joy of life was aptly characterized by a visitor from Great Britain, John Morley, when he said, "Do you know the two most wonderful things I have seen in your country? Niagara Falls and the President of the United States; both of them wonders of nature."

Roosevelt was loved because his great achievements were the result of hard work. He was not born into genius; rather he personifies the adage that "geniuses are made, not born." He was fond of quoting Thomas Edison's "Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration."

Though his manhood was marked by robust physical stamina, as a boy he was a weak asthmatic. The first time this fearless straightshooter of the Rough Riders went hunting, be got "buck fever." His achievements were not gifts but were fashioned by overcoming his weaknesses through self-discipline and hard work.

Roosevelt was loved for his external boyishness. His last personal exploit—tracing the 1,000-mile course of Brazil's River of Doubt at the age of 55—was undertaken "because it was my last chance to be a boy."

But it was not his boyishness but his manliness that made him one of the first to see the lesson that we so slowly learned in the succeeding years. "To be prepared for war," Roosevelt used to quote George Washington as saying, "is the best way to promote peace." Roosevelt learned this lesson as a very young boy. When he was 13, two boys teased him unmercifully. Finally, he decided to fight but he found that one of the boys could easily hold him at arm's length. He immediately began taking boxing lessons and he became a good fighter. This was Roosevelt's first lesson in preparedness—a lesson he never forgot. He was one of the first to call for today's peace through strength program.

Preparedness—

He said—

deters the foe, and maintains right by the show of ready might without the use of violence. Peace, like freedom, is not a gift that tarries long in the hands of cowards, or of those too feeble or shortsighted to deserve it; and we ask to be given the means to insure that honorable peace which alone is worth having.

Roosevelt was loved because he was one of the first Americans to see the challenges and opportunities that lay ahead of this country in the 20th century. When inaugurated 53 years ago today, he said:

Much has been given to us and much will be rightfully expected of us. * * * Power means responsibility and danger. * * * We have become a great Nation, forced by the fact of greatness into relations with other nations of the earth.

He imaginatively and perceptively foresaw the tremendous explosion of American power that lay ahead and he called on his countrymen to rise to the challenges.

The true conservative—

Said Roosevelt

is the man who resolutely sets his face toward the future.

And Teddy Roosevelt's face was set toward the future.

If he could speak to us today even as he spoke on March 4, 53 years ago, he would see the next stage as confidently as he saw it then. He would say: "Oh, my fellow citizens, each one of you carries on your shoulders, not only the burden of doing well for the sake of your own country, but the burden of doing well and see that this Nation does well for the sake of mankind. Our success means not only our own triumph, but the triumph of the cause of the rights of the people throughout the world."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. I consider him one of the greatest of our Presidents. I am indeed happy to join in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of his birth. I want to congratulate the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission for arranging this memorial service today.

Theodore Roosevelt was the first President I can remember. I recall the day in September 1901, when my father came home very excited and told my mother that President McKinley had been shot. My father was very depressed over the assassination of the President. That incident made a deep and lasting impression upon me, and I heard of Theodore Roosevelt for the first time.

I recall seeing President Roosevelt on two occasions in my hometown of Trinidad, Colo. The first occasion was about 1905 when my mother took me to the railroad depot where the President's special train made a short stop. School was dismissed that day and all of the students went to see the President, who was making a trip through the Southwest. It was a day never to be forgotten.

The second time was in 1912 when Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for President on the Bull Moose ticket. His special train made a brief stop in Trinidad and he delivered a short talk from the rear platform of the train. His appearance made a lasting impression upon me. I recall his famous smile, and how he enjoyed shaking hands with the people. He had the happy faculty of knowing how to make friends.

I have always been an admirer of Theodore Roosevelt. His name implies honesty and integrity. I liked his forthright character and his fearless attitude in handling important national issues. He was known as a fighter, and never quit fighting for the best interests of our country, which contributed greatly to his popularity.

We in the West have a special reason for liking Theodore Roosevelt. The first reclamation law was passed in 1902 under his administration. He believed in developing our natural resources and was an ardent conservationist. He spent much time in the West and was personally familiar with the problem of the Western States.

Mr. Roosevelt was bitterly disappointed when he failed to obtain permission to organize a division in World War I. He was not content to have four sons in the service, but was anxious to participate in the conflict. It is said that some 300,000 men responded to his call for help, and were ready to serve with him. He suffered a severe shock when his son, Quentin, was killed in action and his grief no doubt contributed to his early death.

He was a man of great physical courage. He liked sports and hunting and was an expert boxer. He overcame some early physical handicaps and was able to lead a most active and vigorous life.

He was also a man of great moral courage. He never hesitated when important decisions were to be made. The people had confidence in his judgment and were happy to follow his inspiring leadership.

The stature of Theodore Roosevelt will continue to grow over the years. His influence will always be felt in the political life of our Nation. History has recorded him as one of our greatest Americans.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to add my voice to others commemorating the memory of one of our greatest Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt. There have been in the history of this Nation a few Presidents who have been truly outstanding. But their true greatness has frequently been held back, not from their own desires but because the events of history have not been such that their full strength of mind and character was needed.

But history set the stage for the advent of Theodore Roosevelt as a principal player. America at the close of the 19th century was emerging from the quiet pastoral existence of a small Nation into the full, rowdy, robust strength of a great power with muscles forged of industrial sinews. America, too, had emerged suddenly on the world scene as a power to be reckoned with. The great new strength of the young and vigorous

Nation had destroyed the vaunted pride of the old, decaying power that was Spain—and, in a sense, all Europe.

From a nation considered by many to be a roistering brat we had emerged a full-fledged world power.

It was at this auspicious moment in history—as the 20th century with its marvels of transportation and industrialization opened—that Theodore Roosevelt stepped forth to take the helm of statesmanship. He could have been a mediocre man and gotten by with it. But the future greatness of the Nation would never have developed. He could, had he desired, slavishly imitated and copied the fads and fashions—in dress and politics—of the older European nations. He could have betrayed this country into an immediate jousting for a position of power among those who lived by the balance of power theory.

He avoided these pitfalls. With clarity of vision and determination of purpose he led this country on a straight and true course to greatness. He devoted his time and boundless energy to the development of a powerful armed force to protect the new country as it emerged onto the world stage. And while protecting our interests abroad, he did his utmost to insure a healthy and vigorous economy at home to back the military with the materials they needed.

America was fortunate that he appeared on the scene as he did. America was fortunate, too, that in his own person Theodore Roosevelt reflected the unchained strength of character and body that was typical of the Nation he led.

We were fortunate, also, that Theodore Roosevelt believed wholeheartedly and with single mindedness in a code of simple Americanism. He expressed this in a letter once opposing a multiplicity of languages in this country. He advocated strongly the use only of English because, he said, "we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans and not as dwellers in a polyglot boardinghouse."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Theodore Roosevelt was a typical American and a typical New Yorker. The Nation during his lifetime had a personal affection for him because he made history. He was a man of action—dashing action. Although he was a man that emphasized deeds and not words, he was nonetheless a scholar with a wide knowledge in many fields. He was never classified as a scholar because he made his scholarship a constant instrument in his practical activities. He was a great thinker and used his scholarship and learning to regulate that thinking. He believed in results. He also believed in the strenuous life. He was a statesman of the highest caliber, subordinating all his tastes, all his abilities and all his knowledge to achieve success in the path he hewed out for himself, namely, political and social progress.

He was not a lawyer, yet strangely enough, was wise enough in the law to be admitted to the bar. He firmly believed in law and order but unfortunately, he was intolerant of the law's delays. He was impatient with judicial judgments, particularly when he considered them wrong. He never worried about precedents. A man of his dynamic impulses and will to achieve and ebullient personality could not be possibly held down. He readily climbed the ladder of political fame. He became a member of the Assembly of the State of New York soon after his graduation from college in 1881. He was reelected and was the youngest man in the legislature. He was the nominee of his party to the speakership. He was defeated for that office but became floor leader. He was then only 23 and 26 years of age. He became police commissioner of New York.

He was a strong advocate of civil-service reform as well as a strong opponent of corruption in politics.

He went West to the Elkhorn Ranch in 1883, to the then Territory of Dakota, and learned the ways of western life which he loved. No one could ride a bucking broncho better than he. His ranch life brought him into intimate contact with the West.

He became a Commissioner of the United States Civil Service under President Harrison and threw himself with great ardor into the work of civil service. He then became famous in his fights and feuds with politicians who wanted to use jobs as steppingstones to their selfish interests. He did his utmost to keep politics out of the civil service and developed many reforms in furtherance of the merit system. As police commissioner, he fought the gangs and labor racketeers. He descended upon the crooks and thieves like a bolt of lightning. He set the pace for future commissioners.

He then became Assistant Secretary of the Navy in 1897. The Navy was always his first love and he did all and sundry to strengthen it. With the outbreak of the war with Spain, he significantly stated:

> I leave for the front tomorrow. Everybody in Washington whose opinion I respect, the President, the Secretary, and even Mrs. Roosevelt, think I can be of more service by remaining at my post in the Navy Department, but I have always said if my country ever engaged in war, I should take part, so I am going off tomorrow.

He believed it was the duty of the United States to intervene in Cuba and to drive the Spaniards from the Western World. He wished to play his part not in Washington, but in the theater of combat operations. He became the colonel of the Rough Riders and served with great distinction. After the war, he became the center of political interest and was elected Governor of the State of New York. He was one of New York's best Governors. He then became running mate as Vice President under McKinley and was elected. He did not wish that nomination since he was anxious to be reelected Governor of the State of New York. The then Senator Platt was anxious to get rid of Roosevelt—he wanted him out of New York and to bury him in the Vice Presidency but Roosevelt would not stay buried. Roosevelt was not the one to be submerged. With the death of McKinley, he became President of the United States.

The White House had seen many Presidents and their families, but no man at all like Roosevelt had ever been there before. He had an energy that was contagious. Rudyard Kipling once said that while in Washington he was listening to Roosevelt at the famous Cosmos Club. Roosevelt would "come and pour out projects, discussions of men and politics, criticism of books, in a swift and full-volumed stream, tremendously emphatic and enlivened by bursts of humor."

> I curled up on the seat opposite—
>
> Said Kipling—
>
> and listened and wondered, until the universe seemed to be spinning around and Theodore was the spinner.

As a President, he gave us the Square Deal; he was the happy warrior, the man who never forgot the "forgotten man." His handling of the business at the White House was a model of efficiency. His administration was crowded with achievements of national and international significance. We owe to him the Panama Canal. In a sense, after 100 years of conversation, he built the canal. In a speech at the University of California on March 23, 1911, he said:

> I am interested in the Panama Canal because I started it. If I had followed traditional, conservative methods, I should have submitted a dignified state paper of probably 200 pages to the Congress, and the debate would have been going on yet. But I took the Canal Zone, and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the canal does also.

Roosevelt was always careful in his appointments and gave them full opportunity to do their work. When that work clashed with private interests, he stood firmly behind his appointees against political and financial pressures of every kind. He never asked his men to do anything that he was not ready to do himself. He was his own severest taskmaster. He was accused of usurping Executive power; but frankly I believe that he, like the Roosevelt who followed him, sincerely and necessarily broadened the use of Executive power.

When he knew he was right and others sought to worst him, he burst the chains of political allegiance. Witness his formation of the Bull Moose Party with the slogan of the right of the people to rule, sometimes also called the Progressive Movement. He used the Presidency as a pulpit from which to preach on many and different subjects which were not within the Federal jurisdiction. One just could not keep down his effervescence. If he had something to say, he would say it.

He was a great friend of labor and believed in the organization and recognition of labor unions. He was a statesman who followed public opinion just as a coachman follows his horses—having a firm hold of the reins and guiding them. He believed in the immigrant and sought to better their conditions. To him "immigration was the sincerest form of flattery." No man that ever lived had a greater courage, whether fighting vested interests and big business or holding up his musket at a charging tiger in the bowels of Africa.

We love him for the enemies he made.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, Congress today observes the anniversary of taking the oath of office of one of America's great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt.

As a young man this great leader sought the prairies of the Dakotas to regain his health. Not only did he leave his mark on North Dakota, but likewise upon South Dakota, and particularly in my Congressional District.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who sponsored the Orman Dam and reclamation project near Belle Fourche, the first Federal reclamation project in the United States. Not only did he leave his mark in conservation, in the preservation of wildlife, and so forth, but also did he leave his mark in government. He said:

Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood—the virtues that made America. The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

Americans can well afford to study and reflect on the rugged, individual life of Theodore Roosevelt today, the kind of a life that has made America great.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, if we attempt to find one word that most clearly characterizes Theodore Roosevelt, perhaps that word would be "vigorous." We know he had much physical and moral courage; we know he had steadfast integrity and devotion to public office; there are a long list of attributes which he possessed but there was a dashing action about him that makes him stand out among our leaders of the past as a vigorous, forceful man.

Oddly enough, he was frail as a child, and knew much illness before finally, as an adult, developing a more robust health. He loved nature and the outdoors, and as a youth had a desire to be a naturalist. He knew personal tragedy, but perhaps that was an element in forming the resolute character which marks him so clearly in our history.

He put his stamp on the period of our history in which he lived, and in many cases his remarks clearly state American ideals. He said:

I want Uncle Sam to be peaceful; I want Uncle Sam to show scrupulous regard for the rights of others; but I want to see Uncle Sam owe his safety to two facts; in the first place, that he will do nothing but good to men, and, in the second place, that he will submit to wrong from no man.

As one who had proven his personal courage in the charge of San Juan Hill and elsewhere, his comments on defense policy are worth noting.

The only permanently efficient type of defensive—

He said—

is the offensive.

It would be interesting to have his reaction to the situation we have found ourselves in during the cold war, and with the advent of missiles and atomic weapons. Undoubtedly our retaliatory power has done much to deter the Communists from recklessness; but we are faced now with trying to decide how much of our defense spending should go for missiles for offensive strength, and how much for antimissile missiles for defense.

The restless vigor which drove him in each undertaking was expressed in these remarks:

I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life, the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife; to preach that highest form of success which comes not to the man who desires mere easy peace, but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph.

There is expressed the call of the wilderness to the first settlers, and of the farmlands and plains to the pioneers. He noted that no nation can be truly great unless the average man is a pretty good person, and that it could not reach its greatest achievement unless the average woman is a pretty good person, too.

Perhaps Teddy Roosevelt could be termed an impatient man, but it was the same type of impatience which made Americans insist that obstacles be overcome. We insisted that nature be tamed and its productivity turned to man's uses; that disease and deprivation be relentlessly attacked; that injustices be corrected and that men be given the fullest opportunities in a life of freedom.

His devotion to public life is summed up thus:

The test of a man's worth to the community is the service he renders to it, and we cannot afford to make this test by material considerations alone.

He added that "character, in the long run, is the decisive factor in the life of an individual and of nations alike." We have been extremely fortunate in the United States to have had so many men of the stature of Theodore Roosevelt to shape and form our national character.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 53 years ago today Theodore Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States in his own right. Facing a vast throng assembled before the east front of this building, he declared:

My fellow citizens, no people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours, and this is said reverently, in no spirit of boastfulness in our own strength, but with gratitude to the Giver of Good who has blessed us with the conditions which have enabled us to achieve so large a measure of well-being and of happiness. To us as a people it has been granted to lay the foundations of our national life in a new continent. We are the heirs of the ages, and yet we have had to pay few of the penalties which in old countries are exacted by the dead hand of a bygone civilization. * * * Much has been given us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. * * * We know that self-government is difficult. We know that no people needs such high traits of character as that people which seeks to govern its affairs aright through the freely expressed will of the free men who compose it. But we have faith that we shall not prove false to the memories of the mighty men of the past.

In these notable words Roosevelt at once proclaimed his enduring faith in the great heritage which has come down to us from the past, and his awareness of the responsibility we owe to ourselves and our posterity.

In the more than half century which has elapsed since Theodore Roosevelt became the 26th President of the United States, we have had reason to recall the truth of the words I have just quoted. Twice, in two mighty world wars—Roosevelt barely lived to see the victorious conclusion of the first—we as a people have been called on to defend our heritage; we have passed through the fiery ordeal, and if our national existence has not been immediately threatened, we have had it brought home to us with terrifying emphasis that in the perils and complexities of this world today we cannot live to ourselves alone.

This year we celebrate the 100th anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth. It seems strange—especially to those who knew and loved him—to think that Roosevelt could have been born so long ago, but that is only another way of saying that his greatest qualities are, and will remain, timeless.

Let us, therefore, reverently and with abiding gratitude, turn our thoughts backward today toward a gigantic figure who, once upon a time, dwelt and labored among us, who preached—

Not the doctrine of ignoble case, but the doctrine of the strenuous life, the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife; that highest form of success which comes, not to the man who desires mere easy peace, but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph.

That is the legacy Theodore Roosevelt bequeathed to us.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Committee of Sponsors of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Observance this year, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to this great American on the occasion of the 53d anniversary of his inauguration as President of the United States. We will celebrate the centennial of Theodore Roosevelt's birth later this year, but we pause today to give due recognition to the anniversary of his inauguration.

Particularly as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives it seems fitting to honor the memory of this great President, who, in his day when confronted with a new situation in world affairs, was foresighted enough to realize the profound international changes that were occurring. No longer was our country able to remain aloof and take international stability for granted. One of Theodore Roosevelt's greatest contributions was his recognition and insistence that the United States must play a new role on the international scene in his day. We have lived to appreciate the value and wisdom of Theodore Roosevelt's belief.

We, therefore, honor Theodore Roosevelt not only as a great statesman and a great President, but also for his many concrete contributions to the public welfare and our country as a whole. We honor him for his patriotism, his leadership, and his courage.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, history is replete with personalities demonstrating qualities of leadership in adapting the resources and human potential to needs of the times.

The beginning of the present century produced a public leader possessed with the spirit of progress and endowed with the personality, energy, and drive needed to enlist his people in a forward America movement.

Theodore Roosevelt was a man of vision, energy, and persuasion. His contribution to the economic expansion of the Republic was outstanding.

It is altogether fitting that loyal Americans pause to pay him tribute on this, the centennial of his birth.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Theodore Roosevelt who was inauguarted President of the United States 53 years ago today. We are all proud of Teddy Roosevelt's record which stands as a monument to leadership. I wish to include a recent column by George E. Sokolsky entitled "Theodore Roosevelt Centennial."

The article follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Not enough is being made of the fact that next October the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt will be celebrated. The particular era in which we live historically starts with Theodore Roosevelt, and while a younger generation may feel closer to another Roosevelt, it was Teddy who stirred the Nation with his overpowering personality, his physical dynamism, his intellectual forensics, and his intense nationalism.

Theodore Roosevelt was a nationalist, one who believed in America first and practiced it all the time. He was President when this country was still in its upbuilding stage and he was unapologetic in his assertions of its strength. He talked like a warrior but kept the peace. He moved through his Presidency with pride, dignity, and courage, and accepted no second place for his country.

Like all Roosevelts, both the Oyster Bay and the Hudson River varieties, Theodore came of a middle class, old Dutch family, of not too great means but enormous respectability. His father had been a bond broker and collector of the port of New York; his mother was the daughter of Maj. James S. Bullock, a Confederate officer in the Civil War. Teddy went to Harvard, from which he was graduated and immediately entered Republican politics on the grassroots level. He was elected to the assembly but his health was poor and he went west to the little Missouri to be a cowboy on a ranch, thus establishing his love for the great outdoors.

His major interest, however, continued to be politics. He ran for mayor of New York City but was defeated (1886). He was appointed to the Civil Service Commission where he served 6 years, thus getting a valuable experience which served him later when he became President.

What brought him into direct line for high office was his very dramatic career as president of the New York City Police Board.

The top Republican politicians in New York wanted to get Roosevelt out of their hair. They had the President appoint him Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He directed naval operations during the Spanish-American War for a while but finally organized the Rough Riders, and served as its lieutenant colonel.

At any rate, it was the colorful Roosevelt of the Rough Riders who was elected Governor of New York to the chagrin of the boss, Tom Platt. Platt immediately set about getting rid of him by having him nominated to the Vice Presidency in 1900. Mark Hanna did not want Roosevelt but Teddy had by now become the most popular figure in the Republican Party. The politicians thought they were rid of him forever, as Vice Presidents do not usually have much of a role in American life.

However, President William McKinley was assassinated and Theodore Roosevelt became President on September 14, 1901. His administration was a lively, exciting one. Roosevelt read everything, knew everything, knew everybody. He made the White House a center of American culture. He freed the Republican Party from the bossism which held it tightly in the control of monopolistic businesses. He stimulated a public interest in government. He sent his son, Quentin, to public school in Washington and shocked the fancy people of Washington. He entertained Booker T. Washington, a Negro educator, in the White House. He is the author of the Panama Canal.

Teddy Roosevelt—nobody called him Theodore—was President until 1909 when his friend, William Howard Taft, succeeded him. Roosevelt went hunting in Africa, returned to edit The Outlook and, quarreling with Taft over basic principles, he organized the Progressive Party, better known as the Bull Moose, and ran against Taft in 1912, thus paving the way for Woodrow Wilson to be elected President of the United States.

His career was so full of action, of effervescent living that it is not always remembered that Theodore Roosevelt was one of the most constructive Presidents in American history.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ALBERT W. CRETELLA, of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM T. ROY

Mr. PRESTON assumed the chair.

Mr. RAYBURN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the end of the service of one of the most capable and faithful employees the House of Representatives ever had. I refer to my good friend William T. Roy who retired on that day.

Bill Roy was born in the District of Columbia in 1901. He served in various capacities and then during the Speakership of Mr. Longworth he was made assistant to our great Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Deschler. In that capacity he served for approximately 27 years.

Bill Roy, in my opinion, was one of the most capable men that it has ever been my privilege to have around. Many times I would say to him: "Congress passed a law 10 or 15 years ago" about a certain thing. "I do not know that you can remember the number of the bill or anything like it." But in 10 minutes Bill Roy would have the statutes on my desk and open to the place where the law appeared.

Bill Roy was faithful, he was kind, intelligent, energetic. I shall never cease to regret, as closely as I have worked with him, that he will not be in the House and serving the House as long as I am here.

To him in his retreat in Florida I trust that he will be restored to complete health, that he may be happy and contented for the remaining years of his life. I wish him a happy birthday on this the 4th of March 1958.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with our beloved Speaker in expressing my deep regret at the resignation of Colonel Roy, and at the same time I would wish him a very happy birthday, this being the anniversary of his birth. I agree with the Speaker that no man served with greater fidelity or greater ability than did Mr. Roy. He was dedicated to his work and for many years rendered conspicuous service. During my two terms as Speaker, he was of powerful assistance.

The House has lost a very able employee. It has lost the services of Mr. Roy only because of ill health; no other reason, I am sure, would tempt him away from the House he loved. We all regret his going and we all hope for him many years of happiness in the new home in Florida he is to establish. He has well earned a period of rest and we hope he will regain his old rugged health.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Bill Roy was a dedicated man in his service to this body and through his service to this body to the people of the United States. The fact that the Speaker of the House has taken the floor to express himself in relation to the retirement of Bill Roy is the best evidence of the value that we placed upon Bill Roy's services and the affection and esteem we had for him personally as assistant to our great Parliamentarian Lew Deschler, the greatest parliamentarian in the world.

Bill Roy rendered invaluable services. He had the confidence not only of Mr. Deschler but the confidence of the leadership of both parties in the House of Representative throughout the 27 years, approximately, that he served in the responsible position of Assistant Parliamentarian to the House. To Bill Roy in his retirement and to his loved ones I extend my best wishes for many years of happiness and success, and particularly that God will look down upon him and improve his health very rapidly.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join our illustrious Speaker, who has just finished his 45th year in this body, in paying tribute to one of the finest, ablest and most courteous officials of this House, Bill Roy. Never in all my life have I

known a person more accommodating, more appreciative of the other fellow's problems, than Colonel Roy.

One of the great parliamentarians of the country, he has served as the strong right hand of our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, for many years.

From the time I was a new Member in this body I have always been able to go to Mr. Roy with my parliamentary and legislative problems and I have always received from him not only sympathetic and genuine interest, but able and reliable counsel. I shall miss him when he leaves. As he departs, I extend to him my very best wishes for many happy and useful years in whatever endeavors he may undertake in the future.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the distinguished Speaker and the other gentlemen who have paid this fine tribute to Bill Roy, as we commonly called him. I understand he has been on the Hill for 35 years, 27 years of which he has served as an extremely able assistant to our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. His service has been outstanding not only by virtue of his ability but also his loyalty to the position which he occupied. He has had at all times an intense interest in the many Members of the House who have served here over the years. He loved the Congress and served well the different Members, regardless of their political affiliations. At all times he was willing to be of help to all of us. I think of Bill Roy not only as an Assistant Parliamentarian, but I also think of him as a personal friend. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to become acquainted with him both officially and unofficially. Now, after retiring from labor so diligently performed, I trust that the good Lord will bring to this splendid man peace and contentment in the years ahead.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned with the deepest regret of the retirement of Colonel Roy from the service of the House.

I think that no one since Asher Crosby Hinds, with the possible exception of Mr. Deschler himself, has understood so fully the theory of parliamentary procedure or been able to express so accurately with his facile pen the fundamental principles of parliamentary law.

I am myself under deepest personal obligation to him. Frequently in the preparation of parliamentary work he has been of invaluable assistance. And he worked indefatigably on any parliamentary problem presented to him by any Member of the House.

Through the years he has taken from the shoulders of Mr. Deschler much of the work not directly connected with the offices of the Parliamentarian and the Speaker, but which must necessarily be handled by the Parliamentarian of the House.

I do not know of any member of the staff of either House of Congress who will be so greatly missed and whose retirement will carry with it deeper regret on the part of the membership of the Congress than that of Colonel Roy.

I join with the Members of the House in expressing regret at his leaving; in the expression of appreciation of his long friendship, in the wish that he will soon be restored to health and in the hope that the best of life still lies ahead of him.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join with you and with our colleagues in the House of Representatives in commendation of the outstanding work of William T. Roy, and in extending my very best wishes to him upon his retirement from the position of Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives. Colonel Roy, as he is affectionately known, has every reason to be proud of the record he has established in one of the most difficult positions in the legislative branch of the Government. I have no hesitancy in saying that the service which he has rendered has made significant contributions to the public interest. There are few people, except close students of Government and those of us here who can appreciate the high importance of the positions of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, and the crucial nature of the decisions which they are required to make in rendering advice to the leadership and the Members.

Our legislative system has been the subject of commendation and admiration of students of Government not only in this country but from abroad, and the positions of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives are truly key staff positions.

Colonel Roy has brought to bear on his duties a professional competency, high intellect and dedication to the public interest which we all admire and of which he can always be proud. Colonel Roy was working for the House of Representatives when I first came to Congress. On many occasions he has rendered assistance and advice to me in innumerable ways. I have always found his advice and counsel to be sound and dependable.

I regard him as a great friend and a valued public servant. He has labored long in the vineyard and deserves a period of well-deserved rest and an opportunity to devote time to personal pursuits, and to his family.

I extend to him my sincerest best wishes upon his retirement. I join with all my colleagues in commending him for his many years of faithful, efficient and diligent work in the public interest.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving as an elected Representative of the people in the Congress of the United States is that we are accorded the experience of meeting staff assistants who are outstanding in ability and dedicated in patriotism. One of these outstanding staff assistants is a man to whom the House is paying deserved tribute today. I refer to that great American, Col. William T. Roy, who has served with distinction in various offices in the Congress but who has particularly distinguished himself as an Assistant Parliamentarian in the United States House of Representatives.

Colonel Roy has lent increased meaning to the term "public servant" by his outstanding ability and the conscientious manner in which he employed that ability to further the best interests of his fellow countrymen. As an officer in the United States Army and as an official the United States House of Representatives, Colonel Roy has comported himself in the finest tradition of public service in behalf of his Nation in times of war and in times of peace. That Colonel Roy now finds it necessary to retire is a cause of regret to us all, but it is a retirement that is well earned. We express the hope that Colonel Roy will find opportunity to come back to visit us often.

I would take this occasion to express to Colonel Roy my heartfelt appreciation for the great services that he has consistently rendered to me. I, as one Member of the House of Representatives, will miss his wise guidance and counsel. I know that I speak for the entire membership of this distinguished body when I wish him well in the years to come.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I somehow find myself totally unprepared to accept the announcement of the retirement of our distinguished Assistant Parliamentarian, Col. William T. Roy. He has been such a pleasant fixture in the daily life of the House of Representatives that we will find it most difficult to become reconciled to his absence.

One of the things that endeared Bill Roy to the membership of this body was the fact that he had a genuine love for the House of Representatives. He was extremely jealous of its prerogatives and its traditions. He lent himself freely to the proposition that the House should at all times fulfill its mission in high dignity and full responsibility. He was quick to remind Members, in a respectful way, of what proper procedure was. He gave counsel and guidance to us on so many, many occasions to assure that the procedure was not only in keeping with the rules, but in accordance with custom and propriety.

Truly our friend has made a great contribution to the legislative branch of our Government and to the Nation he loves so well. When illness demanded the absence of our Parliamentarian, Colonel Roy filled this position like the veteran that he was. The House has indeed been blessed with having two remarkably capable Parliamentarians in the persons of Mr. Lewis Deschler and Colonel Roy.

The people of the Nation do not understand, generally speaking, the important role of the Parliamentarian in the House. He must be an individual fully capable of being completely impartial. Many people would find this

trait difficult to develop. He must be a man with a brilliant intellect. He must, by his conduct, demand the respect of every Member and officer of the House of Representatives. Colonel Roy possesses all of these attributes.

The retirement Colonel Roy seeks is well deserved. In the peaceful inactivity he expects to enjoy he can be happy in the thought that the good wishes, love, and admiration of the entire House of Representatives and its officers are with him constantly.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Bill Roy grieves me much. He is one of the finest, cleanest, men that I have ever known. He was and is a constant inspiration to me by his cheerfulness and the life that he lived. Time after time he made the cares of my job lighter by good cheer and good-natured kidding. He was a tower of strength to all of us.

I wish for him and his loved ones in retirement, the best that life affords—good health and happiness. I hope our paths cross again.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly was sorry to learn this morning that my dear friend, Bill Roy, has decided to retire as Assistant Parliamentarian of the House.

We all knew, of course, that he had not been feeling well of late, and we had missed him working with Lew Deschler and the presiding officer of the House.

Over the years he has been a fixture in the House of Representatives and has contributed in great measure to the parliamentary success of much important legislation.

Bill is one of the most affable men I have ever met, and certainly I am just one of countless Members of Congress whom he has been considerate of and has helped and assisted.

In 1952 I had the pleasure of making a trip to the Far East with him, and we became very close companions on that trip.

I sincerely hope that the days ahead will afford Bill the much-needed rest and relaxation he so deserves; but I am sure his deep affection, happy memories, and sincere interest will always lie with the House of Representatives of the United States that he served so well.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that William T. Roy, Assistant Parliamentarian, is leaving us. I am sure the reason must be an overriding one like illness. He seemed quite happy in his assignment with us. I take it that his physical condition requires this change. His work seemed congenial to him. He always seemed happy and contented. A happy man does his best work. Bill always rendered exemplary service. No task was too burdensome, no chore too heavy. He was ever responsive to the needs of the Members.

I frequently consulted him. He always with tact and wisdom unraveled knotty parliamentary problems.

He served in this House for many years, 27 of them as assistant to Lew Deschler. He was Lew's right arm.

Bill will be sorely missed.

Wherever fate will take him we wish him and his dear wife happiness and good health.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men I met when I came to Congress in 1944 was Bill Roy. Since that time it has been my pleasure to enjoy his friendship. I have never known a finer man, he was honest, able, and courageous at all times while serving as an officer of the House. Many, many times in his courteous way he was most helpful to me. I shall certainly miss him after his retirement and I join his many other friends in wishing him a well deserved rest, happiness and good health for many years to come.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep regret concerning the retirement last week of my good friend William Roy, who served this body so long and so well as Assistant Parliamentarian.

Colonel Bill will be fondly remembered by every one of us who has been privileged to work with him, Republicans and Democrats alike, as a man who was unceasingly devoted to his job and who took great pride in his work.

In his 35 years on the Hill, his ready smile and his friendly way have earned him countless friends, and his integrity, his sound judgment and his valuable advice have won him the lasting admiration of us all.

As Colonel Bill leaves us now for sunny Florida and a much-deserved rest, I know he carries with him the warm best wishes of us all, and the gratifying inner-knowledge of a job well-done.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with those who are sorry to learn that Col. Bill Roy has elected to resign his position as Assistant Parliamentarian. While we have missed Bill being around here, it was my understanding that he was recovering from his recent illness and I was looking forward to seeing him back at his familiar place in this Chamber within a short time. Like so many other Members I became acquainted with Colonel Roy shortly after I came to Congress and from that time on relied on him for advice on parliamentary procedure. Never have I found a friend who had more patience or understanding, or who seemed more anxious to answer my questions or help me with my problems. I will miss Bill Roy's presence and it is my sincere hope that he will shortly be restored to his usual good health. Bill does deserve a rest, and I want him to enjoy his retirement to the fullest extent. I hope that with the relief of responsibility he will cease to worry, and will soon be back here to visit with us, without having to be bothered with our problems.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the more than 22 years I have had the honor and privilege of representing the First Congressional District of Alabama in the Congress of the United States, I have never met a more helpful and cooperative officer of this House than my good friend, Bill Roy. Bill has visited me down in Mobile and on the beautiful and historic Fort Morgan peninsula, and we enjoyed having him and his lovely lady with us.

We will sorely miss Bill in this House, but we are all happy for him that he has retired to that land of eternal vacation and enjoyment, Florida.

We salute you, Bill Roy, on the occasion of your 57th birthday. May you enjoy many, many more years of happiness and may your health continue to improve. God bless you, Bill.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret that I learned today of the retirement of my good friend, Col. William T. Roy, Assistant Parliamentarian of the House. Colonel Roy is one of the finest persons I have ever known. He was always courteous, friendly, and helpful. He will be greatly missed by his many friends, and all of us wish for him the best of health and happiness during the years to come.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the announcement of the retirement of Col. William T. Roy, and I take this occasion to make a few remarks. Colonel Roy, in his capacity of Assistant Parliamentarian, has endeared himself to every Member of the House because of his ability and his friendly attitude to each of us.

During the 16 years that I have served as a Member of the House, I have had many occasions in which it was necessary to consult with Colonel Roy regarding questions of parliamentary procedure. Upon all of these occasions his advice has been wise and helpful. All of us will miss Colonel Roy, and I wish to express my personal appreciation for his fine and loyal service to me during my time of service.

I extend to Colonel Roy my best wishes for his good health and happiness during the years of his retirement. He has earned from a grateful membership our best wishes and our continuing appreciation for the 35 years of able service to the House of Representatives.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed to learn that my old friend, Col. Bill Roy, has retired. His devotion to duty and his long years of painstaking effort as Assistant House Parliamentarian have not only deprived him of much relaxatien but they have also taken their toll of his health.

Much as I hate to see him leave, I would as his friend of many years urge him to do exactly what he has done, namely, to take it easy and get himself to feeling entirely well again.

As we bid him goodby from the Halls of Congress, where he has worked for so long, a great many of us recall the years when he has been ready and willing to advise us in the complicated parliamentary procedures. I, for one, recall his unfailing good nature when younger Members of Congress have come to him seeking advice which he might have said was out of his line of endeavor.

I shall miss him, and I shall console myself in the loss only with the thought of how richly he deserves his rest and what a lot of fun he should have for the balance of his life to compensate for the things he has done for his country.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with other Members of this body in wishing the best of everything to Bill Roy whose retirement has just been announced.

As an Assistant Parliamentarian for 27 years out of his 35 years' service here on the Hill, Bill has rendered a great service to all of us and has guided many of us through the intricacies of parliamentary procedures.

I have enjoyed my associations with Bill Roy, both in business and pleasure, and always found him ready to lend a helping hand. I know we will all miss his presence and assistance and without doubt the House of Representatives will suffer a great loss in his retirement.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in these wonderful tributes which have been paid here on the floor today to our wonderful friend, Col. William T. Roy, whom we all know as Bill Roy.

All of us who had an opportunity to be associated with him regard him as a friend, anxious to be helpful, willing to go out of his way to encourage young Members, and always faithful to the traditions of the House of Representatives.

While we regret to see him retire, he has our best wishes for a happy life in the days to come.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the influence for good exerted by Col. William T. Roy, as Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 27 years, simply cannot be calculated. It was a type of service that came through admirable patience, great wisdom, and supreme tact. His talents were many and appreciated, but in one sense they were hidden from the general public and the great mass of the American citizenry, although his skills and knowledge benefited all Americans eventually.

His profound knowledge of orderly procedure in Government came from exhaustive study and research and his position as one of the leading parliamentarians of the world was recognized amply by other governments than our own. His help to a multitude in the Congress since 1931 was not only expert, but generous. One of the aspects of his personality which endeared him to so many was that he imparted from his great store of knowledge with kindly cooperation, when it could have been given with the air of a harassed teacher, which he often was. The work of Col. William T. Roy is embedded firmly in the majority of the laws which have benefited the American people, through their elected Representatives.

Colonel Roy's talents aided many new, modern governments, for he was consulted in establishment of parliamentary procedures by Western Germany, Vietnam, Japan, Korea, and other new republics. To these he gave solid counsel and in doing so shared American ideals of popular government and governmental obligation to the people of these countries. He was a most astute ambassador of Americanism in many places.

As a parliamentarian he brought peace and order in many a Congressional dispute and debate. If in his retirement, he achieves only a fraction of the peace, content, and good will he spread around the House of Representatives for 27 years, we who appreciate his efforts and cherish his friendship, shall be content.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we learn from our distinguished Speaker that the Members of the House of Representatives will no longer have the benefit of the services of one of its most conscientious and able workers. Col. William T. Roy, the First Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, has decided to retire from a most active life. This news comes as a great shock to me and I know it is a great loss to the House of Representatives.

Bill Roy was a real help to all Members of the House. He was also a particularly great and devoted friend of mine. I shall never forget his splendid cooperation when we had the Flag Day services for the first time in the House of Representatives. He arranged with the various services in the Department of Defense for the personnel to appear on the House floor. Neither shall I forget the pride on his countenance when the flag entered the Chamber for the first time on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when we heard the announcement of the Doorkeeper of the House, "Mr. Speaker, the flag of the United States."

Bill Roy is a gentleman in the true sense of the word. He is a most considerate, kind, and genial man. During his long years of service with us he cheerfully met every challenge in or beyond the call of duty, always showing a deep understanding of our wants and was gifted with an extraordinary ability to serve them well. He possesses the coveted trait of fostering warm, deep, and lasting friendships.

Bill has been sick for some time and has endured a great deal of pain and suffering. But this in no way diminished his many faithful services to us here in the Chamber.

He has chosen our Florida climate for recuperation and rest and it is my prayer he will receive both of them to their fullness. No one could be more deserving.

Although I am happy that Colonel Roy's working days are complete and he can now relax and enjoy a much-needed and richly deserving rest in the Florida sunshine, I shall miss the sunshine of his smile, the warmth of his friendship, and his ever-pleasant personality.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tribute being paid today to Col. William T. Roy, the Assistant Parliamentarian, who is retiring after 27 years of faithful service. It was my good fortune to meet Bill Roy shortly after I began my service in the House, and he was always most helpful and willing to be of assistance whenever I had occasion to call upon him. He has been a conscientious loyal employee whose background and vast knowledge of his complex duties will be hard to replace. Colonel Roy will be greatly missed by the entire membership of this House whom he has served so well. As he leaves us today, we extend to him our heartfelt appreciation for his many years of devotion to duty, and express the hope that he and Mrs. Roy will enjoy the years of retirement ahead in good health, and that they will be rich with contentment and happiness.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I came to work on Capitol Hill in January 1924, as a Congressional secretary, I met William T. Roy, then a senatorial aide. I liked the cut of his jib, as the sailors say, and we soon became close friends.

No one was more pleased than I when 27 years ago Bill was named assistant to Lewis Deschler, distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, and every Member of our body will say "amen" to the tributes that have been accorded Bill by Speaker RAYBURN and former Speaker MARTIN and so many others as he and his beloved wife Donna leave for what all of us want to be many happy years in retirement in the Southland.

Washington newspapers today describe Bill as the Parliamentarian with the photographic memory. He has just that and he knows every Member of both House and Senate, his background, and his record. When the Speaker or a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, wanted to refer to a precedent or a bill or an enactment of yesteryear it took Bill only minutes to pinpoint the subject matter. It is understandable why the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the author of Cannon's Precedents, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, who once was House Parliamentarian, now rates Bill alongside of Asher C. Hinds and Lewis Deschler, as among the most famous of all House Parliamentarians.

Men and women, serving in the parliaments of the NATO nations, Germany, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam have called on Bill Roy in recent years for assistance in working out practical parliamentary procedures and Bill has many dear personal friends among them.

Bill has an outstanding war record, his service in the military beginning back in 1919, when he was a buck private in the army of occupation in Germany. When he returned home he became intensely interested in helping to build up a strong National Guard organization in the District of Columbia. He rose in the ranks to a lieutenant colonelcy and the 29th Division, which he commanded, will never forget him.

What is the secret of Colonel Bill's success? A very simple one. He loves people. The Congress was his second home and how he exalted our National Legislature, its history, traditions, and prerogatives. He will long be remembered for his courtesies, his patience, his understanding, his thoroughness. He stands very high in my book of unforgettable characters.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sincerest best wishes and commendation to a valued public servant upon his retirement from an important office in the legislative branch of the Government. William T. Roy, the Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives is retiring from many years of highly efficient, able, and dedicated service to the legislative branch of the Government and to the people of the United States. Colonel Roy is one of those rare individuals who we encounter as we go through life. He has applied

all of his energy to his work, and Members of this House will attest to the dedicated nature of his service and the professional skill and competence which he has brought to bear on the important problems which have fallen within his sphere of responsibility. I have valued him over a period of many years as a close and trusted friend. He has always been ready to assist Members of this House and others with a multitude of problems arising out of the intricacies of legislative procedure. The positions of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian are among the most important positions on Capitol Hill. Decisions made by persons in these positions in rendering advice to the elected representatives of the people have an important and far-reaching impact upon the lives of all Americans.

I join with my colleagues in commending Colonel Roy for his dedicated public service and extending to him my very best wishes for a period of well deserved rest and relaxation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I was elected to the House of Representatives, I had the pleasure of meeting William T. Roy, Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, and after that time, had the opportunity to see and talk with him on many occasions and to benefit from his many years of parliamentary experience. It is with great regret that I learned of his retirement for he will be truly missed in the House of Representatives. However, my District is fortunate in that Bill has bought a home in Delray Beach, Fla., and plans to make it his permanent home, so while we have lost a very able parliamentarian in the House, Florida has gained a fine citizen. As Congressman from the Sixth District, I would like to take this opportunity of publicly expressing my great satisfaction in knowing that Bill Roy will reside in Delray Beach, and of welcoming him and his family to our district.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on his birthday anniversary to my good and able friend, the distinguished Assistant Parliamentarian, Col. William T. Roy, who has so faithfully served us for the past 27 years in the House of Representatives.

Also, it is with deep regret that I note his retirement after his many years of public service in this body.

Bill has been a hard-working, conscientious public servant during his service here in the House—always ready with his great gift of understanding, experience and ability to be helpful in any way he could. His work has been outstanding, and he has earned and deserves the hearty commendations of the Members of the House for the excellence of his performance. He has turned in a magnificent record of which he can well be proud.

Bill has been my very good friend since my coming to Congress. We certainly will miss the fine companionship which we have enjoyed with him over the years. No matter what request was made of Bill, he was always greatly pleased when any little act or deed of his added to the happiness of any of us.

It is my sincere hope that Bill's health will greatly improve and that in his retirement he will find great happiness. My wish for him is that he will enjoy all the good things in life over the years ahead.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you can correctly call a man an institution or not, but if you can, then, as far as I am concerned we have lost a gracious institution on Capitol Hill with the retirement of Bill Roy as Assistant Parliamentarian.

Colonel Roy was always a distinct credit to the office in which he served so ably through the years. There was never a hint of partisanship in his make-up, and I can say in all truthfulness that, although I have availed myself of his services time and again during my years in the Congress, it never occurred to me to ask Bill Roy his politics. I still do not know what they might be, and it does not make any difference to any of us, I am certain.

That is the way it should be among those whose responsibility it is to do the best possible job for all of us on both sides of the aisle and that is the way it has always been.

It was because of Bill Roy's strict objectivity that we could all rely with complete confidence on his word.

I will remember Bill as a fellow who was always not only willing, but eager, to go out of his way to be helpful, even when the assignment we might put to him was out of his immediate bailiwick, so to speak.

He was an agreeable, friendly, accommodating employee of the House who would figuratively tear his shirt to get any job done we might ask him to do.

I will always remember Bill, too, as a fellow with a vast store of personal knowledge and anecdotes about folks who have been among us here. They were kindly, affectionate stories, reflecting Colonel Roy's own devotion to his fellow men and to his career in the office of the Parliamentarian.

All of us will miss him, and I join with my colleagues on this occasion in wishing Bill Roy an abundance of the good things of life for many years to come.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Col. William T. Roy, as Assistant Parliamentarian, removes a faithful and loyal employee of the House and one upon whom many of us depended. Colonel Roy served all Members of the House and he did it well. I became especially well acquainted with him during the sessions of the 80th Congress when the impact of the new Congressional Reorganization Act coincided with the transfer of control from Democratic to Republican Party, and it was a very difficult time for a good many Members of the House who had never felt the responsibility that comes to a majority party. Frankly, I have no idea what Colonel Roy's politics is, but I do know that he served chairmen of committees, the leadership, and anyone else who was at a loss for information in a very fine unselfish, bipartisan manner. Like the Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler, he was dedicated and unselfish in his service.

I earnestly hope that in the balmy atmosphere of Florida his health will be improved and that he will enjoy the relaxation from arduous duty that he so richly reserves. I shall always, myself, be deeply indebted to him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was ill with an influenza virus and unable to be present on the floor when many Members joined in felicitating Bill Roy on the occasion of his birthday and expressed their sincere regrets that he was retiring as Assistant Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

It was my good fortune to meet this fine gentleman when I came to Washington a few days after my first election. No one was more helpful to me at that time, and through the years that have followed he was never too busy to give me of his time and wealth of knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House. It was therefore a shock to me to learn earlier this year that he contemplated retirement.

Bill Roy is not only a parliamentarian of unquestioned knowledge and repute; he is an oustanding American citizen. A zealous defender of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, he also knew full well the meaning of the Constitution in its relation to orderly government and the preservation of this Republic.

This public servant has made a valuable contribution to his country and I wish both he and his wife all the good things of life in their retirement.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to join with the other Members of this body today in honoring the memory of one of our greatest American Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, on the occasion of the 53d anniversary of his inauguration.

At a time when our country is seeking leadership we are more cognizant than ever of the great debt we owe Theodore Roosevelt, a man of enormous courage, forthrightness and practical idealism.

So many of the problems which beset America today are the same problems which Theodore Roosevelt and his generation faced, but the following words which he uttered over 50 years ago might well have been said this very day:

> The history of America is now the central feature of the history of the world; for the world has set its face hopefully toward our democracy; and, O my fellow citizens, each one of you carries on your shoulders not only the burden of doing well for the sake of your own country, but the burden of doing well and seeing that this Nation does well for the sake of mankind. * * *

Nowhere else in all the world is there such a chance for the triumph on a gigantic scale of the great cause of democratic and popular government. If we fail, the failure will be lamentable * * * for not only shall we fail ourselves, but our failure will wreck the fond desires of all throughout the world who look toward us with the hope that here in this great Republic it shall be proved from ocean to ocean that the people can rule themselves, and thus ruling can gain liberty for and do justice both to themselves and to others.

I am indebted to Charles L. Dufour, a widely read columnist of the New Orleans States, for reminding us in New Orleans of the special debt we owe to Theodore Roosevelt.

The year 1905 was not only the date of Roosevelt's reelection, but also the date of New Orleans last yellow fever epidemic. The city was immediately put under quarantine and business between New Orleans and other parts of the Nation came to a complete standstill. President Roosevelt took a particular interest in the progress of the fight against the disease and put every possible Federal facility at the hands of the local government.

So appreciative was the city of New Orleans that on September 16, when the epidemic had subsided Mayor Martin Behrman wired the President expressing New Orleans heartfelt thanks and inviting him to make a trip to New Orleans so that her citizens might show their gratitude. The President accepted, and in doing so not only received one of the greatest receptions ever bestowed by a city famed for its hospitality and parades, but by his very act of coming, broke the quarantine against the city and opened up normal travel and commercial relationships again between New Orleans and the Nation.

In 1924, when the old Grunewald Hotel changed owners, the new owners of the hotel received permission from the Roosevelt family to name the hotel after the man who almost 20 years before by his grand gesture had helped to get New Orleans back on her feet. The Roosevelt Hotel stands today as a memorial to a great friend of New Orleans, of America, and of freedom loving people everywhere.

MRS. MARGOT M. DRAUGHON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 1692, for the relief of Mrs. Margot M. Draughon, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "Draughton" insert "of Denver, Colo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of these small bills the gentleman from Massachusetts is going to bring up, and I suggest that he explain what they are in one statement.

Mr. LANE. The first bill I am calling to the attention of the House merely inserts in line 3, after the name of the complainant, Mrs. Margot M. Draughon, the words "of Denver, Colo." The other three bills I wish to take up following the passage of H. R. 1692 merely strike out the regular attorney's fee provisions that have been inserted in the bills by the House.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH H. WEEKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 2901, for the relief of Ralph H. Weeks, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE A. BATDORF

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 4541, for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST H. BYROADE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 5163, for the relief of Forest H. Byroade, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, in a world divided between the forces of freedom and those of tyranny, it is fitting at this time that we should recall the life of a great man who made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of human liberty. That man was Casimir Pulaski, the 211th anniversary of whose birth is marked this day.

His heroism and valiant efforts in the cause of freedom are noteworthy and memorable because he was a fighter for freedom wherever he saw injustice and tyranny. He fought courageously against overwhelming odds in striving to obtain freedom for his native land, Poland. When this goal was denied him, he threw himself unstintingly into the cause of American freedom, a cause made successful through his efforts and those of others like him. He ultimately gave his life in the American Revolution, dying on the field of battle at the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1779.

The struggle to maintain the ramparts of liberty, as General Pulaski clearly understood, is a never-ending one. Democratic institutions have ever faced a hostile world, more often than not controlled by those who have no respect for the dignity of the individual. By following his example, we have been able to defend ourselves against the despotisms which continue to plague our world today. But the battle is not won, however many victories we can point to in the past. The maintenance of our cherished way of life will require the energy and devotion of all of us who have long revered the name of General Pulaski.

Casimir Pulaski may be considered a symbol of what we understand to be the responsibility of the citizen in these difficult times. Courageous in the face of brutal and unrelenting despotic power, eager to transmit the blessings of liberty to others, and undying in the love of free institutions, he advanced immeasurably the cause of human freedom. It is our responsibility to take up his mantle and pursue the cause of liberty with the same devotion, integrity, and honor.

MILITARY DISCHARGES

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the 8 to 1 decision of the Supreme Court yesterday in two military discharge cases is another milestone in the field of individual rights. The majority opinion that the Army must be bound to base discharges exclusively on the military service of a soldier is an eloquent statement of a position which I have long believed to be a foundation of the protection of the rights of servicemen. The guarantee that inductees now have that their discharge will accurately reflect the character of the service which they have rendered as soldiers returns the nature of military discharge to its former place; that is, a certificate of service rather than an affidavit that a veteran was or was not an undesireable civilian before his military service began.

Unfortunately, the policies of the Department of Defense which are affected by the decision have taken a toll among hundreds of exservicemen that can perhaps never be fully compensated. Jobs have already been denied them, as have many legal rights. Their position in their community has in many cases been undermined.

Let us now hope that the process open to these men for correction of their discharge will be speedy and effective. Having born the brunt of what has effectively been illegal action on the part of the Department of Defense, they deserve no less than the quickest practicable relief.

REVIEW OF REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although the hearings on the Federal Communications Commission have pointed out the weak political morality of Federal Communications Commissioner Mack and the unprofessional approach of Attorney Whiteside, these disclosures of corruption have apparently served the designs of those who seek to obscure the vast areas of corruption far more costly to the public.

If Commissioner Mack was bought off by fixer-lawyer Whiteside, does this leave National Airlines free from criticism? Can it be assumed that National Airlines was innocent of the method or methods employed by its agent Whiteside in bringing home the bacon—the Miami television channel? Is not National Airlines responsible for the acts of its agent?

Mr. Mack and Mr. Whiteside are symbolic tools of corporate avarice. But why shouldn't the corporation that employed them be punished and made to show cause why it should not be cited for public contempt—and suffer a review of its capacity to operate a publicly licensed TV station or a publicly licensed airline. The Mack incident invites attention to the corruption of corporations as it does to the corruption of men.

Obscured by the Mack incident is the crying need for review of all of the regulatory commissions. The failure of the CAB to establish basic principles in rate-fare schedules is pathetically contrary to the public interest. The failure of the FCC to establish consistent guideposts in determining qualifications for broadcasting rights is equally so. The utter failure of the FPC to establish firm standards in gas-rate fixing is a most glaring disregard of the public interest.

The fact of the matter is that these commissions are merely trade organizations for the industries they are suppose to regulate. The failure to adopt fair and equitable bases for rate fixing is a deliberate industry dictated plan.

The airlines, radio, TV companies and the federally regulated utilities enjoy a bonanza of benefit by the development of weak ineffectual regulatory commissions. It is this organized ineffectuality which should be investigated because the resulting damage to the public interest transcends Commissioner Mack, Attorney Whiteside and their kind.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many with whom I have joined in introducing a joint resolution urging the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to make the observance of Independence Day, July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

In so doing, I would like to repeat the words of our great President, Theodore Roosevelt, words which President Roosevelt spoke in Newcastle, Wyo., on May 3, 1903. President Roosevelt stated that:

> In this community and in Wyoming I recognized an abundance of that spirit on which we have to rely to make our country great—the spirit of hard work, of self-reliant capacity, each to shift for himself and to unite for the common benefit.

President Roosevelt further stated:

> In order to attain to the highest degree of national success, there must be work by the Nation, there must be wise legislation, upright and honest as well as fearless and intelligent administration and legislation. But no making of laws, no administration of law, can take the place of the individual man's individual effort.

Theodore Roosevelt recognized that the West had been settled and built up primarily by the individual work of the pioneer and the successor to the pioneer. He recognized that all must steadfastly endeavor to shift and develop the laws to the new needs that from time to time arise. He was a firm believer that all of this was fundamentally grounded on the courage, the commonsense and the capacity for hard work of the average man. Theodore Roosevelt of course recognized that there were other countries with institutions like those of our great Republic, which countries nevertheless have failed to come up to the standard we have attained because they do not have the men in back of the law. As he said, "Just as in battle, it is the man behind the gun who counts the most, so in civil life it is the average man in back of the law who counts the most."

We of the West and the great State of Wyoming adhere to the principles set forth by Theodore Roosevelt and call upon the people of the United States to rededicate themselves to these principles in his memory on July 4, 1958.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

HENRYK BIGAJER AND MARIA BIGAJER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7057) for the relief of Henryk Bigajer and Maria Bigajer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Henryk Bigajer and Maria Bigajer, of 321 Division Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents the amount of departure bonds posted by Henryk Bigajer and Maria Bigajer and breached on October 27, 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 11 and page 2, line 1, strike the words "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE OF REFERENCE AND COUNSEL OF FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the pur-

chaser of certain surplus property from the United States under contract No. W-ANL (PA-1)-3614, dated May 31, 1946, and supplement numbered 1 thereto, dated June 12, 1946, between such Committee of Reference and the Central Field Commissioner for the Pacific and China, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States for such surplus property any amount over and above the sum of $1 million already paid to the United States therefor by such Committee of Reference.

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.

HEAVY AND GENERAL LABORERS' LOCAL UNIONS 472 AND 172 OF NEW JERSEY PENSION FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5219) to provide tax relief to the Heavy and General Laborers' Local Unions 472 and 172 of New Jersey pension fund and the contributors thereto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Heavy and General Laborers' Local Unions 472 and 172 of the New Jersey pension fund, created July 1, 1953, as a result of an agreement between the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, Locals 472 and 172, of the State of New Jersey and the Associated General Contractors of New Jersey, which fund has never been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries, shall be deemed to have met the requirements of section 401 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and shall be deemed to be exempt from tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 for the period beginning July 1, 1953, and ending November 8, 1956.

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.

ISAAC LIDJI, HENRY ISAAC LIDJI, AND SYLVIO ISAAC GATTEGNO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1519) for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "deduct" strike out the balance of the line, lines 1 and 2 on page 2, down to and including the word "available" and insert "three numbers from the number of immigrant visas authorized to be issued to refugee-escapees pursuant to section 15 of the act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 643-644)."

The committee amendment was 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.

MARIA DITTENBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8239) for the relief of Maria Dittenberger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Dittenberger, the fiance of Ralph Johnson Kiefer, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Maria Dittenberger is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ralph Johnson Kiefer and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the abovenamed persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Dittenberger, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the abovenamed persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Dittenberger, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Maria Dittenberger as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 527) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chan Yak Shing, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Peter Chin, also known as Chan Jung Dot, a lawfully resident alien of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anka Scirkovich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Mary Yojkovich, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kata Genero, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Mrs. Katherine Genero, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Kazuko Inoue and Takako Inoue, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Julian P. Weir, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Miho Sinko, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Hamilton Fish, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim-shun Fong shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Thomas L. Fong, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 7. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this joint resolution shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, strike out the name "Yojkovich" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Vojkovich."

On page 2, line 15, strike out the name "Miho Sinko" and substitute in lieu thereof the following "Michael Hamilton Fish (formerly Miho Sinko)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 2, line 6, after the word "natural-born" insert the word "alien."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 528) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Virgilio Fiordaliso may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Parania Mykycej and Edgars Pedraudze may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, upon compliance with such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiaries are entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (31) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Trinidad Maldonado Ortiz may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. CROWDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1283) for the relief of Charles T. Crowder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Crowder of Suffolk, Va., the sum of $5,948.69. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Charles T. Crowder against the United States arising out of losses incurred by him as a result of his failure to include in his bids for Post Office Department Star Route contracts an amount equal to the Commonwealth of Virginia's gross receipts road tax on operations covered by such contracts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 529) for the relief of certain aliens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MICHAEL ROMANOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8348) for the relief of Michael Romanoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under the immigration and nationality laws of the United States Michael Romanoff shall be deemed to have been born in New York, N. Y., in 1893.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michael Romanoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 22, 1932, upon payment of the required visa fee."

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.

MASSMAN-PATTI-TANNER AND MITCHELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1329) for the relief of Massman-Patti-Tanner and Mitchell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $17,037.98 to Massman-Patti-Tanner and Mitchell, of Kansas City, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents reimbursement of premium wages paid to employees, and State taxes thereon, for services performed in connection with the rehabilitation of the Sunflower Ordnance Works near Lawrence, Kans., under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract numbered DA-23-028-ENG-440, dated January 2, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after "1951" insert, "*Provided*, That prior to the payment of the sum provided for in this act, Massman-Patti-Tanner and Mitchell of Kansas City, Mo., shall be required to present evidence establishing that its subcontractors have been fully reimbursed for premium wages paid by those subcontractors for work under said contract."

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.

HARRY SLATKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6731) for the relief of Harry Slatkin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Slatkin, 46 East Main Street, Paterson, N. J., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Harry Slatkin against the United States, in connection with the $500 departure bond posted by the said Harry Slatkin, on behalf of Erno Kraus on January 3, 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

SPERA CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7944) for the relief of the Spera Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Spera Construction Co., of Harrisburg, Pa., the sum of $5,142.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement of increased costs incurred by it in order to expedite, at the request of the contracting officer for the United States, the time of performance of a contract to construct a fuel accessories test facility at Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa. (contract No. AFC 36 (600)-1857, dated September 17, 1954): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

CAPT. LAURENCE D. TALBOT, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8433) for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired), of Alamo, Tex., be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,072.50. Such sum represents overpayment of disability retirement for the period July 1, 1952, through December 31, 1955, received from the Retired Pay Division, Finance Center, United States Army, and the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired), a sum equal to the aggregate of all amounts which have been withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability of which he is relieved by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

DR. RAYMOND A. VONDERLEHR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9990) for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective as of November 1, 1955, the retired pay of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr under the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) shall be computed as though he had continued in the grade of Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service until the close of December 31, 1943.

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.

FELIX GARCIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9991) for the relief of Felix Garcia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Felix Garcia, of Barrio Naranjito, Hatillo, Puerto Rico, the sum of $204.65, in settlement of all claims arising out of a vehicular collision in Puerto Rico, on April 21, 1941, involving a United States Army vehicle and a truck owned by Mr. Garcia.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any contract, no part of the amounts appropriated in this act shall be paid, or delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. Any person who violates any provision of this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000.

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.

JAMES R. MARTIN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9992) for the relief of James R. Martin and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following disbursing officers and former disbursing officers of the United States Navy the amounts listed opposite their names. The amounts listed represent moneys paid from their personal funds to liquidate deficiencies incurred in their accounts, which deficiencies were not as a result of bad faith or lack of due care on their part:

Lieutenant (junior grade) James R. Martin, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $30.93; Lieutenant Carl C. Mueller, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $37.65; Lieutenant Jackson Leroy Schultz, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $45.30; Lieutenant Leroy Spratling, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $17.50; Lieutenant Commander Kern A. Ulrich, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $150; Lieutenant (junior grade) William D. Warne, Supply Corps, United States Navy, $25.

SEC. 2. The relief herein authorized shall not bar recovery from the payees or beneficiaries of the amounts improperly received by them.

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.

WILLIAM E. NASH

The Clerk call the bill (H. R. 10220) for the relief of William E. Nash.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William E. Nash, Bryan, Tex., a sum consisting of $9,945.18, representing the amount reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to House Resolution 93, 84th Congress (Congressional No. 13–55, decided January 15, 1958), to be the amount of losses of said William E. Nash suffered while furnishing architectural services (including the furnishing of certain reimbursable items) performed by him in connection with housing project TEX20–2 undertaken under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

MRS. WALTER E. VON KALINOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 573) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on claims against the United States, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski at any time within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, shall be applicable to this act.

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.

CALE P. HAUN AND JULIA FAY HAUN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 674) for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1953 of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun, the elections of said Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun, sole stockholders of River Grange Co., Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on December 24, 1953, to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, such benefits having been denied because the mailing of such election was delayed, without negligence or fault on the part of such stockholders, beyond the 30th day following the adoption of such plan.

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.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide that in the determination of the 1953 individual income tax liability of Mr. and Mrs. Haun, the sole stockholders of the River Grange Co., Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation, they should have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Under the provisions of the applicable subsections of section 112 of the Revenue Code, taxpayers who seek the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) must make an election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations, and notify the District Director of the Internal Revenue Service within 30 days after the adoption of the plan of liquidation.

Generally, section 112 provides that in the case of property distributed in complete liquidation of a domestic corporation it shall be taxed in a certain way, according to the disposition of the proceeds of the liquidation.

The Hauns, on December 24, 1953, adopted a plan of liquidation of the corporation, and elected to avail themselves of the applicable provisions of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code. However, due to a disabling cerebral hemorrhage of their attorney, Mr. Lawrence B. Howard, in July 1953, which disability has continued down through the subsequent years, the required notice of election within 30 days after the adoption of the plan of liquidation was not given. Upon the discovery of the failure to give the notice, such notice was immediately given.

It therefore appears, Mr. Speaker, that this private bill confers no special benefits on the taxpayers. The Hauns will not gain a special tax advantage by the passage of this private law. They will

gain only the benefits of the applicable statute to which they were already entitled by law. The bill grants relief as to the time of compliance with section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Taxpayers were blameless in their present plight. They advised lawyers and accountants to do everything necessary to carry through with the complete liquidation of the corporation they—Mr. and Mrs. Haun—owned, including notices of election to receive benefits of the tax laws in such a situation. And I speak with personal knowledge when I say that the 30-day notice of election required by law would have been given by the Honorable Lawrence B. Howard had he not suffered a terrible disabling cerebral hemorrhage after he advised the Hauns as their attorney the course of action to be pursued in the proposed liquidation. Mr. Howard has only partially recovered at the present time. He remains incapacitated and in enforced retirement. Taxpayers, when they learned that the notice of election had not been given in the time required by law, immediately notified the Internal Revenue Service of their election.

The Congress is empowered to grant this relief and this private law sets no precedent. The 82d Congress passed such a private law—Private Law 363, 82d Congress, chapter 576, 1st session, H. R. 1596; also S. 636, 82d Congress, 1st session.

The test is whether the taxpayer himself was negligent or at fault personally, or the error or omission occurred through no fault or negligence of the distressed taxpayer.

This is a meritorious bill, and I am hopeful that it will be passed by the House. It has already received the approval of the other body.

To penalize a taxpayer, though blameless, when others are not, is contrary to our concepts of equal justice under the law in America.

Since the Congress has granted relief to other taxpayers in similar distress, it should now give relief to Mr. and Mrs. Haun.

The effect of the bill's passage is to defer the payment of the tax upon unrealized appreciation in value of the property distributed in liquidation. The bulk of the assets of the corporation was unimproved real estate and has not been sold. When sold by the Hauns, the tax to be paid will be the same. The only difference is when the tax will be paid.

ALEX P. COLLINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 888) for the relief of Alex P. Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alex P. Collins, the sum of $2,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for refund of the amount of the bonds posted with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice in the case of his niece, Maria Karvelis, and her three minor children, Boeleta Karvelis, Martha Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis, and declared breached by such Service when the said Maria Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, Martha Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis failed to depart in accordance with the terms of such bonds although they were subsequently granted permanent residence in the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the calendar be dispensed with, due to the fact that the committee has not had reports in sufficient time to be informed about the bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11085) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and one-half of the time by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 11085, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Barden	Fulton	Rains
Barrett	Gordon	Reece, Tenn.
Blitch	Granahan	Saund
Bonner	Green, Pa.	Shelley
Bow	Gross	Sheppard
Boykin	Halleck	Shuford
Bray	Herlong	Sieminski
Buckley	Hess	Staggers
Burdick	Jenkins	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Jonas	Tollefson
Cooley	Knutson	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Vursell
Dellay	Montoya	Walter
Dempsey	Moulder	Williams, N. Y.
Dies	Murray	Willis
Engle	Passman	Wilson, Calif.
Forand	Poage	Wilson, Ind.
Frelinghuysen	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11085) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 365 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is recognized.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to the fact that we are now considering the second largest appropriation bill that will be before this House this year. Of course the largest bill is for the Department of Defense.

This bill carries a total of $23,600,000,000. Let me point out, however, that of that amount $8½ billion is for permanent indefinite appropriations, over which our committee has no control whatever. The largest item among the permanent indefinite appropriations is the item of interest on the public debt, which is estimated at $7,800,000,000 for this fiscal year, and at identically the same amount $7,800,000,000 for the fiscal year, 1959.

In addition, this bill carries trust funds, and there, again, our committee has absolutely no control over those funds. Payments are made out of those funds as provided by law, but they do have to be appropriated. It is estimated that payments out of the trust funds for 1959 will amount to approximately $11 billion, the largest items of which are that of $8 billion for old-age and survivors trust payments, and $2 billion for payments to the unemployed.

When you deduct the permanent appropriations and the trust fund appropriations from the total bill, that leaves approximately $4 billion over which the committee does have control, and upon which our committee has been holding hearings for the last month.

I would like to pay my respects to the members of my subcommittee who have

labored so diligently over this bill. There are several members of the committee who have served on it for a long time. We were distressed at the beginning of this year to learn that one of our most valuable Members, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], had suffered an illness and could not be with us; but the chairman of the full committee immediately appointed the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] to serve during the absence of the gentleman from Louisiana, and he sat on the committee throughout the hearings. Also on the committee in the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] on the Democratic side. On the Republican side is my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. The gentleman from New Jersey and I have alternated the chairmanship of this committee for a number of years, and I can say very frankly that I have never seen the judgment of the committee influenced by political motives. We have tried to keep politics out of our deliberations, because the Treasury and the Post Office are two service Departments of the Government. They have definite and important duties to perform; and, certainly, there should be no politics in connection with the appropriations for those two Departments. In addition, we have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES]. I think you will agree that we have a very able subcommittee, and I can assure you that we have an exceptionally able staff assistant in Mr. Robert L. Michaels.

We have been over this bill very carefully, and frankly, I feel like making some apologies. I believe we are recommending the smallest cut this committee has ever made.

As I stated, the combined appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the United States Tax Court, over which we have control, for 1958, were $4,026,027,000. The estimates for 1959 are $4,121,969,000. We recommend in the bill for 1959 $4,100,608,000, which means that we are recommending $74,581,000 more than was appropriated for 1958, but $21,361,000 less than was requested in the President's budget.

First let us consider the appropriations for the Treasury Department, and here I would like to pay my respects to that Department. I have said time and again that in my judgment it is the most economically operated Department in the entire Government of the United States. I want to reiterate that at the present time. This is one of the very few times I can remember that any department has come in and asked for less than it had the previous year. We appropriated last year $699,567,000 for the Treasury Department. They came in this year with estimates of $699,367,000, which is $200,000 less than last year's appropriation. I will admit that is not much of a reduction, but usually, every department asks for more money as our expenditures continue to climb from year to year. Our committee recommends $697,127,000, which is $2,440,000 less than the 1958 appropriation and $2,240,000 less than the estimates.

May I say here that by the introduction of modern methods and electronic equipment in the various bureaus of the Treasury they have succeeded in reducing the personnel in that Department by 10,000 people within the last 5 years. You will find an interesting table showing personnel changes for each of the bureaus on page 476 of the hearings.

I think I can speak for the entire committee when I say that we were very much impressed with the new Secretary of the Treasury. He appears to be imbued with the idea of economy, as had his recent predecessors, and I think we are fortunate in having at the head of our Treasury Department men who are imbued with the idea of saving money. In the previous administration, Mr. Snyder, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, set up a committee, within the Department, on management and reorganization. That committee exists to this date. It is working constantly trying to put in improvements which will add not only to the efficiency of the Department but will save money. It is producing excellent results.

As we look at the item appropriations for the Treasury Department, we find, first, the Office of the Secretary. We have given the Office of the Secretary the exact amount requested, $3,068,000, which is a reduction of $20,000 in the appropriation for 1958. I think it is fair to say for the Secretary's Office that the estimate this year includes the full-year cost of a Government actuary transferred from the Bureau of Accounts and also the salary of an Assistant Secretary heretofore financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Therefore, they are going to absorb this additional expense and still spend $20,000 less in 1959 than was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

For the Bureau of Accounts we recommend the appropriation of the amount requested, $3,110,000, which is $15,000 less than they had the year previously. The Government actuary has been transferred from this bureau to the Office of the Secretary, which accounts for that reduction.

In the Division of Disbursements we appropriated $17 million last year. They estimate $17,340,000 for 1959. We recommend in the bill $17,300,000, which is $300,000 more than was appropriated for 1958 and $40,000 less than was requested for 1959.

The reason for the increase over the present fiscal year in the Division of Disbursements is the ever-increasing number of Government checks that they have to disburse. The number of checks for various reasons is increasing every year.

For the Bureau of the Public Debt we appropriated $45,900,000 for 1958. The estimate for 1959 is $44,600,000. We reduced that to $44,500,000, which is $1,400,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1958 and $100,000 less than the request. The reason for that reduction is that the Bureau of the Public Debt, as some of you probably know, during this last year switched from paper savings bonds to a cardboard bond with perforated marks that can be handled in electronic machines. The issuance of those cardboard bonds, similar to the checks issued by the Government, is saving a tremendous amount, because they can do away with a lot of the labor in handling the bonds by handling them through electronic machines. That is a striking evidence of the modern methods, being installed by the Treasury Department, which are reducing the expense and adding to the efficiency of the Department.

For the Office of the Treasurer we appropriated $17,950,000 for 1958. They estimated the same amount for 1959, and we recommend the full amount of the request without any change.

In the Bureau of Customs the same is true. We appropriated $48 million for 1958. They requested $48 million for 1959. We recommend $48 million.

I might add here that during the year the Treasury Department felt that they could make some savings by combining 11 of the customs collection districts with adjacent districts. It was estimated that by so doing they would save $175,000 per annum. They announced these consolidations, and as soon as they did, a great protest came to the Treasury Department. Of course, every time you reduce expenditures there is a protest. But here the representatives of the various ports came in and objected to the change on the ground that private individuals and the local governments were contributing to the development of these ports and they were afraid that if the consolidations were made these local contributors would lose interest. For example, at Charleston, S. C., they had a bond issue in prospect to improve the port facilities and they were afraid that it would have some effect on the bond issue. Therefore, the Treasury Department rescinded its order of consolidation. Frankly, from the standpoint of the Treasury Department itself and the efficiency of the customs service, they can be consolidated. We recommend in our report that consideration be given to the question of charging the localities or the local interests the additional cost of operation if the localities are interested in maintaining the present setup. But it is merely a suggestion. There is nothing in the report to require it.

Internal Revenue Service: The Internal Revenue Service asked for $325.5 million, which was the amount that was appropriated for 1958. We did not cut them at all. We did deduct from that amount $3.5 million and we recommend that the highway trust fund reimburse the Internal Revenue Service $3.5 million for the collection of the highway funds. Now, frankly, I do not think that this situation is similar to the one that we had with the Labor Department at all. That involved the administration of an act.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is, of course, familiar with the specific legislation creating the highway trust fund

wherein it is spelled out that the only funds which may be used from the highway trust fund are administrative funds for the Bureau of Public Roads; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. I do not agree with the gentleman on that interpretation of the act.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, for the benefit of the gentleman I will insert the provisions at the proper time in the RECORD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that many of the highway-user funds do not go into the trust fund; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. Some of them do not, as such.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, what does the gentleman mean?

Mr. GARY. Well, I mean in addition to the highway fund we also make appropriations for the highway department and have been for years.

Mr. BOGGS. I beg to correct the gentleman. All of the funds for the construction of roads by the Federal Government now come out of the highway trust fund.

Mr. GARY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BOGGS. Then what is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. GARY. I am referring to the fact that, in addition to that, the Government makes other appropriations.

Mr. BOGGS. But not for highways.

Mr. GARY. For highways.

Mr. BOGGS. Oh, no. What other appropriations?

Mr. GARY. The Government has always made highway appropriations.

Mr. BOGGS. What other appropriations?

Mr. GARY. For building highways.

Mr. BOGGS. I would beg to disagree with the gentleman. All of the highway program is now financed through the highway trust fund. This includes the interstate program as well as the 50–50 matching program and the other programs. There are not any other appropriations.

Mr. GARY. And the money goes out of the Treasury into the highway funds. It is collected by the Internal Revenue Service and turned over to the highway funds.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not think the gentleman quite understands my point. There is a whole group of highway users' taxes; taxes on gasoline, taxes on tires, taxes on accessories; excise taxes on the sale of buses, automobiles, and trucks; taxes on lubricating oil and others. Some of those taxes go into the highway trust fund; some of them do not. For instance, not 1 penny of the lubricating oil tax goes into the highway trust fund although there is no reason why it should not. That is where it ought to go. Now with reference to this $3 million that the gentleman has in his bill——

Mr. GARY. Three million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BOGGS. Three million five hundred thousand dollars to which at the proper time I intend to make a point of order. Will the gentleman explain to me if he makes a distinction between the gasoline tax and the lubricating oil tax?

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that our committee has recommended the amount which the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service has advised the committee that it costs to collect the highway funds. If there is any mistake in the amounts, then I refer the gentleman to the Treasury Department. We are reporting to the House the amount which the Internal Revenue says it costs to collect these funds.

Mr. BOGGS. As the gentleman knows, I have a very profound respect both for the gentleman and his subcommittee as well as the full committee. I might say, however, that this is the first time the Treasury Department has ever made such a distinction. We have heard them before the Committee on Ways and Means many times, and several of us have bills which have been pending before that committee, some of which ask for just the kind of breakdown the gentleman now has incorporated into this appropriation bill. The Treasury Department invariably has said that it has no means of making this kind of distinction. How the Treasury Department can come up with a cost estimate which makes a distinction between those taxes which are not dedicated to the trust fund and those which are, is beyond me.

Mr. GARY. As I stated to the gentleman, we are using the estimates that have been given to us by the Treasury Department and I, for one, see no reason why those costs should not be paid out of the fund.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to join my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] in expressing concern over the manner in which this trust fund is being—I do not know the exact words——

Mr. GARY. It would be hard to find the exact words for this because this is a proper transfer of funds; this does nothing more than compel the fund to pay certain costs of collection. I see no reason why they should not be paid.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All I wanted to say is that I want to join my colleague on the other side of the aisle to demonstrate that this is of interest to both groups in the Committee on Ways and Means. When we get into the merits of it we can discuss that, too.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman. I would prefer not to yield any further, because I want to finish the rest of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. I feel a very vital interest in this trust fund. I think I was largely responsible for its being created and I think it ought to be kept inviolate. There is a tendency when we create a trust fund to begin to nibble into it. We eat it up and destroy it. I think this whole highway program is so important to the country at large and there is such vital interest in it that if we begin dipping into this fund and breaking it up we are going to pay a big price for it.

The other day I put a little statement in the RECORD in regard to the situation with regard to social security. We are going to face a situation there that is rather serious. Already the benefits are larger than the income there. Sooner or later we will have a tax there of a billion or so. The people can stand just about so much.

Now they have this program laid out here in an orderly sort of way. I just want to join the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and some others here in seeing that this fund is absolutely protected.

Mr. GARY. We will have ample opportunity to discuss this matter when it comes up on the floor. I would rather not yield further now.

Mr. BOGGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding very generously. I might say to him that the statement that he just made means that this will really be the first time we have had an opportunity to discuss this when we could vote on it.

Mr. GARY. There will be no disposition on my part to shut off debate in any way. I want to give everybody an opportunity to discuss the matter.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is eminently fair.

Mr. REED. May I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak my piece.

Mr. GARY. I was delighted to do so.

That was the only change that was made in connection with the Internal Revenue Service.

For the Bureau of Narcotics, we recommend the same amount we appropriated for this year, and the amount they requested for 1959, which is $3,780,000.

Here I will pay a compliment to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. The Bureau of Narcotics has done a magnificent job. I think Dr. Anslinger, the director of that Bureau, has the proper idea of the functions of that Bureau. He believes that the Bureau should operate on the international level and on the national level, and assist local officials in local enforcement. That is the only manner in which it can operate efficiently. If we ever get to the point that we try to set up in the Bureau of Narcotics an enforcement personnel to take over the entire enforcement of the narcotic laws it will cost us millions of dollars and the results will be far less effective than they are now, with the Bureau cooperating with the local authorities.

There has been a great improvement in the narcotics situation because of the recent laws that have been enacted, one by the Congress, which was sponsored by my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], increasing the penalty for violations. The Federal Government and many of the States have increased the penalties for violation of the narcotics laws to the point that we are scaring these traffickers out of business, which is a great thing. There are 1 or 2 States which are still somewhat behind in this respect, but for the most part we are get-

ting excellent results throughout the United States.

Mr. BOGGS. May I commend the gentleman and also his colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] on the very splendid cooperation they have given Commissioner Anslinger over the years. Because of the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means has the responsibility for the enabling legislation for this Bureau, I have followed this matter very carefully. I think that we for the first time are making really tremendous progress in wiping out this menace. The gentleman has helped it tremendously.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is certainly correct about the progress we are making. I thank the gentleman for his comments. It is a most important subject because nothing is more important than stopping this traffic which is destroying a great many people in our Nation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that our subcommittee would like very much to see more realistic sentences imposed by the judiciary throughout the Nation against these narcotics offenders as well as more interest and greater concern evidenced by local communities in their cooperation with these Federal agencies? It is a fearful thing, Mr. Chairman, that in the city of New York—yes, in the area in which I live, we find that 43 percent of all drug addiction in the United States is focused in that one city. That is an awful and staggering challenge to the local authorities in New York City.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I will say our committee has been cooperating with Dr. Anslinger for years on this program. I believe we are now beginning to achieve real results.

The next item is the Bureau of the Mint and there the appropriation is the same as last year, and the same as the amount requested, which is $4,300,000.

Now, we come to the United States Coast Guard. Let me say that the United States Coast Guard is an arm of the defense of this Nation. Notwithstanding that fact, it is certainly the most economically operated of all of the defense organizations, in my judgment. For operating expenses, they requested $171,700,000 which is an increase of $2,700,000 over the amount that they have available this year. We recommend the amount requested. But, I want to warn the House that the physical plant and equipment of the Coast Guard is deteriorating more rapidly than it should, and sooner or later we are going to have to spend a considerable sum of money on this item.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In connection with the statement the gentleman just made, turning to page 416 of the hearings, I would like to ask the gentleman if he could advise us as to the reaction of the committee or the action of the committee, if any, regarding the advisability of replacing the wooden dormitories of the Coast Guard Academy with buildings of a more permanent nature.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman there is a very vital need for that replacement. It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy, from the House of Representatives, for the last 3 or 4 years. Every single year we have recommended that this temporary dormitory be replaced, but we are faced with the question of replacement of that dormitory just as we are faced with every other problem. We have these tremendous expenditures to make on missiles and submarines and various other defense items. Therefore, the Treasury Department and the Coast Guard did not think that this was a proper time to present that request. Since they did not request it—although we discussed it in our committee and we told them we thought they ought to have a new building—no money was appropriated for the building. We hope that an appropriation can be made for that purpose next year. The estimated cost, by the way, is $2 million.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that the reason the subcommittee did not take action on that particular item is the fact that the Coast Guard itself did not give it a sufficiently high priority on the Coast Guard program—in other words, they did not ask for it?

Mr. GARY. It was not in the budget requests. The Coast Guard may have asked for it and the Budget Bureau may have cut it out. But, in any event, it was not in the budget requests which were presented to us. Whether the Coast Guard cut it out or the Treasury Department or the Bureau of the Budget, I do not know.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Would I gather from that that the gentleman might be friendly to the suggestion of an amendment to put in sufficient funds for the building of these dormitories and that such an amendment might be acceptable to the gentleman?

Mr. GARY. I would say it would not be this year, because I do not believe we ought to go beyond the budget request. We have done that in one instance, to which I will call attention in a few minutes, but I do hope that it can be done next year.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to point out, as a member of the Board of Visitors visiting the Coast Guard, that we toured these wooden barracks and observed the condition that existed. I would like to point out that I was shocked to find that insofar as fire protection was concerned they had a rope dangling from each window in the upper stories so that in case of fire the cadets housed in the building could get out by this rope.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I do not mean to belabor the point with the gentleman, because I know he is one of the most friendly Members of the House with regard to the needs of the Coast Guard, but is it not a fact that in the creation of the new Air Force Academy no expense is being spared to provide quarters and safety for the boys trained at the Academy, and it is regrettable that we do not exercise the same vigilance in taking care of the boys trained at the Coast Guard Academy?

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman. I hope that by next year we can get this matter straightened out.

The next item, United States Coast Guard acquisition, construction and improvements, the request was for $16 million. We recommended $16 million. Let me say that under this item we have an item of the Coast Guard that has given our committee considerable concern for a long time. That is the condition of the Coast Guard aircraft. We have felt for a long time that there has not been sufficient effort to keep the airfleet modern and safe. Therefore, we requested a modernization and replacement program over 5 years ago. Such a program was worked out by the previous administration. Then, when the present administration came in, they said they would like to study the program, which we thought was entirely proper. Since that time we have been trying for 5 years to get a proper program worked out.

Finally, a report was submitted to our committee last year after we had made our appropriation. That report recommended the expenditure of $12 million during the present year, $12 million for 1959, and $18½ million for each of the next 4 succeeding years. This year that report was modified. We appropriated $12 million for 1958. This year they are asking for only $9 million for 1959, which will mean we will have to increase the appropriation for each of the 4 succeeding years to $21,600,000. The reason for the change in the report is that a number of piston planes have been declared surplus by the Air Force. The Air Force needs jets, the Coast Guard does not. The Coast Guard officials think they can utilize those surplus planes. Consequently, we are to some extent marking time on this program to see what use can be made of those airplanes. In view of that fact our committee acquiesced in the modification of the report.

Coast Guard retired pay. That is a matter which is fixed by law. The estimated payments for retirement are $27,800,000, which is an increase of $1,400,000 over the 1958 appropriation.

Now we come to the Coast Guard Reserve training program. I daresay that the Members of the House have received telegrams on this item; I personally have had several telegrams on the program from various Reserve units.

We appropriated $15 million for the Coast Guard Reserve training program last year. We cut other items in the Treasury Department and we were informed that there was a plan to ask the Senate to give the Department the privilege of transferring funds so that they could transfer funds out of the Coast

Guard Reserve training program for these other items.

We opposed it very vigorously with the result that it was specifically provided that no transfers should be made from Coast Guard funds.

Instead of transferring the funds they froze $3,500,000 appropriated for the Reserve training program. They set that amount aside as a reserve. This year they requested only $11,500,000 for 1959. Our committee feels that if the Coast Guard is going to serve the Nation properly in a time of emergency that we should have an adequate Coast Guard Reserve; as a matter of fact, we would like to give the entire amount of $15 million. You have heard statements about the restoration to $15 million, but this committee was only requested to appropriate $11,500,000 for 1959.

What we did was this: We directed the Treasury Department to restore $1 million of the $3,500,000 they have in reserve immediately for this year; then we have added to their request for next year $1,500,000, making the item $13 million rather than the $11,500,000 requested.

In this manner we will make available to the Coast Guard $1 million more this year and $1,500,000 more next year than has been requested by the Department.

We have an item here, liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That is decreasing very rapidly. Eight hundred thousand dollars was requested for this year; only $160,000 is requested for next year because they are liquidating those funds and not as much work remains to be done.

We now come to the Post Office Department. We have increased the Post Office Department appropriations $77 million for 1959. They had $3,325,000,000 in 1958. The estimates for this year were $3,421,121,000, an increase of $96,121,000. We recommend in the bill $3,402,000,000, which is an increase of $77 million over 1958 appropriations, but a cut of $19,121,000 in the estimate. This increase is due largely to the estimated increase on the volume of mail and to an increase in railroad rates for transporting the mail.

We have cut requests for administration approximately $3 million. After the controversy that took place last year with reference to the Post Office Department appropriations the committee sent its staff over to investigate. The staff submitted a voluminous report, the major portions of which are incorporated in the hearings of our committee beginning at page 200, along with the answers of the Department to the various recommendations. It is gratifying to the committee to know that the comments of the investigating staff are met with either specific or tacit agreements in the answers of the Department.

They are now engaging in some reorganization in the Department. For example, the District operational offices and the District transportation offices are being eliminated as such. District officers and their principal aids are now designated field or mobile service officers. It may be that ultimately some 460 positions will be eliminated or vacated. That was the testimony offered before our committee. There were no deductions for estimated savings from this reorganization, and we, therefore, cut the appropriation $3 million to take advantage of estimated savings.

For operations, the appropriation for 1958 was $2,380,000,000. They asked for $2,703,468,000. We recommended $2,690,000,000, which is an increase of $71,056,000 over the 1958 appropriation and a decrease of $13,468,000 in the request for 1959. The increase is due to the increase in the estimated mail volume. We felt that the increase would not be as high as estimated for two reasons. The increase this year was estimated at 4 percent. It has only worked out to 3.4 percent. They are now estimating a 3.4 percent increase for next year. We think that with the recession, which is now recognized, and also due to the fact we are about to increase the mail rates that there will be some falling off in the volume of mail next year. We have made a cut to take care of estimated savings in that respect.

For transportation, the Department asked for $476,200,000. We recommend $475,000,000, which is an increase of $5,019,000 over the comparative appropriation for 1958 and a decrease of $1,200,000 in the request for 1959. Let me say we will probably have an increase in railroad rates. The railroads now have pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission a request for an increase in those rates and if an increase is granted the Department will have to come back and ask for a supplemental appropriation.

For facilities they asked for $237 million.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for giving us such a complete explanation of this bill. I do not know whether he can give me any information at this particular point or not, but some days ago when the President announced a building problem, so many people in my district seemed to think that they were going to get new post offices. A lot of them seem to think I am the reason they are not getting those new post office buildings. Can the gentleman tell me whether his committee, in the nature of the work they deal with, had occasion to talk about a post office building program and if the gentleman can give me some information?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we talked a great deal about that matter, I may say to the gentleman from Florida, but the facts are that program was advanced on the theory it would be handled under the lease-purchase program. That program, as the gentleman knows, was authorized by a law which has expired, so that it will have to be reenacted before any post offices not already approved under that program can be built. Before there can be any appropriations for a post-office-building program it will first have to be authorized by legislation, because there is no authorization now for expenditures for new post offices. Our committee cannot make any appropriations until we are authorized to do so. But in the facilities, as I stated, they asked for $176,503,000. We allowed $175 million, which is a reduction of $1,503,000.

The Tax Court of the United States is also in this bill. They had appropriated for their use this year, 1958, $1,460,000. They asked for $1,481,000 for 1959. We recommend the full amount. There is a difference of only $21,000 for the estimated additional cost of office personnel during the next year.

We feel that we have presented to the committee a reasonable bill. There are some items I would like to see increased. Very frankly, I would like to see the Coast Guard item increased, but I do not believe that at this session of the Congress we can begin to appropriate more money than has been asked for. There are other items that I would like to see cut to some extent. But this has been worked by a unanimous vote of our committee, and I submit it to you as such with the hope that it will be approved by this body.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes. Mr. Chairman, I have a brotherly affection for the chairman of our subcommittee and for all other members serving on our subcommittee, including our very able clerk.

The chairman of our subcommittee has just indicated that our deliberations in the markup of this bill and our presentations to the full committee were unanimous, and I am sure that he will permit me to make one correction. I dissented and dissented most vigorously on the Coast Guard Reserve item, and I am prepared today to support most vigorously the so-called Kilday amendment which will restore that Coast Guard Reserve item to the 1958 basis, the appropriation that we allowed last year.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that he is absolutely correct, and I was in error. There was certainly no attempt on my part to misrepresent the gentleman's position.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I knew he would make that statement.

Mr. Chairman, during the years subsequent to World War II, no agency of our Federal Government has ever had to fight more for modern tools to meet rising costs than the Post Office Department of the United States. From 1900 to 1941 the yearly postal deficit has averaged about $33 million. During the current fiscal year the deficit will approximate $700 million. From 1946 up to and including the 1958 fiscal year the total deficit will amount to $6.1 billion. Just think what we could do today with those funds. Modernize our post-office capital plant, yes. Spend some additional billions on national defense, and, yes, to pay a few more billions on our national

debt. Are you aware that Americans are sending and receiving more mail than all the rest of the world combined? Well over 60 percent of the total world-mail volume. The increase alone of United States mail in fiscal 1957 over fiscal 1956 was 2.6 billion pieces; 2.6 billion pieces increase in that year alone. This roughly is equivalent to the entire mail volume of Holland, one-third that of France.

In his annual report for the fiscal year 1958 the Postmaster General broke down the dollar income of mail as follows. This is the dollar intake. Metered postage, 34.8 cents. Postage stamps and paper, 33.5 cents. Funds to finance the deficit, 17.2 cents. Other postage, 10.6 cents. Money orders and box rent, 3.9 cents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, please listen to the outgo of the dollar income. Personnel 77.9 cents; transportation 16.5 cents; rent, supplies, et cetera, 4.2 cents; capital and research expenditures 1.4 cents.

It is important to emphasize that in the outgo column approximately 78 cents of every dollar goes for personnel.

How our United States of America is growing. It is estimated that the Post Office Department will in its new fiscal year be required to serve 5 million more persons than in 1958. Our people are moving out into suburbia and it must be pointed out that this factor alone will add an extra cost because there will be a net decrease in population served by the city carriers. Service is rendered in these outlying areas on the basis of about 2,200 people per square mile as compared to 2,955 people per square mile in all city delivery areas. A total of 4,500 new carrier routes mostly outside the concentrated city areas is projected for fiscal year 1959. Approximately 5,000 are being put into effect during the current fiscal year 1958.

The Post Office Department is required to face numerous difficulties in projecting its estimates of mail volume and postal revenue for future years. Take, for instance, the fiscal year 1958; that is this year, 1958. It may be difficult for you to believe that in this fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1958, next, the Department had to make its first estimate 22 months ago or, to be specific, in August of 1956. How could the Department foresee the extent of the recent snowstorm of almost countrywide proportions, the worst we have known in decades; one which caused our executive establishment literally to be at a standstill; one which literally knocked out the Pentagon. It is currently estimated that this storm may result in a $10 million cost to our postal service.

Do you recall the awful floods of yesteryear and their effects on our mail?

An example of the kind of variance in mail volume that can occur as a result of this situation is this. The Department based its 1959 budget upon a mail volume estimated at 4 percent in 1958 above 1957, and 3.4 percent in 1959 over 1958. Recent information reveals that these percentages will probably be reversed; that is, mail volume for 1958 will be 3.4 percent above 1957 and that for 1959 will be 4 percent over 1958. This change does not affect the anticipated volume for 1959.

The overall increase in man-years that the 1959 budget will now provide is 1.89 percent over 1958. This takes into account the reduction of 3,366 man-hours because of the House cut in this very bill now before us. This leaves a total of 558,665 man-hours that the 1959 budget will provide as compared with 548,278 in the present 1958 budget, an increase of 1.89 percent.

In making up their apportionments in the beginning of a fiscal year, Mr. Chairman, a gun is pointed at the Post Office Department and its name is the Antideficiency Act approved in August 1957. The effect of this statute is to prohibit the Department from requesting an apportionment of appropriated funds from the Bureau of the Budget that would indicate the need for a supplemental appropriation. In other words, it means that if the funds appropriated are not sufficient to handle the volume of mail that actually develops, an immediate curtailment of service to the extent necessary to stay within available funds is mandatory.

In other words, if they do not project those funds properly at the beginning of a fiscal year for all four quarters and something extraordinary arises, then they have to cut the mail service.

One item in the Treasury appropriation, Mr. Chairman, is very controversial. There have been recent developments, may I say, that have been very contradictory, almost inexplicable, and very distasteful to me and other friends of national defense in this body as a result of operations on the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve items.

Let me read you a bit of testimony. In addressing the vice admiral, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Alfred C. Richmond, before our subcommittee, just a few weeks ago, I said this:

I measure my words, now, when I say this: Somebody has done a job on the United States Coast Guard Reserve in this appropriation request. I want to repeat a statement I made when the Secretary was here. That is this:

"Mr. Secretary, I cannot help but feel that if the decision had rested alone with you, you would not have imposed this cut of $3½ million on Reserve funds for the new year."

Admiral Richmond, having in mind the presentations you have laid before us in behalf of the Coast Guard Reserve down through the years, I make the same statement insofar as you are concerned. I believe with the utmost sincerity that had you alone been able to make the decision respecting this cut, you would not have made it.

Now, a little history about the situation. Last year, when we acted on the 1958 requests in the House, it became evident to many of us that the Treasury was not very happy about the cuts imposed. They were not severe, but cuts were imposed on the Treasury.

It was shortly after action by the House that the Senate subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator ROBERTSON, held hearings on the subject of Coast Guard Reserve funds. Those hearings were held on February 28 last. They contained the following:

"Senator ROBERTSON. You probably know that Representative CANFIELD is very much interested in the Coast Guard Reserve.

"Secretary HUMPHREY. I understand so.

"Senator ROBERTSON. He protested very bitterly when the House cut that $16 million to $15 million. He will not look kindly upon any further cut. Can you tell us anything about what the prospects are as to whether the Coast Guard will get another 5 percent if we put in language in the bill?"

He was making reference to a request by the Secretary that the following language be inserted:

"Not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriations in this title for legal activities and general administration shall be available interchangeably with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget but no appropriation shall thereby be increased by more than 5 percent."

Secretary Humphrey went on to say:

"I will be very frank with you. The Coast Guard Reserve is one of the items we are looking at with the greatest care. I am not prepared to state today. It is under study, under direct study. It is one of the items that we are studying to see if a further readjustment in it or further reduction in it can be made. I do not know whether it can or not, or whether we can propose it, but we are looking at it hard to see if that is not a place where a cut can be taken."

Now quoting myself again, I said:

Shortly thereafter—very soon thereafter—I ran into some Treasury people downtown and these people brought up a discussion about the cuts imposed by the House. They went on to say that Treasury was not very happy about them. And it had been practically agreed in Treasury that there would be substantial cuts imposed on the United States Coast Guard Reserve.

No cuts were imposed on the United States Coast Guard Reserve because, after Secretary Humphrey's appearance and his presentation, the Senate committee reported out this provision:

"SEC. 2. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation herein made to the Treasury Department for the current fiscal year, except for the appropriations made to the United States Coast Guard, may be transferred with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to any other appropriations of the Treasury Department, but no appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Now, Mr. Chairman, do you comprehend why I am saying that a job was done in recent months on the United States Coast Guard Reserve?

Continuing further, I said:

When the conference report was before the House for final action, the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. Gary, said this. The date was May 16, 1957:

"I might say that our subcommittee heard that the Treasury Department had asked for this transfer of funds. We were fearful that they might interfere with the Coast Guard appropriations in which there is an item for the Coast Guard Reserve. We did not want those funds molested; and we, therefore, let it be known that we would vigorously oppose any invasion of the Coast Guard funds."

You heard the very forthright statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on the floor of the House.

Then the record continues and I am still quoting myself:

So the Congress excepted the Coast Guard, including the Reserve, in the amendment. The bill was passed and became the law of the land.

The Treasury was served notice exactly how the Congress of the United States felt

respecting these appropriations for fiscal 1958 for the United States Coast Guard and the United States Coast Guard Reserve.

Now it is my understanding that that mandate—

And, Mr. Chairman, there may be some difference of opinion as to whether it was a mandate or a directive or a very definite request.

But, as I said:

Now it is my understanding that that mandate has not been carried out by the Treasury Department and some of those Coast Guard Reserve funds have been impounded.

Is that so?

Admiral RICHMOND. That is correct sir.

Mr. CANFIELD. To what amount, Admiral?

Admiral RICHMOND. $3,500,000, sir.

Mr. CANFIELD. Admiral, last year, in response to my inquiry concerning the importance of the Reserve program, you made the following statement:

"Admiral RICHMOND. Well, sir, I think I could summarize it this way. As you know, the Coast Guard automatically goes into the Navy in the event of war or in a national emergency. The Navy obviously has war plans and our war plans are geared to Navy's. The Navy has assigned us certain duties. From those duties flow our mobilization requirements. Without mentioning those mobilization requirements there is no way that the Coast Guard can be in a position to meet those requirements without the Reserve. All of the indications from Selective Service are that it will be at least 2 or 3 months after an emergency is created before the Coast Guard can start drawing under wartime or emergency conditions from Selective Service."

Now, then, if you accept that figure and consider that a minimum of 2 or 3 months is required to train a man so that he is of any value to you, it appears that 5 to 6 months would be the earliest that we could augment our forces in the event of an all-out emergency, unless we have a trained Reserve. Therefore, we have set our requirement at that figure, which by war plans is our mobilization requirement of M-day plus 6 months.

I think in the position of the Coast Guard there is another factor that definitely ought to be considered, particularly because of port security. The Coast Guard will have to get people aboard almost within 24 hours or 48 hours if we are going to discharge that function. In other words, it will do no good to guard the ports 6 months after M-day if in the meantime they have been opened to subversion.

We have almost an immediate need that requires a very strong posture on the part of the Coast Guard in building up its Reserve so that we are ready to throw people in to guard the port areas.

Last year you said, in response to a question by Mr. Gary in support of your request for $16 million, Admiral:

"That makes a sizable increase in the amount requested for the Reserve in 1958 over what we got in 1957, and in carrying forward this program there will be further increases next year for the extra 1,000 men involved, not proportionately as it was this year because the capital investment is large in this program this year."

That was Admiral Richmond still speaking.

The $16 million request of last year was cut to $15 million in the 1958 bill. Now Treasury after its impounding now indicates it seeks $11.5 million.

Then I said:

I am sure you recall that testimony, Admiral. I frankly think that you, as head of the Coast Guard, are forced in an unfortunate spot in the desire of the Treasury Department to contribute some moneys in savings to national defense—how? By subtracting moneys from a military component now under the Treasury Department, the United States Coast Guard Reserve.

Do you have any statement you wish to make at this time? I want to say further, Admiral, that I have yet to meet a man on the floor of the House or elsewhere that felt that this cut was for the best interests of our national security. I regret the situation.

Admiral RICHMOND. I have no statement, sir. The testimony that you read from last year, I would say, insofar as the need, the statement is as valid today as it was when it was made and if I had to restate it, I could think of no better way of stating it, sir.

I, of course, do not know of any conversations or any ideas that might have been in the Treasury Department last year during the period when the amendment or the restriction was put on the transfer of funds for two reasons: First, if I did it would not be appropriate for me to testify to it. That would be a matter for the Treasury Department. Actually, I was not present during any of the consultations on that matter anyway. I simply do not know.

Think of it, $3½ million impounded in the Coast Guard Reserve item only a few months ago, and the admiral, the head of the United States Coast Guard, was not called into consultation, not even asked for any recommendation. To what point have we come in our system of national defense?

I said:

Mr. CANFIELD. You will state, you have been given a job, Admiral. That job is a part of the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which staff has reviewed very carefully M-day requirements. Is that not true?

Admiral RICHMOND. I would hope so, sir, I really do not know. I am not again a part of those decisions over there. I do not know to what extent—I do not know to what extent they have reviewed these plans. To put it another way, our jobs are primarily set by the Navy, because we become a part of the Navy. Automatically in the event of war we become part of the Navy and they have assigned us certain missions, and those missions once assigned, we must prepare ourselves when we go into the Navy to be able to discharge those missions.

Here is some other testimony bearing on the Reserve item, Mr. Chairman. Admiral Richmond, in discussing what has been done as a result of this impounding last year, said this:

There was one other facility in a part of the training program that was also cut back. As you know, as a part of this Reserve training we are operating a cutter on the east coast for the trainees. They spend 3 to 4 weeks of their training period on that cutter. Because we have some reservists at Alameda, we had planned to operate a similar vessel on the west coast, the cutter *Dexter*, which we had all ready to go, but we had to put it in mothballs.

Mr. CANFIELD. In other words, the *Dexter* is not available for training purposes now?

Admiral RICHMOND. No, sir.

Mr. CANFIELD. And how much was spent on the *Dexter* to make it suitable for training purposes?

Mr. Chairman, listen to this. This is Admiral Richmond commenting:

Admiral RICHMOND. I am sorry to say about $900,000 before the decision was made not to use it. I might say that it is not a complete loss from the standpoint of the Coast Guard, because the biggest item of cost was to reengine it. The vessel has now been reengined and to that extent the United States Government has a vessel in reserve ready to go which it did not have before.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then approximately $1 million was taken from the Reserve or Regular program?

Admiral RICHMOND. From the Reserve program.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is terrific. That is another blow to the Reserve program that I was not fully aware of.

Mr. Chairman, I was an American delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris last November. Other Members of the House and the Senate were delegates to that very important conference. One of the highlights of that NATO conference attended by parliamentarians from 15 NATO countries was an address by Adm. Gerald Wright, top NATO Navy commander from the United States. And what was the main point that he made in that address? It was this:

I am concerned about the ever-increasing number of submarines being constructed by the Soviet Union and the threat they pose to our ports and harbors in the United States.

It was only a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, was standing before this very microphone saying in effect what? Saying this:

I am concerned about the possibility of foreign ships bringing into our ports and harbors unorthodox, or nuclear, weapons which so quickly could destroy our most important cities and areas.

As the gentleman from Missouri spoke, and even as Admiral Wright spoke before the NATO conference, the words "United States Coast Guard" and "United States Coast Guard Reserve" literally rang in my ears.

I cannot believe that in this session of the 85th Congress we are going to permit somebody to do the job they have done on our subcommittee and on the Congress of the United States and on the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve item. In the name of national defense, I believe, yes, I believe, that this House will stand by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], when he proposes his amendment for the restoration of $2 million in this item.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey with regard to our Coast Guard Reserve program; and I want to say to him, also, and I believe this statement will be agreed to by most everybody in this Congress, that there is no Agency or Department or Bureau in our Government that has a budget that is held down like that of the Coast Guard. It is not prepared by the Coast Guard; it is prepared by the Treasury Department, and it is under the thumb of the Secretary of the Treasury. That is the reason it is pared down as it is. I want to ask the gentleman this question: What does he intend to do about the proposal he has just mentioned with respect to the

Coast Guard Reserve? Does he intend to offer an amendment?

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman that our distinguished colleague and my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is going to propose that amendment and like the gentleman he will know whereof he speaks. I shall support that amendment most vigorously.

Mr. LENNON. I hope we will have the unanimous support of all our colleagues on it.

Mr. CANFIELD. I hope so, too. Before I close, may I emphasize this point. The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], stated in his presentation, and it is the truth, that we have already raised the item $1,500,000, but I contend and hold that that is insufficient. We are not even back on the 1958 base. The gentleman and I are not going to permit an operation of that kind. It was an unfortunate operation downtown and we must make correction now.

Mr. LENNON. I would like to make this observation: In the future in the consideration of the Coast Guard bill, this subcommittee on appropriations that has charge of that particular feature must go above and beyond that recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and particularly the Treasury Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. In the name of national defense, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, our able subcommittee chairman [Mr. GRAY] and our ranking minority member [Mr. CANFIELD] have ably described the bill before us today. It is not my purpose to burden the Committee further with details. However, I want to take this brief time to pay my respects and to commend Secretary of the Treasury Anderson and Postmaster General Summerfield and their staffs for what I think is one of the finest jobs of preparing and presenting a budget that has come to my attention in the years I have been a Member. The budgets you have before you today are remarkable in several respects. Many of them provide for no increase in next year's funds over the present year, yet in almost every case the agencies involved are going to have to carry heavier and increased workloads. It is to the credit of those in charge of these departments that they are finding ways to absorb this extra work without asking the Congress at a time like we are in this year to increase the funds that they need to do the job. When we see a situation of that sort, it is only right and proper that we commend those in Government who can carry out so fine a thing as they have presented here.

I enjoyed sitting through the hearings on this bill and I want to congratulate the leadership of this subcommittee for the fine and able job it has done. While there may be a point or two in the bill that some of us would like to see changed a little bit, in the main it is a good bill and I believe that there will be few budgets that any committee will bring to the House this year in which Members can with better conscience support the committee than in this bill. I hope the House will give the committee the support it needs to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join to a great extent in the comments made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] in regard to the handling of the Coast Guard Reserve money which was appropriated by this Congress last year. At the same time that I join the gentleman and pay tribute to him for his diligence in watching over the Coast Guard affairs over the years, I certainly do not want to in any way leave any implication that I slight or have any underestimation for the fine work done by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], chairman of the subcommittee, who has just as vigilant an interest in the affairs of the Coast Guard. But, I think a great many Members of the House as well as a great many of the American public do not understand the functions and the duties of the United States Coast Guard. Several years ago the United States Navy said that when it came to port security that was a feature for the Coast Guard to handle. However, the Coast Guard has been held down because it has not been generally included as a defense arm of the Government, and the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines have gotten the great bulk of defense money. But, just as integrally a part of the defense of this country as any one of those four services I mentioned is the United States Coast Guard. When M-day comes, the Coast Guard is immediately responsible to do that which they will not be equipped to do, and that is to protect all the ports of the United States. In fact, they are so responsible today and have neither the material or trained men. Today they are trying to carry out that duty with a few men, less than about 8 percent of the men in the United States Navy, in the total complement of the Coast Guard. Now, the only way you can build up to meet this situation is by training your Reserves. For the past year or two we have recognized the situation and we have appropriated money for a reserve development and training program. I think the criticism lies with the Treasury of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget who arbitrarily, coldbloodedly, in spite of what the Congress of the United States did last year, put out an order that all departments should reduce their expenditures by 25 percent so that they could make a phony bookkeeping record upon which they thought they could go to the public this year for votes. I think the Congress should act this year in conformity with the committee recommendation by voting back $1 million of the money Treasury and Budget held back, which is less than one-third of what was held back, and give Coast Guard the additional money for the Reserve training program of the United States Coast Guard. I think we ought to put the finger right on the parties responsible and we ought to, as Members of the Congress elected to take care of these things, see that it does not happen again.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I take the time of the Committee to make some inquiries regarding the appropriation for the Internal Revenue Service. I would like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to the language on page 6 of the report, down near the bottom of the page, where we find this language:

> The current estimate, in providing no more than appropriated in 1958, is in reality a program for a decrease in average employment, being 306 below the present estimate for 1958, and 917 below the actual average attained in fiscal year 1957.

Now, this is the particular language I am interested in.

> The committee can only agree with the Commissioner: "At the present time we just feel we are willing to go along with this budget and see how it works out in 1959."

My reason for asking for some comment on this is because of a number of conversations I have had with accountants, tax accountants, with people in the Internal Revenue Department, with reference to the fact that it is penny wise and pound foolish to reduce expenditures for the salaries for the collectors, for the field men, investigators, and so forth, in the actual collection department. And, I am most concerned with what would seem to me to be a reduction even over what we have at the present time, where many of the people in the Department say "We do not have enough people at the present time to do a job of decent collection of our taxes."

Would the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. GARY. We are allowing the Internal Revenue Department the exact amount that they had last year, except for the $3.5 million. But, very frankly, if the transfer of the $3.5 million from the highway fund is stricken out by a point of order, then unquestionably the $3.5 million should be added to the Internal Revenue appropriation, because it is not our purpose to cut the service at all.

What we have reference to in the language quoted by the gentleman from California is that there are certain within-grade promotions in the Department that cost the Department more money each year. The Service is absorbing those within-grade promotions and other costs to the extent pointed out.

Mr. SISK. Therefore, they are absorbing that by reducing the total number of their personnel.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Let me ask the gentleman if the testimony of the Internal Revenue Service people before his committee indicated that they can afford a reduction

in total number of employees, particularly of these enforcement officers, collectors and accountants who go out into the field, because the information which I have from accountants in my State and from employees within the Department in my State is that today in California, from a group of our larger taxpayers, the Government is probably getting not more than 60 to 75 percent of the amount of money they should be getting from those taxpayers. I am curious to know what their testimony was with reference to that.

Mr. GARY. The Commissioner said—and I read from the hearings at page 444:

> We are making further progress toward our goal of paying our people for the work they do. They are being promoted to the grades for which they are eligible and qualified as rapidly as funds permit. The practical worth of these promotions is amply demonstrated by the fact that the same number of people, or less in some areas, are turning out more and better work. The higher production is due largely to our promotion program. The 1959 estimate before you provides some funds for the continuance of this program, even though this will mean a few less people. As I said before, the increased incentive and improved morale resulting from the promotions, the fair recognition of the value of the job done, stimulate greater effort. The cost of these promotions is the best investment we can make.

Insofar as the number of personnel is concerned in the Internal Revenue Service, the claim has been made for years that for each dollar we spend for an additional agent he would bring in $5, $10, $15, or $20 in increased revenue.

Mr. SISK. That is the point in which I am interested.

Mr. GARY. But somewhere along the line you reach the point of diminishing returns. Just where that point is nobody knows. It is a guess. But since the Service itself has recommended this figure, which has been approved by the Treasury and by the Bureau of the Budget, we did not feel we were justified in adding to it at this particular time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. I want to commend the committee for doing an outstanding job. I have been concerned because of many statements that I have heard from tax accounting firms as well as people in the Department about the failure of the Government actually to collect the amounts of money due the Government. That is why I was particularly concerned about this.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman very frankly that we have been increasing this force very materially in recent years. There was a sharp reduction in the force some years ago, but since that time we have been gradually restoring the number of personnel until we have now about reached the point where we think it should be. They may be able to use a few more men, they may be able to get along with a few less, but we feel we have about reached the point where we will get the best results.

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that if the $3½ million which the gentleman proposes to transfer is stricken out, then the gentleman would favor an additional appropriation in that amount?

Mr. GARY. Unquestionably; the Bureau should have that money, whether it comes out of the trust fund or out of the Treasury. I think it should come out of the trust fund because it is an expense of collecting the money for the fund. But if you are not going to take it out of the trust fund, then we should take it out of the Treasury, because they have still got to collect the money.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I would like to make it completely clear that I vigorously oppose the transfer of any amount whatsoever from the highway trust fund for administrative expense of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I also believe we should seriously consider increasing appropriations for the field service of the Bureau. I cannot subscribe to the idea that funds provided by taxes on highway users and held in trust for direct use in providing highways should be made available to other agencies with resulting decrease in actual highway construction. I understand either a point of order or an amendment will be made to cut out this proposal and I would like to say that I propose to vote against this proposed transfer.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service, including purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; $322 million, together with $3,500,000 to be derived from the fund established pursuant to section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956: *Provided*, That not to exceed $200,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for expenses of instruction and facilities for the training of employees by contract, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language appearing on page 3, in lines 19 and 20, and the portion of line 21 preceding the proviso, that the language proposes to change existing law and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we feel that the language of the act referred to authorizes this transfer of funds. We think that the language of the act provides for the payment of the expenses incident to the collection of the funds out of the fund itself. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made a study of this question and I yield to him to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the language involved is as follows, and I am reading from Public Law 627, 84th Congress, page 26, at the bottom of the page:

> (f) Expenditures from trust fund.
>
> (1) Federal-aid highway program: Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations).

There is nothing in there that confines the appropriations that are to be made to that particular thing.

The matter has been passed upon in days gone by. In a moment, I am going to ask to be permitted to read from Cannon's Precedents, volume VII, page 290, section 1232, which is clearly and unmistakably in point and covers just this kind of situation. Those words are not inclusive and they do not pretend to be, and there is nothing that says the funds cannot be appropriated for any other purpose necessary in connection with the administration of the Highway Act, and the Highway Act includes the collection of funds under the Bureau of Internal Revenue involving the tax upon gasoline and other articles named there. This is one of those functions in the Government which comes about as the result of the fact that we have that Highway Act. We would not have the tax——

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentlemen enlighten the Chair as to the citation?

Mr. TABER. Yes, the page number is page 290 in volume VII. The part to which I referred starts at section 1232. The meat of the question is discussed on page 290 and is on all fours with this very situation.

Mr. Chairman, there is another item which I think I will call your attention to before I take up that particular proposition. I am reading from Cannon's Rules of Procedure in the House of Representatives at page 25, at about the middle of the page:

> Expenditures necessarily incident to legitimate functions of governmental facilities do not require specific authority of law. (April 19, 1938.)

There is a long dissertation on the question involving an agricultural appropriation which is quite similar to the principle involved here. That appears in the RECORD of April 19, 1938, at page 5542.

Referring to Cannon's Precedents, it appears that there was a naval appropriation under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman be kind enough to again give the citation from which the gentleman is reading?

Mr. TABER. It is Cannon's Precedents, volume VII, pages 289 and 290:

"Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Drydock (limit of cost is hereby increased to $3,350,000), to complete, $1,050,000; waterfront development, $100,000; street paving, $25,000; water system, $17,000; power distribution, mains and conduits, $75,000; metal and lumber storehouse, $25,000; paint and rigging loft, $25,000; pattern shop, $60,000; storehouses, $100,000; latrines, $10,000; railroad equipment, $45,000; floating crane, to complete, $210,000; in all, $1,742,000."

Mr. Samuel J. Tribble, of Georgia, made the point of order that the items for street paving and metal and lumber warehouses were not authorized by law.

Mr. Lemuel P. Padgett, of Tennessee, submitted:

"Mr. CHAIRMAN, I do not think the point of order is well taken. The act establishing the naval station at Pearl Harbor provided:

" 'The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on the site heretofore purchased for that purpose, and to erect thereat all the necessary machine shops, storehouses, coal sheds, and other necessary buildings.'

"So that Congress does not fix any limit, does not define the scope of such buildings as may be necessary. It is in the discretion of the Congress and, of course, is in order on an appropriation bill. Pearl Harbor is a new place out on an island, but there is nothing there in the way of highways. This paving of streets is simply the making of roads, so that the heavy machinery and heavy guns can be hauled over the roads."

The Chairman, after debate, overruled the point of order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is just square-toed with this case, because there are many things in there that were not specifically authorized that go with the job. This is in just the same shape.

I would like to have you note in the language of the statute particularly the words at the top of page 27, "which are attributable to Federal highways."

There is no question but what the collection of the money to pay the bills is attributable to the Federal aid highway proposition, and it therefore is clearly in order that we should expect the Treasury to be reimbursed or to be provided with all of the money that it is necessary to collect these items.

Perhaps I have not cited everything that was available, but I think I have covered the meat of that question, and it seems to be absolutely clear that there is no question but what we have a right in an appropriation bill to provide an appropriation of $3,500,000 to the Treasury to cover this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from New York.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana care to be heard?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The language is clearly subject to a point of order under the well-established rule prohibiting legislating on an appropriation bill.

First, disposing of the precedent cited by the distinguished gentleman from New York, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the precedent is clearly distinguishable from this case now before the Committee. The precedent cited by the gentleman from New York had to do with building a naval base in Hawaii, and the Chair very properly ruled that the construction of a highway and other incidentals thereto was a necessary adjunct to the building of a naval station.

In addition thereto, Mr. Chairman, and of even greater importance in distinguishing the cases, in the case cited by the distinguished gentleman from New York, I point out that no trust fund was involved.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. No; I am sorry, I cannot yield.

The present case involves a trust fund created by the Congress for certain specific purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I might mention in passing that I, as chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 have some knowledge of what the intent of Congress was when we drafted it, but aside from that, to me it is obvious, and the language is most specific. In addition to the specific language of the statute I refer the distinguished chairman to the committee report of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee. Both reports contain the following language in subsection (f):

Subsection (f) relates to expenditures which may be made from the trust fund. Paragraph (1) provides that amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures during the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, to meet these obligations of the United States incurred, either before or after the effective date of the bill, under the Federal-Aid Road Act which are attributable to Federal aid highways.

By way of interpolation, the interpretation put on that language by the gentleman from New York, that the collection of taxes is incident to the construction of the highways is, of course, to stretch the language; because, by the same token, you could legislate on any area of Federal activity where the collection of taxes was involved.

And, finally, to spell it out, Mr. Chairman, the committee reports went on to say "The expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled 'Federal-aid highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.' " In other words, what we did was to say to the American motoring public that all of the money going into the highway trust fund would be used for buying rights-of-way, for building roads, for engineering service, and for one administrative purpose only, namely the Bureau of Public Roads which was authorized to administer the program.

In the matter of precedents, I cite for the benefit of the Chair—and I am sure the Chair is aware of the precedent already—section 1407, volume 7 of Cannon's Precedents, 1936, page 417, dealing with the very point in question.

In this case cited, unlike the case cited by the distinguished gentleman from New York, a trust fund was specifically involved. It involved a trust created for Indian tribes in Oklahoma. An effort was made, as is being made here today, by way of an appropriation bill, to make certain appropriations for the Indians themselves. The Chair ruled as follows:

The citation by the gentleman from Oklahoma of the statute which he says authorizes this action by the committee seems to the Chair to provide that the fund of these Indians derived from the sale of lands shall be placed in the National Treasury to their credit and draw a specified interest. But—

Says the Chair—

it occurs to the Chair that after these funds are placed there by statutory enactment—

That is this case, Mr. Chairman, statutory enactment—

it would certainly require legislation—

I repeat—

It would certainly require legislation of some sort to take these funds out and disperse them, and therefore, require new legislation.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the case under consideration is identical, that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and I therefore trust that the point of order will be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Louisiana and will now hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman would not yield to ask a question may I say that I gave him the courtesy and yielded to him very extensively in my remarks. I am sorry he did not see fit to yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard further?

Mr. TABER. I would like to say one word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be happy to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is not legislation because it is specifically authorized by the provisions that I read out of the law:

The amount in the trust fund shall be available as provided by appropriation acts for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred.

The collection of the money for the trust fund is unquestionably incident to that and is attributable to it:

To meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal Aid Road Act.

In addition to that, the item that I refer to is clearly in order. The section of Cannon's Precedents I referred to clearly provides for this kind of a situation because there they provide for all sorts of things where certain items were specifically provided that could be done, but there were all sorts of other things provided for and the case hinged on that. In this provision on page 418 there was no provision at all anywhere

for the appropriation of funds for handling things incident to that Indian operation. Therefore, that has no application whatever to this situation.

It seems to me it is perfectly clear that this is an order and it is amply provided for by the basic statute.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. As I understood the argument of the gentleman from Louisiana, he was contending that the precedent which the gentleman from New York referred to was distinguishable because in that case a highway was incidental to the use of the base. Could you have a highway trust fund if you did not have a collection of those funds? Is the collection not only incidental but necessary for the establishment of the fund?

Mr. TABER. You cannot have a fund without having a tax bill to collect it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard further?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Briefly, Mr. Chairman. First I would like to say I apologize to my very dear friend from Virginia for not yielding to him. I did not do so because I was attempting to follow out my thought. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. I have just made the point I wanted to ask the gentleman about. I desired to ask him if that was his position. I understood it to be but I did not want to misquote him. It seems to me that the collection of these funds is not only incidental but essential to the establishment of the fund itself and to the maintenance of the fund.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further argument at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas). The Chair thanks the gentlemen for their able presentation and is prepared to rule.

This matter does present some difficulty, of course, and requires an interpretation of section 209 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Reference to the legislative history would indicate that it was the intention of the Congress to preserve inviolate trust funds for highway purposes, with such indirect use as appeared clearly from the act itself. And, when we take that into account and the precedents with reference to the disposition of trust funds, I think it appears that the language is not sufficiently broad to cover the proposed appropriation in this case, and in the absence of an authorization otherwise, the point of order should be sustained.

Now, the Chair has examined the language of paragraph (f) of section 209, and it is the opinion of the Chair that the appropriation in question is not covered. The language reads:

> Obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways.

Now, it might be argued that this would come within the purview of that broad language, but when you read the language within the parentheses, you will find that it is limited. The portion of that section in parentheses reads:

> (Including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations.)

It is the opinion of the Chair that this comes under the old axiom that where a certain purpose is stated other purposes are excluded, and if it had been the intention of the Congress to cover such indirect appropriations as this, it would have been clearly stated in the same place in which it covers administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads.

The Chair would point out, too, that the citations offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] did not cover trust funds, and because of the rectitude with which Congress views trust funds and the necessity for narrow construction of the language included, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS: On page 3, line 18, strike out "$322,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$325,500,000".

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I regretfully made this point of order a minute ago, and had I not felt so strongly about the sanctity of the highway trust fund, I would not have made the point of order.

The language now pending, which I have just offered, will simply restore the $3.5 million to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which would have come out of the trust fund and which was stricken by my point of order, but out of the general fund of the Treasury. If this amendment is adopted and if the funds are required, as the committee says they are, then the $3.5 million previously taken from the trust fund will be restored to the appropriation for the Bureau from the general fund.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to acquaint the Members of this body with what we tried to do when we set up this highway trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, delegated as chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee which had the responsibility for formulating and presenting the revenue provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, I would have been neglecting my duty to the Members of this great body if I did not rise to challenge the provision of the pending bill, stricken down by my point of order, which would have provided $3,500,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund to provide funds for the Treasury Department to defray the expenses of collecting and administering certain of the Federal excise taxes being covered into the trust fund. Specifically, I refer to page 3 of the pending bill, H. R. 11085, line 18, and all that follows thereafter through "1956" in line 21.

The highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 was established to provide funds for the construction of roads, the acquisition of rights-of-way, and to provide for direct administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads pertaining to these purposes. Accordingly, every dollar of the fund devoted to other purposes will necessarily reduce the roads contemplated under the Federal highway program. That the provisions of section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act were designed to protect the sanctity of the trust fund is revealed by its legislative history in the committee reports of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee and the floor debates pertaining thereto, as I have said.

In order that the Members of this great body may have all of the facts before them, I think it necessary to review the history leading up to the provision of the pending bill to which I have successfully objected. Shortly after the Highway Revenue Act and the Federal-Aid Highway Act became law in 1956, the Department of Labor transmitted a request to the Bureau of the Budget for $1 million, to be appropriated out of the highway trust fund to cover that Department's administrative expenses under section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. This request was cut to $500,000 and approved by the Senate in a supplemental appropriations bill, and was in turn reduced to $300,000 in conference. The appropriation was never before the House except as it appeared in the conference report of the supplemental appropriation. Again last year, in the bill H. R. 6287, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, an appropriation was provided in the amount of $365,000 for the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, to be derived from the highway trust fund for the same purposes as the supplemental appropriation provided in 1956. As Members of the House will recall, I was unsuccessful in my attempt to secure unanimous consent to strike the provision from the bill. However, upon carrying my fight to the other body, the entire appropriation was stricken from the bill. In conference, $200,000 was restored. Had the item been brought to my attention in time to raise the proper objections under the rules of the House, I do not believe that the Members of this great body would have approved it.

Evidently based upon these precedents, the President of the United States has made recommendations in his budget message of January 20, 1958, for the fiscal year 1959, which would make it impossible for the Congress of the United States to maintain faith with the American motorist and preserve the sanctity of the highway trust fund. In brief, the President has recommended that revenues presently dedicated to the

trust fund for the construction of roads be withdrawn and devoted to other purposes. Specifically he has recommended that the 2-cents-per-gallon tax imposed upon aviation gasoline and that all of the 7-cents-per-pound tax on aviation tires be withdrawn from the trust fund and, in addition, that the Department of Labor and the Treasury Department, the recommendations in question today, be allowed to defray from funds derived from the trust fund, the administrative expenses incurred by these Departments in collecting the taxes which are covered into the trust fund, and the expenses of administering the Davis-Bacon Act in relation to the Federal-aid highway program. He also recommends that the trust fund be charged with the expenses of financing forest highways and public land highways. I submit that these recommendations directly violate both the spirit and terms of the agreement entered into between the Congress and the American motoring public when the highway trust fund was established, and that, if adopted, will result in a loss to the highway trust fund totaling approximately $782 million for the period ending July 1, 1972. The provisions of the pending bill to which I have objected, represent the first opportunity that this body has had to pass upon the underlying policy implicit in the President's recommendations. For that reason, I believe it is most important that we act, as we have acted, to prevent raids upon the highway trust fund which, if sanctioned, could extend to the other Federal trust funds, the sanctity of which we are charged with maintaining.

Section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 established and provides for the highway trust fund. Section 209 (f) provides for the expenditures which can be made from the trust fund in the following language here pertinent which I again repeat:

(f) Expenditures from trust fund.

(1) Federal-aid highway program: Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations).

Both the report of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee contain the following language under subsection (f):

Subsection (f): Subsection (f) relates to expenditures which may be made from the trust fund. Paragraph (1) provides that amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures during the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, to meet those obligations of the United States incurred, either before or after the effective date of the bill, under the Federal-Aid Road Act which are attributable to Federal-aid highways. The expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled "Federal-aid highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce."

All of the Members of this body are aware of the fact that the costs of the Federal highway program are running much higher than they were originally estimated to be in 1956, and I am sure that each of us here realize that a loss of $758 million would seriously damage the integrity of the highway trust fund. To completely dispel any thought that the President's proposal, as represented by the provisions of this bill, has merit, let me point out that the American motorist pays billions of dollars of highway user Federal excise taxes which are not covered into the highway trust fund and from which they receive no direct benefits in the form of improved and new roads. In the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, we imposed approximately $15 billion of new and additional highway user taxes upon the American motorist. In consideration for the imposition of these taxes, we established a trust fund to assure the American motorist that every cent of these additional taxes, and that part of the existing user taxes covered into the fund, would be used for the construction of roads and for no other purpose. We left 50 percent of the tax on trucks and buses, 100 percent of the tax on automobiles, 100 percent of the tax on automobile parts and accessories, and 100 percent of the lubricating-oil tax, to be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. Highway users get no direct benefits from these taxes. It is estimated that for the period of the trust fund's existence these taxes will produce $20,703,000,000, if existing rates are permitted to expire, and $28,334,000,000, if we continue to extend the emergency rates now in effect, as recommended by the President for this year. Let me reiterate. All of this sum will be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, not into the highway trust fund. If these funds were covered into the trust fund, as they should be, the revenues thus provided would be sufficient to meet the increased costs of the Federal highway program. I cite this fact to prove that the American motorist is contributing more than his fair share to the general fund of the Treasury, and to support my belief that the integrity of the highway trust fund must be maintained. I know that the Members of this great body will agree with me when I state that the Treasury Department is more than adequately compensated by the American motorists' contributions to the general fund for any expenses incurred by the Treasury Department in collecting and administering those taxes which are covered into the trust fund.

Additionally, let me point out that amounts expended from the highway trust fund do not appear in the Federal budget. Thus the administration has a large incentive to get what it can from the trust fund, since budgetary requests need not show the amounts received from the trust fund.

The administrative expenses authorized from time to time from the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund to the Treasury Department and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, do not offer a precedent for appropriating funds out of the highway trust fund to the Treasury Department, the Department of Labor, or any other Federal agency or instrumentality, except the Bureau of Public Roads. In the case of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance fund and of the new disability insurance trust fund, section 201 (g) of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, specifically provides that the expenses incurred by the Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the administration of titles 2 and 8 of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1956 and chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are to be provided out of the trust fund. Similarly, in the case of the unemployment trust fund, the administrative expenses which may be paid therefrom are specifically spelled out and a defined term "unemployment security administrative expenditures" is utilized in section 201 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, to specifically spell out the administrative expenditures which can be covered out of the fund. Thus, references to the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund, the unemployment trust fund, and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, by proponents of the President's proposals, are inapposite and provide no authority to sustain their case.

Additionally, let me point out that all of FICA taxes and FUTA taxes are covered into these trust funds. This fact alone distinguishes the case from the proposals respecting the highway trust fund into which only a part of Federal highway-user taxes are covered.

Let me tell you how enticing it is to participate in this fund. If you adopt this amendment, Mr. Chairman, this $3½ million amendment which is now pending before this Committee, this will be part of the budget. When the totals are made up come July, this $3,500,000 will be a part of the budget. But if you, Mr. Chairman, had not sustained the point of order a minute ago the $3,500,000 as provided in the bill would not have been a part of the budget.

You know, it is so nice to have a nice big fund sitting over here where you can say, "Now, if I can just get a little bit of it I will not have very much trouble accounting for it." That is why every time, Mr. Chairman, I shall bring up this matter. I am serving notice that when the Labor Department comes in I intend to fight it again.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Was not the real reason for establishing the fund in the first place to take the highway funds out of the budget?

Mr. BOGGS. No; it was not.

Mr. GARY. That is the effect of it.

Mr. BOGGS. I beg to disagree with the gentleman. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because one of the real difficulties with the trust fund is that so many of the user taxes do not go into the fund as I have said. The American motorist has a very legitimate

complaint about it. For instance, when you buy an automobile you pay a 10 percent excise tax. Not one nickel of that goes into the trust fund. When you buy a quart of lubricating oil at the same time that you buy a gallon of gasoline, the money from the gallon of gasoline goes into the trust fund but not 1 penny from the quart of lubricating oil goes into the trust fund. When you buy an automobile accessory, not 1 nickel of that goes into the trust fund.

It has been estimated that if all of the highway user taxes went into the trust fund, where they ought to go, we would not have all the problems that we now have confronting us about financing the interstate and the matching fund road program. Rather than take things out of the trust fund, as is now being recommended, we ought to be putting these other items in the fund.

Mr. GARY. But the amount that does go into the trust fund is not a part of the budget; is not that correct? It is not under the budget.

Mr. BOGGS. It is not under the budget in the same sense that the social security trust fund is not in the budget, but the funds must be appropriated, as the gentleman knows, by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if my friend is making an argument to segregate all tax revenues and set up trust funds, and then perhaps Congress would never have to come back here and go into session to determine how these tax funds would be spent.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is a very able and distinguished Member of this body. I detected, or so I think, just a note of facetiousness in his question, but I shall answer it sincerely.

Certain of our Federal excise taxes, that is those imposed upon gasoline, automobile tires, automobile parts and accessories, lubricating oil, and so forth, have been long denominated, and were so denominated before the highway trust fund came into existence, as highway-user taxes, that is, they have always been known as benefit taxes. The thing that is fair about the dedication of taxes for highway purposes is that if you do not own an automobile, or if you do not use the highways, when you dedicate these sums you do not pay those taxes; but if you do get some benefit from roads as a driver or trucker, then you do pay the taxes. I think that is a fair and equitable proposition. This is a very well established and an old principle in the administration of tax laws.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Does the gentleman know that there was an attempt just last week to divert $60 million out of the trust fund that has always been appropriated under general appropriations, and it was defeated by the House Committee on Public Works?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, so I have been informed; but I appreciate the gentleman's calling my attention to it because, as I said a moment ago, this is only the beginning. The gentleman mentions $60 million. I can calculate now on the basis of the present budget message for this year something just a little less than a billion dollars, over the 16-year period, that could be lost.

Mr. FALLON. I remember the gentleman's argument on the floor last year when he attempted to take out the money that was taken from the trust fund for the Labor Department, at which time he pointed out that this was a very attractive and easy way to get money and that it would be followed by other attempts. So that we have had two attempts in this present year. May I say I want to congratulate the gentleman for his work in this regard.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman. Since the gentleman brought it up, I suspected that is the way the Bureau of Internal Revenue got the idea. Otherwise, it would not have crossed their minds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt my amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time today in support of this amendment to bring to the attention of the committee the situation that exists with reference to the progress of the Interstate Highway program. You will recall in 1956 when no bill ever received a more deliberate and careful attention than was given to the Highway Act of 1956. You recall the motion to recommit to send the bill back to the committee and have the Committee on Ways and Means consider the tax assessment and the creation of a trust fund to establish amounts necessary for the construction of some 37,000 miles of interstate highways. Under the trust fund, which was established, the total amount covered in the trust fund was for 38,548 miles. The Interstate Road System is now in excess of 40,000 miles. That leaves approximately 2,452 miles not financed at the present time.

The original estimates presented by the Secretary of Commerce at the time of the authorization estimated the cost of the program to be approximately $27.6 billion. Now the estimate has risen to over $37.6 billion. It was also originally estimated that the period of construction of the Interstate Highway System would take approximately 13 years. Now that estimate has gone up. At the rate of revenues being turned over to the trust fund, it would take approximately 19 to 22 years to construct the 37,000 miles of interstate highways. Just recently the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Rothschild, in testimony before the House Committee on Public Works, advocated the transfer of $32 million more annually to the trust fund. If we make a raid upon the trust fund which was carefully created to carry out this tremendous work program, we will bring about further impairment to the progress of this program. To give you some idea of the size of the program, I would like to call your attention to the fact that this program is something of the size of the Panama Canal, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the St. Lawrence Seaway projects all put into one package and then multiplied 30 times. It is the largest single program of work ever authorized in the history of the world. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should be most careful to protect the progress and the growth and the construction of the Interstate Road System which has received such careful attention by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $16 million, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEELY-BROWN: On page 6, line 16, strike out "$16,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000, including $2,000,000 for new dormitory facilities at the Coast Guard Academy."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GARY] for his graciousness in yielding to me during the general debate so that I might question him on this item. I thank him very much, not only for yielding to me but for the courtesy of his replies.

I think too many times, unfortunately, some look upon the Coast Guard as an unwanted stepchild of the service academies until we run into an emergency. As soon as we run into an emergency then the Coast Guard comes very much to the forefront because of the splendid training of its personnel.

I also think that unfortunately, too many times we overlook the Coast Guard when it comes to appropriating moneys necessary for the maintenance of the physical plant of the Coast Guard. Certainly the committee itself has recognized this fact, as is evidenced by the committee report, and also as evidenced by the questions of the members of the subcommittee as printed in the hearings.

Also, may I remind this body that last year we appropriated $3 million for the Air Force Academy to build a chapel. The argument was not over the $3 million. The argument was over the design of the chapel.

I can recall, when first I came to this Congress, the difficulty in getting a bill passed authorizing the Coast Guard to build, with private funds which the Coast Guard itself raised, a chapel which is presently constructed at the Coast Guard Academy.

Certainly I think there is very real need for this amendment. This amendment would make possible the construction of permanent barracks to replace

the termporary wooden barracks which were built at the Coast Guard Academy in New London during World War II. This replacement has been recommended by every recent Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, and was given No. 1 priority by the most recent Board of Visitors last year. I am sure many of you would agree with me that the Coast Guard Cadets are entitled to exactly the same housing facilities which the taxpayers of this country provide for the cadets in the other service academies. With the emphasis which we have on public works as a possible antidote to present economic ills, I think that by appropriating money for the construction of permanent barracks we have a chance to do something which is needed, which is useful, and which in my opinion is helpful.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I would like to compliment and congratulate my Congressman on the amendment which he has presented, and I wish to associate myself with him. Certainly, if we want to have encouragement for these young men to go to the Coast Guard Academy, we ought to give them housing which will give them incentive to put forth their best efforts in their schooling and training, and be those who will be ever ready when the time comes, whether in peacetime or in wartime. Likewise, when their parents or their brothers come to visit them, they can point with pride to the facilities wherein they are situated, to become officers who will be a protective arm of our Government, in war and in peace.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to point out to the membership of the House the recommendation of the Board of Visitors last year with respect to the Coast Guard Academy. It said:

> 2. That an order of priority be established for the projects listed by the Superintendent, Academy, as vital needs. The Board and the Superintendent are in agreement that the primary emphasis should be given to elimination of fire hazards with the excessive cost of repair for outmoded structures a secondary consideration. The Board submits the following priorities:
>
> (a) Replacement of wooden barracks for both the cadet corps and officer indoctrination schools.
>
> (b) Replacement of wooden buildings for classrooms and administration of officer indoctrination schools.

I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut wholeheartedly and hope the House supports his amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

I believe the gentleman from Michigan probably knows as much about those wooden barracks as anybody in this body because, if my memory is correct, he lived in those wooden barracks during his training period with the Coast Guard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The gentleman is correct; I lived in those barracks.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. I want to urge my colleagues to support the amendment which has been offered.

I was one of the visitors to the Coast Guard Academy 4 years ago. We reported that the facilities there as to the barracks were unsatisfactory; and they had been long before that.

I hope the amendment passes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I stated in my opening remarks that this building is very greatly needed. There is no question in the world about it. But we in the Congress have got to weigh the various demands for expenditures and we have got to establish certain priorities between the various requests. We cannot appropriate all the money that is requested or that really is needed. To do so would plunge us again into deficit spending. We already have a public debt of $275 billion. If we begin now to add to that public debt no one knows what will happen to the economy or to the solvency of the United States.

As I stated before, no request was made for money for this building. If you will look at page 415 of the hearings you will find this colloquy between Admiral Richmond and myself:

> Mr. GARY. While you are on the question of the Academy, when are we going to get that new dormitory?
>
> Admiral RICHMOND. I could have gotten it this year if I had taken $7 million for airplanes instead of $9 million. It is a matter of operational priorities.

The airplanes are in a deplorable condition, and we have worried about that situation, because if we send our boys up in airplanes that are not safe then we are criminally liable here in the Congress.

I said:

> Mr. GARY. I have had several complaints about the fact it was not included in the budget, and that has been my answer, which I took to be the correct answer, that you could not do everything and you had to set up priorities, and the Coast Guard felt some of the other things were more demanding than the new building.
>
> Admiral RICHMOND. I think that is the only answer you can make sir.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Would not the gentleman say we would be just as criminally liable should a boy burn to death in those wooden barracks?

Mr. GARY. Yes; if the barracks are not safe they ought to be made safe. But we have been assured by the Coast Guard that they would not operate unsafe planes. We have also been assured that the building is safe, although a new building is highly desirable and greatly needed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And is it not the fact that it is needed? Which would the gentleman say was more needed, a $3 million chapel at the Air Force Adacemy or to spend $2 million for adequate housing at the Coast Guard Academy?

Mr. GARY. We had quite a fight over the chapel last year. I think the Coast Guard is a defense arm of the United States and that they should receive exactly the same treatment as the other arms. It is a very important arm of our defense becaue it is the Coast Guard which will be charged mainly with the protection of our coast in case of an emergency. We all know that one of the great dangers we would face if we have a war is an attack on our coastal areas from the sea.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to point out that insofar as the chapel at the Coast Guard Academy is concerned, it was built voluntarily with contributions from individuals. I myself contributed to it.

Mr. GARY. It was built with contributions from the cadets, the alumni, and the public. It was a very gracious gesture. They have a beautiful chapel there and I glory in the fact it was built through voluntary contributions of the American people.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to say I find it wholly inconsistent with what we have done for the Air Force.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone far afield in talking about the chapel at the Coast Guard Academy and the chapel at the Air Force Academy; they are not pertinent to the issue before us. I happen to have been a member of the Board of Visitors that inspected the Coast Guard Academy last year. The barracks referred to are in a deplorable condition. Many of them are not worthy of occupancy. Some of them have had to be closed up. We are reaching the point of diminishing returns where it is costing more money to keep them up than it would to build new ones.

I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Virginia say that the Coast Guard is an arm of our national defense. That has long been its history. When we have needed it and we have called on it we have never found it wanting. It always comes through in war or in time of disaster. But, unfortunately, this agency which is so important to our national defense finds itself sunk in the Treasury Department that knows little about or that has apparently very little sympathy for national defense or anything else—but saving money. I am certain that if Admiral Richmond could have been frank with you he would have told you that unrealistic budgetary limits are put on him, that he is told he can have so much money to operate the Coast Guard and no more, and he has to cut the cloth to fit the pattern. Every Board of Visitors for many years has recommended replacement of these rotting, wooden barracks—temporary buildings of World War II. Each year the visitors have recommended doing certain important maintenance work at the Coast Guard Academy but each year is like its predecessor. Nothing is done. Unfortunately, there is no one to fight for the Coast

Guard. There is no great body to fight for them like there is for the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. The voices of most people interested in the Coast Guard Academy are stilled before they reach here.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. The distinguished gentleman from California now addressing the Committee did not tell the Committee that he was Chairman of our Board of Visitors this last year. We were all in agreement with the recommendation year after year of different members of the Board of Visitors. We are put in the position, according to the chairman of the subcommittee, where for the Coast Guard Academy or for the Coast Guard we have to choose between airplanes and barracks. I do not think we should be confronted with a situation where we have to choose between airplanes and barracks. I strongly urge that the Committee accept the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. Very seldom is an agency put in the position of having to make the choice that Admiral Richmond has to make. I congratulate him on selecting planes before barracks for they are the tools with which he works and he is a good officer, but that is no reason why this Congress should not take cognizance of the necessity for new buildings to help him out of his present dilemma.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. They have the same curriculum at New London as they have at Annapolis and West Point; do they not?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. With the same appointment after graduation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Not exactly the same but one leads to the other, and these people are qualified naval officers when they come out.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point to mention a matter which is coming up before this Committee in short order. My good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], is going to present on the next page, page 7, an amendment which I am told will increase the amount of money available for Reserve training. I am disturbed a great deal, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, by the apparently concerted effort to reduce the amount of money available for the Reserve program. It runs throughout the entire theme of the national-defense recommendations.

Our Subcommittee on Reserves met this morning and we adopted two resolutions. By the way, both resolutions were adopted unanimously. One resolution provides that the Defense Department be called upon to support a National Guard of 400,000 persons rather than reducing it to 360,000. The other resolution, likewise adopted unanimously, would call upon the Defense Department to retain a Reserve of 300,000 persons rather than reducing it by 30,000 down to 270,000. The Coast Guard finds itself in a similar situation.

Here on page 7 is an effort to reduce the amount of money needed by the Coast Guard from $15 million to $13 million for training purposes. It is not exactly akin to the amendment presently under consideration, but it is vital for the future of the Coast Guard. Some have said there were no strong voices raised in Congress in behalf of the Coast Guard. Whether I have a strong voice or a weak voice, I want to raise my voice today in protest against the continued cutting down of the Coast Guard Reserve training program. I hope when this amendment comes up the Members of this Committee will give it most careful consideration and will give the Coast Guard Reserve the funds that they vitally need to carry on an active Reserve program, for in time of peace as well as in time of war, we depend upon our Coast Guard for aid in disaster. Whether it be in the lower Mississippi Valley from which I come or whether it be on the east or the west coast, we rely upon the Coast Guard. We must maintain reasonable Reserve training for those men in the Coast Guard, and I think we should return to the bill the sums of money that we have deleted, that is, the $2 million, to give the Coast Guard a strong, active, virulent Reserve program.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman speaks of a deletion of $2 million from the bill. As a matter of fact, the committee is recommending $1.5 million more than the Department requested.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. I can read it to you on page 9 of your report if you wish. But, you will find there recommended in the bill $13 million and the appropriation for 1958 was $15 million, which is a reduction of $2 million. You may answer that by saying there is a carry-over there, but that is not the answer. The Coast Guard needs that $2 million. The Coast Guard should have that money for its reserve training.

Mr. GARY. I object to the gentleman talking about a deletion in the bill. There is no deletion in the bill. We, as a matter of fact, have added to the amount that the Department requested.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows that the funds are reduced, are they not?

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. By $2 million.

Mr. GARY. No. No, nothing is reduced.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. You will find that on page 7.

Mr. GARY. The appropriation is $2 million less than we appropriated last year, but they did not spend the money that was appropriated last year.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Because they were held back, and you know how these funds are held back.

Mr. GARY. And if we appropriate $5 million more here, they can still hold it back. There is no way we can make the Department spend money that they do not want to spend. We appropriated $15 million for them last year, and they reserved $3.5 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me answer the distinguished gentleman from Virginia in this respect, that we have an obligation to provide the funds, whether Departments will hold them back or not, and that is what we are fighting for now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 60, noes 18.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law (14 U. S. C. 751–762; 37 U. S. C. 231–319), including direct expenses and repayment to other Coast Guard appropriations for indirect expenses, for regular personnel, or reserve personnel while on active duty, engaged primarily in administration and operation of the reserve program; purchase of not to exceed 6 passenger motor vehicles, of which 4 shall be for replacement only; and the maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; $13 million: *Provided*, That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriation for "Reserve training," for the 2 preceding years shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as 1 fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 7, line 8, strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the amount made available for the Reserve of the Coast Guard by $2 million. At the outset I want to state that the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, stated the situation accurately at the time the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] yielded to him. The committee has increased the appropriation $1,500,000 over that requested in the budget.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. And also directed that they release $1 million of the $3,500,000 that they are holding over for this year, the current year, which would give them $2,500,000 more than the request.

Mr. KILDAY. I suppose the gentleman refers to the proviso which reads that amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriation——

Mr. GARY. No; I refer to the report. We cannot make them spend the money,

but we do make a recommendation in the report.

Mr. KILDAY. I grant you that you cannot, but you attempt by the report to direct them to spend it. I do not see how the gentleman could contend that that would be more effective than it was last year when you appropriated $15 million, the amount that I am now seeking to place in the bill, and the Treasury Department froze $3,500,000 of it. That was an absolute appropriation and they did not spend it. So the expression of a pious hope, in the report, that an additional $1 million will be spent, will certainly be no more effective nor as effective as the positive appropriation made last year.

I grant you, if this item is increased to $15 million, we cannot force the Treasury Department to permit the Coast Guard to expend it any more than we can anywhere else. But we must discharge our responsibility here and let those who have other responsibilities in this area assume those responsibilities.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. CANFIELD. The first request of the Coast Guard leadership was for $21,500,000. They pared that down to $16,500,000. Finally they were forced to take $11,500,000.

Mr. KILDAY. I understand that to be correct.

I believe today we have had more discussion of the Coast Guard than we have had during all the rest of my service here combined. This is a development that is very agreeable to me. I know of no service in our uniformed services which can excel the Coast Guard in their efficiency and in their spirit and their attitude toward the discharge of their duties. When we have this much discussion here I think you can be sure that things have reached the point where it is essential that something be done for the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard occupies a dual status. During peacetime, of course, they have the status of peace officers in the enforcement of the customs laws. Automatically on the declaration of war they become an integral part of the Navy. Therefore their pay and other matters affecting them are handled by the Committee on Armed Services. They are compensated under the same pay bill as all other members of the uniformed services. It is in that connection that I have become acquainted with them. I admire them tremendously.

It has been mentioned here and proper reply made that the Commandant said he could have $2 million for barracks if he would have accepted $7 million instead of $9 million for airplanes. When did it become essential to cut out airplanes in order to secure necessary barracks? We certainly do not do that for other uniformed services. At this session we appropriated an additional $1 million for the Air Force, including installations. I presume there is going to be no other limit put on the amount they could have for airplanes, missiles, and so forth.

I know of no money that you can spend on Reserves where you can have a reasonable expectation of getting results more than you can in the case of the Coast Guard. One of the main assignments of the Coast Guard is port security. If the ports are to remain secure, the Coast Guard must do it. In case of emergency, where can you depend on any Ready Reserves so fully and completely as you can on the Coast Guard, made up of persons living in that very port area, who over night can be alerted and take over the job of port security?

I sincerely trust that this $2 million will be restored to the funds made available for the Coast Guard Reserve. It will only make it what was appropriated last year. The Coast Guard is a military organization, participating in the Reserve training program, the 6 months of active-duty training and then into the Ready Reserve. This additional $2 million will provide the minimum required for the Reserve, and by reducing the very minimum that is regarded as necessary for the Reserve program you are definitely handicapping the participation of the Coast Guard in the Reserve program of 6 months' training and the obligated tour thereafter in the Reserve.

I trust my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my high regard and respect for the Coast Guard of the United States. I have stated time and again I think it is one of the most efficient organizations in the United States Government.

The situation we have before us here today is this: Last year we appropriated $15 million for the Coast Guard Reserve program; that is, for this current fiscal year which ends on June 30. The Treasury Department set aside as a reserve $3,500,000, leaving only $11,500,000 for expenditure this year. Instead of asking for $15 million for next year they requested only $11,500,000 for the next year. Our committee heard testimony with reference to the Reserve program. We felt that it should at least be kept at its present level. We felt that under the recommendations made by the Treasury the program would lose ground this year and next. While it may not be advisable at the present time in view of all the other demands upon the Treasury to increase the program, we thought at least it should be held where it is. We estimated that if $1 million of the $3,500,000 were restored immediately for this year and that $1,500,000 is added for 1959, we could keep the Reserve program at its present level through the next fiscal year. That is the recommendation to the House. If the House should see fit to appropriate $15 million this year, there is no more reason to think the Treasury will spend it unless they want to than they did last year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman says they spent $11,500,000 this year and that they have asked for the same amount for next year?

Mr. GARY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MASON. And they held back $3,500,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. What became of the $3,500,000?

Mr. GARY. That has not been spent. It is being held in reserve. We are recommending that $1 million of that $3.5 million be released for this year.

Mr. MASON. And it is available then for them to spend?

Mr. GARY. It is available for them to spend.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I did not in any way intend to reflect upon the work of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who has done a great job on the Committee on Appropriations, but I will tell you this. That after weeks of hearings before the Reserve Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, I find across the board there is a definite effort to cut down the reserve program in all the branches of the service. The Coast Guard is not a large branch of the service. It has had a hard fight building itself up as a Coast Guard Reserve. I can remember when we had to get on the floor of the House and fight for $1 million to start the Coast Guard Reserve program. Now, they are simply asking to continue an Active Reserve program of the type that they need in the Academy, and that is what the $2 million will do. I hope the House sustains that. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for his fine remarks in reference to this part of the program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. How many are there at the present time in the Coast Guard Reserve?

Mr. GARY. At the present time there is a grand total of 8,933 in the Coast Guard Reserve program.

Mr. TABER. How many would be provided for by the amount that the committee brought in?

Mr. GARY. Approximately the same amount—8,933.

Mr. TABER. There would not be any cut?

Mr. GARY. There would not be any cut.

Mr. TABER. The increase beyond the $13 million would have to be then for the purpose of increasing the program?

Mr. GARY. For increasing the program and expanding the program over and above what it is at the present time. It was the intent of the committee to hold the program at its level both with respect to deployment and with respect to other items of the program.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, how can you sustain this program on the present level with $3,500,000 impounded in the 1958 program and only $11,500,000 being asked

for in the 1959 program? That just does not add up.

I am going to repeat a statement that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee made on the floor of the House May 16, 1957, when this bill was debated. This is what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said:

> I might say that our subcommittee heard that the Treasury Department had asked for this transfer of funds. We were fearful that they might interfere with the Coast Guard appropriation in which there is an item for the Coast Guard Reserve. We did not want those funds molested, and we therefore let it be known that we would vigorously oppose any invasion of the Coast Guard funds.

Now, those funds were molested. They were not transferred to any other item in the Treasury, but they were placed in what the Department called a sequestered or savings fund; not to be used.

May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who has been fighting for the Reserves, that the now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Flues, succeeding Mr. Kendall, who resigned a few months ago, wrote a letter to Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, in which the gentleman's name and my name were used. He told Senator COOPER in that letter that Mr. Kendall, his predecessor, had been down to Capitol Hill and had seen certain gentlemen, including the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and while they were not sold on the program, they were not wholly in disagreement. Then he went on to say he did not believe there would be any serious repercussions. That letter did not state the facts, and I am sorry that Mr. Flues ever wrote a statement of that kind on Treasury Department stationery, because when Mr. Kendall came to me and tried to sell me the program, I told him, "You can go back to the Treasury and tell them I am wholly in disagreement, and I will fight any program like that most vigorously." And I am sure my colleague was not properly represented in that letter, either.

Now, what is the prime duty of the Coast Guard of the United States? To protect our ports and our harbors. Admiral Richmond told us a few days ago that he was not even consulted on this question of impounded Coast Guard Reserve funds for national defense. I wonder if he was consulted at all by the Treasury high echelons when the *Dexter* was reconditioned at a cost of $966,000, later to be put in mothballs to help the savings fund.

Do you know what Admiral Richmond told me months back? He said that if the chips were down, if we were really in trouble, he could only get an inadequate complement of men to protect the metropolitan area of New York. I did not like that. May I say to my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] I was in Hamilton, Bermuda, 3 years ago on Armistice Day. Thye call it Armistice Day there, as they call it in London and Paris. We call it Veterans Day. What happened? Our top naval admiral came up to me and said, "Congressman CANFIELD, when, oh, when are you going to do something about these faulty Coast Guard planes? They are dangerous. We, of the Navy, have good safe planes but you in the Coast Guard do not have them here." I came back home and reported the facts, and within days use of these faulty planes was canceled. I do not want mothball treatment for the Coast Guard. This is an important segment of our national defense, and in the name of national defense here on the floor today let us vote right on this restoration, and put the program back at least on the 1958 basis. We have already lost ground because of the impounding, and it is most unfortunate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. First let me say that I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a couple of questions. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia this question with respect to this $1 million that his committee has directed the Treasury Department to make available to the Coast Guard, as mentioned in the report of the committee, I believe on page 3 and also on page 9. Can the gentleman tell me what will happen if the Treasury Department refuses to heed his direction?

Mr. GARY. Exactly the same thing that would happen if we appropriated $15 million and they spent only $11,500,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In other words, this direction does not give the Coast Guard the funds the gentleman is trying to give them, does it?

Mr. GARY. It does not; and neither would an appropriation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I will answer that question. I have great faith in the new Secretary of the Treasury who became Secretary of the Treasury after these operations had begun. He is very characterful, he is forthright. I believe he is going to be more Coast Guard minded than some of his predecessors, and I believe that as a result of this directive he will immediately restore those funds.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman, if he has so much faith in the new Secretary of the Treasury, why he is not willing to follow his request to the Budget? That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. CANFIELD. I talked to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GARY. He talked to the committee, and he upheld this request before the committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. To me he indicated that this matter was under discussion for some time before he became Secretary of the Treasury, and he told us he was pained about the whole situation.

Mr. GARY. So am I pained about it.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman was pained last year.

Mr. GARY. I was. I wish we could give everybody all the money needed, but we do not have it.

Mr. CANFIELD. All I want to say to my distinguished chairman is to repeat what he stated on the floor just last year about the molestation of those funds.

Mr. GARY. I repeat those words, and I maintain that in the sense I used the word "molestation" they were not molested. I meant that if they could not spend it I did not want to see them transfer them to replace cuts that were made in other items.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then the gentleman from New Jersey does not know what the word "molest" means.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I took this time, as I stated at the outset, to ask the chairman a couple of questions. I have a second question I would like to propound: Assuming that the Treasury Department had directed the Coast Guard to spend $3,500,000 less this past year, is it the gentleman's contention that the Coast Guard Reserve could not adequately have spent those funds in furthering the Reserve program?

Mr. GARY. No. They were appropriated for that purpose and they have been spent as the Treasury Department directed them to spend them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Could they have spent them usefully?

Mr. GARY. They would have spent them for the Reserve. I think the Reserve program is necessary. The question is how this affects the program. They contemplated building up to a maximum strength. A cutback of budget funds would not cut back the program; it would delay to a certain extent, a year, or some other period, the time at which we would reach the maximum strength. That postpones the reaching of the maximum strength of the Coast Guard; it does not change the program except by delaying the time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is it not true that the time has been determined to be a certain date in the future, that we must work toward that date if we are to have an adequate defense?

Mr. GARY. It was determined as to time several years ago when it was indicated or determined that a certain date would be desirable, but that was not set out as a necessary time.

Mr. CANFIELD. To carry out the program the Coast Guard asked this year for $21,500,000. They were requested to scale it down to $16,500,000, but finally they were forced to take $11,500,000, which was $3,500,000 under what our committee of Congress allowed for fiscal 1958.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say that all we as Members of Congress can do is to do our duty as we see the duty before us. For instance, yesterday we had 43 governors before our subcommittee, either personally or by representative documents filed, supporting a $400,000 program. Some of them were very critical of the fact that we had not provided money for the construction of an adequate number of armories. Today we find that millions of dollars have been held back in reserve, not allowed to be spent, after this Congress had appropriated the money for those armories. All we can do is to provide the money that we have heretofore provided for the Coast Guard program.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, as an active member of the Coast Guard Reserve, I have a strong personal affection for the service and the men in it. As some of my colleagues may know, I served in the Coast Guard during World War II and take pride in having been associated with an organization which has a distinguished record both in war and peace.

Let me direct the Members' attention to the report of the committee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill for 1959. You will see on page 3 the following statement:

> This amount will permit the utilization of the training ship *Dexter* (on which nearly $1 million was spent before the Reserve program was curtailed) and will allow adequate progress toward M-day goals although not sufficient to guarantee meeting the M-day goal for the Coast Guard Reserve.

Again, on page 9:

> The committee is directing the Department to restore at once $1 million of the funds appropriated for, but withheld from, the Reserve program in the fiscal year 1958. Such action, coupled with the increase of $1,500,000 provided in the accompanying bill, should provide for an adequate Coast Guard Reserve program albeit not sufficient to fully meet the strength proposed for mobilization requirements by 1960.

Mr. Chairman, what this report clearly indicates is that the contemplated appropriation of $13 million is not enough. To have an effective Reserve organization, we must determine what its mission is to be and then appropriate enough money to carry it out.

Now, we may ask, "What is the capacity of the Coast Guard to carry out its mission?"

Admiral Richmond, in his very fine testimony before the subcomimttee, made it clear in response to the questions of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], that the Coast Guard is in no position to meet its present requirements without the Reserve.

To perform its task of port security, the Coast Guard is going to have to mobilize almost within 24 or 48 hours. As the gentleman from New Jersey further pointed out:

> It will do no good to guard the ports 6 months after M-day if in the meantime they have been opened to subversion.

In connection with the traditional missions of the services in time of war, it is often pointed out that the present emphasis on missiles may change the roles of the services. However, as Admiral Richmond points out:

> If you can guarantee to me that the next war is going to be over in 24 hours, I would tell you that we do not need a Reserve—not a single man for Reserve.

However, he also told the subcommittee that the job assigned to the Coast Guard has not changed, and that until there is a reevaluation of its role, it must be prepared to carry out that role.

I do not feel that we can do away with the Ready Reserve. No Member of this body can state with certainty what kind of war the next one would be. With the ever-increasing fleet of hundreds of Soviet submarines, and the dangers posed to our shores by that fleet, I do not think we can afford to hamstring the branch of our Armed Forces that has the primary job of coastal and harbor protection.

In urging that this amendment be adopted, I am fully aware of the fact that no amount of appropriations will do any good if the executive agency does not put the money to its intended use. I have made my position known to Secretary Anderson, and I will do whatever I can to see that the wishes of Congress are not flouted.

However, I think this discussion will have its desired effect—that of bringing about a proper awareness of the Coast Guard's role and needs.

For these reasons, I would like to urge acceptance of this amendment. Money alone cannot guarantee an effective Reserve program, but the full appropriation will enable the Coast Guard Reserve to go a long way toward maintenance of the high state of readiness and training that is called for.

I wish to commend the members of the subcommittee for their expressions of interest in the welfare of the Coast Guard and its Reserve component. I am also grateful to my colleagues who have spoken in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. He says the Treasury refuses to spend the money or, rather, sets it aside in the reserve?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGER. How much?

Mr. GARY. $3,500,000 for the current fiscal year ending June 30.

Mr. YOUNGER. What becomes of that $3,500,000 on June 30 of this year?

Mr. GARY. It reverts to the Treasury.

Mr. YOUNGER. It reverts to the Treasury?

Mr. GARY. It is that much saved. Let me say, this program relates not only to the Coast Guard but to the entire Government. As a matter of fact, you will recall that last year after the budget there was so much talk about the budget the President stated he was going to call on all department heads to hold expenditures as nearly as possible to the previous year. In response to that general order or directive from the President of the United States, the Treasury Department set up reserve funds in various bureaus of the Treasury Department. That related not only to the Coast Guard but went all the way down the line. In the Reserve program of the Coast Guard they set aside $3,500,000. It was an effort to save money and to live within the budget after the Congress had called upon the President very definitely to do so.

Mr. YOUNGER. How much was set aside in the other agencies of the Treasury Department?

Mr. GARY. There were varying amounts set aside in the different agencies. I have that information here.

Mr. YOUNGER. I asked the question because I am wondering whether they picked on the Coast Guard to make a saving rather than in other departments?

Mr. GARY. Here is the reserve established by the Department: Office of the Secretary $5,000, Bureau of Accounts $8,000, salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursements, $50,000, Bureau of Public Debt $93,000, Bureau of Customs $100,000, Internal Revenue Service $1,253,241, Bureau of Narcotics $20,000, United States Secret Service $4,000 for one item and $1,000 for another item and $6,500 for another. Coast Guard, in operating expenses $758,576, acquisition, construction and improvements $13,492, retired pay $43,438, Reserve training program $3,500,000. The Coast Guard is the largest part or a very substantial part of the Treasury appropriation.

Mr. YOUNGER. Out of the Coast Guard you had $3,500,000, plus $700,000, or $4,200,000 total out of the Coast Guard?

Mr. GARY. Probably around $5 million.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. It would look as though they picked on the Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help notice a few things in this debate about the instructions to cut down, and impounding money at a time when war could come at any moment.

We have been close to war for several years but still we are cutting a very important part of our defense, the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is small, of course, but we are doing the same thing with our Army. Unless money is restored, the Army will be cut to 870,000 troops by July of 1959, next year, a figure which our Army men say is below the danger point. Just how foolish can we get?

We see here, from the speeches made on the floor today that the administration has ordered money impounded, or not spent, in such vital places as the Coast Guard. Every day it comes to our notice that money has been withheld in vital places. While we are withholding money to prevent the building of quarters for our Coast Guard, we are sending money by the billions to foreign countries to bolster their economy, and as we cut the spending of the Federal Government in places where it is needed, we see the line of unemployed increase. People are walking the highways and byways begging for a job to earn bread for their starving families.

To my mind this is one of the reasons for the depression we find ourselves in at this time.

We need the Coast Guard. We need the Army at full strength to defend our great country but, again, we need to spend the money here at home to give jobs to our 5 million people who are now out of work.

This is no time to cut our national defense in any amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. Not exceeding $22 million of appropriations in this title shall be available for payment to the General Services Administration of such additional sums as may be necessary for the repair, alteration, preservation, renovation, improvement, and equipment of federally owned property used for postal purposes, of which not to exceed $20 million shall be available for improving lighting, color, and ventilation for the specialized conditions in space occupied for postal purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Page 14, after line 6, add:

"SEC. 205. There is appropriated the sum of $8,209,000 for the construction of a terminal annex at Denver, Colo."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. I contend that the amendment is in order as provided by Public Law 519 dated July 22, 1954, which is commonly referred to as the lease-purchase law. Now, I want to read that part of title II, section 202, which in effect says that—

Whenever the Postmaster General determines that (1) there is a substantial need for space for postal purposes in any particular area which cannot be satisfied by utilization of any existing property suitable for the purpose then owned by the Government, (2) the receipts of the post office serving such area exceed $10,000 per year, and (3) the best interests of the United States will be served by taking action hereunder, he is hereby authorized to obtain and provide space for postal purposes in suitable structures of permanent type construction in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States (including Guam), by negotiating and entering into lease-purchase agreements.

Now, there is authorization to do it under lease-purchase.

However, it is my contention that under the same provision, under section G of Public Law 519 there is this proviso:

No proposed lease-purchase agreement shall be executed under this section unless such agreement has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as evidenced by a written statement of such officer to the effect that the execution of such agreement is necessary and in conformity with the policy of the President.

I want to point out that the Committees on Public Works of the House and of the Senate upon application by the Postmaster General did on July 19, 1956, approve the proposal for the construction of a terminal annex at Denver, Colo. Now here is the authorization as I construe it for an appropriation. I call attention to this sentence:

No appropriation shall be made for lease-purchase projects which have not been approved by resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives respectively within 3 years after the enactment of this act.

When this law was enacted it contemplated appropriations for the purpose of carrying out lease-purchase agreements that had been approved by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate and submitted by the Postmaster General. If that is not true, then why do we have the words:

No appropriation shall be made for lease-purchase projects which have not been approved.

As I understand it, there is an appropriation authorized where there has been a resolution approved by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate upon submission by the Postmaster General to them for approval. That being true and, as I have pointed out, on July 19, 1956, the Postmaster General's proposal for a terminal annex at Denver, Colo., was submitted and approved, if it was not contemplated that an appropriation should be made, then why do we have this language:

No appropriation shall be made for lease-purchase projects.

This is a lease-purchase project that has been submitted and been approved. The limitation that no appropriation shall be allowed until the project has been approved by resolution of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives means this. My contention is when they say "no appropriation" they in turn authorize an appropriation when the project has been approved by the Public Works Committees as this one has been approved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] desire to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the law cited by the gentleman from Colorado expired on June 30 last year. That is the lease-purchase law. In the second place, the lease-purchase law did not authorize any appropriations whatever. It merely authorized the construction of projects under a lease-purchase contract. In the third place, even if there were an authorization of construction, that comes under General Services Administration and the General Services Administration appropriation is not before this committee. We are considering the appropriation for the Post Office Department. There is absolutely no authorization whatever for the project in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the gentleman's statement that this is all under the General Services Administration, because, if the Chair will read title II of Public Law 519, it specifically designates the Postmaster General. That is No. 1.

No. 2, he says that the law itself has expired. The law provides that these projects must be approved within 3 years. I offer proof here that this project was approved by the committee on July 19, 1956, within less than two years. And as to the requirement under "(g)" where it says, "No appropriation," if you do not contemplate some appropriation, why would you put it in that language? I contend that once it has been approved, as it has been approved in this instance, we are free to appropriate under this law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have proof that the project in question received the approval of the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have before me the lease-purchase project that was approved on the 19th day of July, 1956, by the Public Works Committee, and I also have the prospectus filed by the Postmaster General as to the terminal annex at Denver, Colo. It was from this that I arrived at the figure of $8,209,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have at hand a resolution of the committee approving this particular project?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I called the committee and asked them for the resolution, and they said, "Here it is," and sent it over to me about 30 minutes ago. Here is the list. No. 24 on the list is "Denver, Colo., post office, $8,209,000." That is why this motion is limited to that sum.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia care to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That was approved for a lease-purchase contract, not for an appropriation. The Congress cannot now make an appropriation under an act that has expired. The act itself is no longer in existence.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I reply to that this does say that no appropriation shall be made for lease-purchase projects until approved by the committee. That is the wording of the act itself. As far as the act's expiring is concerned, it provides that it shall be approved within 3 years of the enactment of this act. This act was approved July 24, 1954. The committee approved it on July 19 of 1956, which is within the 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. HAYS of Arkansas]. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is grateful to both the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Virginia for their presentation. The Chair thinks reference to the legislation referred to by the gentleman from Colorado would develop the fact that the lease-purchase procedure is a distinctive type of construction procedure that does not yield to ordinary appropriation treatment. Consequently, the argument advanced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] appeals to the Chair. For the reason that no prior legislation authorizing this appropriation has been enacted by the Congress, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11085) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZED PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 493, Rept. No. 1454) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2448) to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LOWER RIO GRANDE REHABILITATION PROJECT, TEXAS, MERCEDES DIVISION

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. THORNBERRY), by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 494, Rept. No. 1455) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5309) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. DELANEY), by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 1456) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7870) to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional $10 million for the completion of the Inter-American Highway. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 8002

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendments which I expect to offer to H. R. 8002:

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 subsections:

"'(b) Whenever the President determines there has been established a satisfactory system of accrual accounting for an appropriation or fund account, each proposed appropriation thereafter transmitted to the Congress for such account pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be accompanied by a proposed limitation on annual accrued expenditures.

"'(c) Whenever an appropriation is subject to a limitation on annual accrued expenditures, there shall be charged against the limitation the cost of goods and services and other assets received, advance payments made and progress payments becoming due, and the amount of any other liabilities becoming payable, during the fiscal year concerned.

"'(d) At the end of the fiscal year concerned, any unused balance of the limitation on annual accrued expenditures shall lapse.

"'(e) Any liabilities becoming payable during the fiscal year concerned but for which payment is not made during that year may be paid, if not otherwise contrary to law, in a subsequent fiscal year or years to the extent they are within the limitation on annual accrued expenditures for the fiscal year concerned.

"'(f) Any obligations incurred during the fiscal year concerned or in prior fiscal years which do not result in liabilities becoming payable during the fiscal year concerned shall be charged against the limitation on annual accrued expenditures for any succeeding fiscal year in which such obligations may result in liabilities becoming payable.

"'(g) Nothing in subsections (b) through (f) of this section shall be construed to change existing law with respect to the method or manner of making appropriations or the incurring of obligations under appropriations.'

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to provide in any bill or joint resolution making appropriations, or in any amendment thereto, limitations on annual accrued expenditures covering amounts becoming payable as a result of obligations incurred both in the fiscal year concerned and in prior fiscal years, and provisions pertaining to the availability of funds appropriated in prior fiscal years.

"(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.

"SEC. 3. This act, and the amendments made thereby shall cease to be in effect April 1, 1962."

EXTENSION OF CAPITOL

Mr. BROWNSON. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, after much thought, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1956 by eliminating the requirement that the extension reconstruction and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905. This is essentially the same bill as was introduced in the last session by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Similar bills have been introduced in the House by the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. This bill is essentially the same as the bill now being considered in the other body which was coauthored by Senator SMITH and Senator CASE of New Jersey; Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania; and Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

It is a privilege to join with these far-sighted legislators in a last-ditch effort to preserve the classic architecture of the east front of the Capitol from hasty and ill-considered change. I notice by today's press that Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, also has joined his colleagues in calling for a delay on the proposed extension until there is a more thorough investigation of the feasibility of repairing the present front.

This controversial appropriation received remarkably little Congressional attention. No hearings were held in the House or in the other body at the time this controversial provision was originally tacked on an appropriation bill. Together with the proposed House Office Building and changes and modifications in the two existing House Office Buildings it represented over $94,500,000.

The great Committee on Public Works with its standing Subcommittee on Public Buildings was completely bypassed. In spite of the fact that the Capitol is a workshop for the Congress as well as a historical shrine, no broad segment of either the House or the other body was permitted to examine, testify, recommend, or to hear expert testimony from architects, historians and office management consultants as to the results of this drastic change. The latest hearings on this scheme B were held in 1935 and 1937. Only 43 Members of the present House date back that far in service.

Why are these extensive changes being made? Is change so much a fetish with us it is considered synonymous with progress? Cannot anything remain unchanging in an era of confusion to remind us that the fundamental principles of our Government and our Constitution do not change?

Millions who love the appearance of the Capitol and who remember and revere the forecourt, traditional setting of the inauguration of each President since Andrew Jackson, would probably agree with Robert Browning when he said, "I detest all change, and most a change in aught I loved long since."

Is this the only place to provide a restaurant? What about the construction now under way at the cost of $1 million or so in the courtyard of the New House Office Building? Is this the only place for additional committee rooms? What about the New Senate Office Building and the New House Office Building, now under construction?

Architectural Forum, an outstanding building industry magazine, has hinted that far more usable space could be obtained elsewhere than will be gained by moving the east front 40 feet forward, and at a cost considerably less than $17 million, too.

Architects throughout the Nation, speaking individually and through the American Institute of Architects, have condemned this program. One of Indiana's outstanding architects, known throughout the Nation for the distinguished character of his professional works, has joined in the cause. Mr. Edward D. James, of Indianapolis, who has for several years been serving as preservation officer for the committee on preservation of historic buildings of the American Institute of Architects, wrote me on February 5 of this year. Let me read two short paragraphs from his letter:

> In the years that I have been in the practice of architecture, I have been vitally interested in the restoration, and in the preservation of existing architecture which has significance in our American way of life. Most of my activity has been centered around Indiana and I have left the rest of the country up to other people. However, I have found that the east facade of the United States Capitol is about to be destroyed and the fine architecture of Dr. William Thornton, which was approved by George Washington, will disappear with that destruction.
>
> I feel the urgency to advise you that the architects of America, and I am sure, many hundreds of thousands of other people, are interested in blocking this expansion program and in solving the necessity for the expansion in a different manner. I understand the plans have been completed and contracts are about to be awarded. I hope you believe as much in the preservation of this Capitol Building as I do and I hope you will join the fight for a different solution for this necessary construction.

Many Americans make a pilgrimage to Washington and their Capitol but once in a lifetime. For many of them that happy visit of inspiration comes while they are in high school. If this plan is carried out they will be denied the historic view of their Capitol for 3½ years while construction is under way. They will never again see this work of three of the Nation's early and most gifted architects, Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe and Charles Bulfinch.

Public protest has saved the historic east front of the Capitol three times in its 165-year history. This is a continuing struggle. Scheme B for the moving of the east front has been lying around for 53 years to a day, since March 3, 1905. It is a product of the same enlightened era of architecture which produced the Library of Congress and the old Department of State Building.

It is apparent that all three Washington newspapers oppose this destruction of historic walls of that section of the Capitol for which George Washington laid the cornerstone in 1793. One paper has compared the destruction of these walls the British could not level when they burned the Capitol in 1814 to President Truman's attempts to change the exterior architecture of the White House by adding a cafeteria and auditorium in 1946. Where does it make sense to expend vast sums to repair the White House by rebuilding the interior from ceiling to roof without disturbing the exterior walls, then to sacrifice the original walls of the Capitol itself built from the same Virginia sandstone?

I have great respect for the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. J. George Stewart. He is affable, personable, technically qualified, and sincere in his position on this matter. I cannot, however, agree with him when the historic judgment of the press from coast to coast and of the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Society of Architectural Historians pleads so eloquently for the preservation of this national shrine which is only in the temporary custody of any one Congress. The arguments of those who propose this change are neither overwhelming nor do they stand the test of careful analysis.

At a time when there is concern about money for defense and money for sparking a lagging economy, is not $17 million a pretty high price to pay for a noontime restaurant, a few more committee rooms, and a private passageway to keep the legislators secure from their constituents? And will the final figure really be $17 million or will it be more like $25 million or perhaps $30 million?

The taxpayers provided their Congressmen with expensive new legislative chambers in 1951. They provided an expensive new Senate Office Building this year and an expensive new New House Office Building to be ready in a few years. Perhaps, instead of providing a new east front to the Capitol, the taxpayers may decide to provide the historic Capitol with a new group of less expensive Congressmen if this spending spree on the Hill does not terminate short of wanton destruction of this very building, itself.

GI HOME LOANS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1958, I introduced in the House H. R. 10764. I view this as a much needed emergency measure designed to breathe life into a very fine program that will soon become inactive unless prompt action is taken. I have reference to the GI home loan program. It is not only curtailment of the benefit for the veteran which concerns me, although this aspect, of course, is a predominant factor. The side effects resulting from the inability of veterans to obtain home loans are being reflected in the number of residential units being constructed, and in the related fields which are hit by a decline in home construction activity.

As has so often been true under this administration, it is the small-business man who suffers most. It is the builder of a few houses each year whose source of funds is cut off. It is the local suppliers of building materials who are hit the hardest by the small builder leaving the scene, since the large operators generally order direct from the factory or mill. But let me say that the problem

is by no means confined to the small builder. Every manufacturer and dealer in appliances and furnishings is hit. It is being felt throughout our economy and is rapidly becoming more acute.

As we all know, the cost of living is rising. The average price of a new house rose from $9,475 in 1952 to $12,375 a year ago. Construction costs have risen more than 13 percent in recent years.

What does this mean to the individual who hopes to house his family in a home of his own? The answer is obvious. All of these forces combine to increase substantially the cost to him or drive him from the home-buying market completely.

The unfortunate fact is that these conditions are not likely to improve. On the contrary, the immediate likelihood is for further worsening. The GI loan program is at a standstill. The economy continues its downward slide.

How can we meet this problem which not only creates hardship for the veteran but also has widespread economic effects? There seems to me to be one reasonable solution which will have an immediate effect. That is why I have introduced a bill to authorize $2 billion in direct loans by the Veterans' Administration. Under my measure, the VA will be authorized to make loans throughout the country if a veteran is unable to obtain a guaranteed loan for which he qualifies. The maximum direct loan is increased from $10,000 to $20,000. The interest rate charged to the veteran would be less than 4½ percent. Savings banks and savings and loan associations whose acocunts are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation would be authorized by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to act as his agent in placing and servicing these loans. A fee would be paid to these institutions out of the income derived from the loans.

Where will we get the money for these loans? Actually the money is available but is simply lying idle. The United States Government holds more than $7 billion as trust funds of the national service life-insurance fund and the United States Government life-insurance fund. My bill would use $2 billion of that $7 billion, about 29 percent, and lend it directly on VA mortgages at the same rate as Government bonds are paying, plus the additional sum necessary to cover the cost of processing, servicing, and guaranteeing. Thus, the interest charge will be less than 4½ percent to the veteran.

One might ask if it would be prudent to so invest these funds. The answer is that this is a common practice of life-insurance companies. Most life-insurance companies have invested at least 35 percent of their funds in long-term home mortgages.

Furthermore, savings and loan associations put practically all of their funds in home mortgages. Savings banks and most of the pension funds put from 30 to 80 percent in mortgages. If this is a prudent practice for these institutions, why shouldn't we do the same with the veterans' life-insurance funds.

Through this program, the lending institutions will be free to use all their available funds for conventional mortgages and FHA insured mortgages. As soon as the market changes and additional funds are again available for both FHA and VA mortgages we can then suspend the direct-loan program.

Mr. Speaker, this is not special interest legislation. It will not only help the veteran trying to buy a home for his family. As I have pointed out, increased activity throughout the economy would result from this program. No additional budgetary expenditure would result. This is truly legislation in the public interest. I urge the Congress to take favorable action promptly.

UNDERGROUND GASIFICATION OF COAL—A RESEARCH NEED

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been considerable interest in the underground gasification of coal. This involves the burning of coal in situ, either in its original seam or after being broken up, in order to produce usable gases. It is possible to vary the nature and the quality—heat units—of these gases by substituting steam or oxygen in the combustion zone for air. The gases can be used for burning in boilers to generate power, to produce synthesized gasoline, oil for pipeline distribution and many organic chemical compounds.

The advantages of converting bulk coal into valuable gases at the mines are obvious. Not only does this process bypass the costly mining operation but it also eliminates the expensive task of delivering mined coal to the user. In addition to these economy factors, underground gasification provides a means whereby coal reserves can be utilized to replace the Free World's dwindling oil and gas supply. The United States and the Western European countries have much greater supplies of coal than of oil and scientists believe, furthermore, that most of the oil yet undiscovered is in other sections of the world. Also, it should be emphasized that the recovery of energy by means of underground gasification will make available to mankind the heat units in coal beds either too thin or with too great a quantity of extraneous matter to be economically produced by mining. Here there exists a possible means of converting something which is useless into something useful.

Despite these incentives, neither the United States nor the Western World is leading the way in this type of coal research. I regret to report, Mr. Speaker, that it appears that the Soviet Union has made considerable scientific progress in this field and is now on the verge of a major breakthrough in successfully gasifying coal underground. At this time, the Russians have as many as 500 engineers and technicians at work on the problems of underground gasification, and in addition many research and educational institutions, while the United States has probably less than 20 persons engaged in this vital project.

Although pioneer underground gasification efforts were made in Russia more than 25 years ago, the first known experiment in the Western Hemisphere took place at Gorgas, Ala., in 1947. The experiment was a cooperative venture of the Alabama Power Co., which owned the coal in the ground in which the gasification was attempted, and the United States Bureau of Mines. Under the expert guidance of Mr. Milton H. Fies, vice president in charge of Alabama Power's coal operations, the Gorgas experiments have continued now for more than 10 years, yielding valuable research data. The technology of coal exploitation is still in its infancy in this country and much additional work is necessary, in Mr. Fies' opinion, to achieve any comparable degree of success.

Extensive gasification experiments have also been carried on in Italy, Belgium, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. In Great Britain, the Ministry of Fuel and Power is tackling gasification problems in great earnestness. The British Government has retained a firm of prominent engineers, Humphreys & Glasgow, Ltd., of London, to push the gasification work. The Government already is constructing a 5,000 kilowatt generating station at the gasification site. Undoubtedly, the English have several score of technicians at work on gasification now—many times more than the United States and far less than the Soviet Union.

A group of British engineers who recently visited Russia to inspect the work being done by the Russians has reported that the Soviet Union is on the verge of significant expansion in the underground gasification of coal. The Russians, it was learned, plan to use the gas produced to generate electricity. In fact, the British party discovered the Soviet's plan to build a 100-megawatt power station, which would, of course, have 20 times the capacity of the English station. In all, some 400 to 500 engineers were busy on the Russian gasification project when the British party was on hand. The British engineers reported—according to an English publication, that the Russians have perfected a drill which bores vertically from the surface to a coal seam and when the drill penetrates the coal bed, it can be so manipulated or adjusted so as to be able to drill horizontally into the seam. This, it is claimed and there is justification for the claim, will be of great advantage in gasifying coal seams in place.

The experimental efforts of the Alabama Power Co. and Bureau of Mines engineers, during the past several years, have been directed toward gasifying coal in place without the use of underground labor, whereas the British and Russian technicians have employed

labor underground in the preparation of coal bed for gasification. The vertical-horizontal drill, referred to previously as having been perfected by the Russians, may enable them to produce gas from underground coal without mine labor.

If the Russians succeed in gasifying coal successfully underground before any of the nations of the Free World, this will obviously be another hard blow to our work prestige, especially since so many other countries are interested in this work. If the Russians find a way to use underground gas as a source of energy, their scientists will not only have placed another feather in their cap but will also have added materially to Russia's industrial potential. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be any great degree of interest in underground gasification in this country.

Even though the actual need for synthesis gas is not an urgent one, there is no denying that America's supply of natural gas and oil is fairly limited. It seems to be to be extremely poor policy, Mr. Speaker, to wait until the actual need is pressing before determining what we may substitute for natural gas and petroleum products. The principal objective of underground gasification in this country is to produce a synthetic gas from which chemicals and gasoline can be made at the mine mouth, and to be enriched and used, someday, as a substitute for natural gas. Down through the years, the industrial and economic growth of nations has closely paralleled the energy productivity of those nations. It is most desirable, therefore, that the United States work to perfect a method to obtain a gas for energy purposes and a synthetic gas from the underground gasification of coal at relatively low cost.

The experiments at Gorgas Mines in Alabama have produced excellent synthesis gas at intervals and the researchers need find only the method of producing this gas over a long period. Mr. Fies, who has been in charge of the Gorgas project, believes that the Bureau of Mines gasification program should be enlarged to include several coal fields. He would like to see experiments in pitching beds in the Far West, abandoned mines in Pennsylvania or West Virginia as well as thin and dirty beds in Missouri or Kansas. Underground gasification will first be utilized, he believes, in those sections of the United States in which the average energy cost of fuel is highest. There is a great variance in fuel costs in this country because of the great distances over which the fuel must be transported. It is, of course, far cheaper to pump gas through a pipeline than it is to haul mined coal equal distances.

Mr. Fies feels, as I do, that the results of the Gorgas experiments in underground gasification have been most encouraging. Despite limited personnel and funds, this project has moved forward at a steady pace under Mr. Fies' skillful direction. To limit this important research to only one location in this country, however, appears to be a serious mistake. We may well be subjected to another sputnik experience by the concerted Russian efforts in the underground gasification field. Personally, I do not welcome the possibility that the Soviet Union may be the first to announce a feasible method of recovering a gas from coal which may be used as a source of fuel in industry and in the generation of power. A Russian scientific victory in this field would certainly not reflect creditably on our own researchers or those of any of the other free nations. Most certainly there will be keen disappointment on this side of the Iron Curtain.

To my way of thinking, an expansion in our work on underground gasification is fully justified by recent Soviet advances and also by the future need for synthesis gases. The world now stands on the verge of a revolution in fuels, one which may well affect the future of our civilization. In alerting the American people as to the progress being made in Russia and in Great Britain in establishing commercial installations using gas produced by burning coal in place as a source of energy, I hope that some of the present apathy may be dispelled and an expanded research program in this country will result. Mr. Speaker, this important scientific project deserves immediate attention.

NATIONAL SECURITY NOT IMPAIRED BY IMPORTS OF SWISS WATCHES AND CLOCKS

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a highly significant decision which was rendered on February 28th by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Gordon Gray. The decision, which in my opinion was one of the most encouraging actions taken by the present Administration in the field of foreign trade, flatly rejected petitions by the domestic manufacturers of watches and clocks for greater protection from import competition on grounds of their alleged essentiality to the national security.

Mr. Speaker, for years we have been bombarded with propaganda by the domestic watch industry which loudly proclaimed its unique contribution to the production of precision military items. This refrain has been repeated so often by the watch and clock firms that many people, including the present administration, had assumed it to be the truth. But now it can be told: the Office of Defense Mobilization has just completed a most comprehensive, two-year study of the defense capabilities of the horological industry and has found that these firms can produce nothing for the armed services that cannot be readily obtained from many other industries.

Of course, Mr. Gray's decision is directly contrary to an earlier ruling made by his agency in 1954. He explains this reversal by stating that in the past three years there has been a marked reduction in mobilization requirements from the horological industry, as well as a substantial expansion of precision skills and plant capabilities in other industries.

All of this may be true, but it is significant that the Defense Department hasn't changed its position. Its 1954 report to ODM concluded that the domestic watch and clock manufacturers were not essential and its recent report reiterated this conclusion. Regardless of past history and past positions, however, it is clear that everyone is in agreement now that the national security is in no way dependent upon the domestic watch and clock manufacturers.

As evidence of the validity of this conclusion, here are some of the highlights of the recent ODM study:

1. The military requirements for watches, clocks, and timing devices in event of war have been greatly curtailed.

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.

2. Nonwatch firms can produce the same military timing devices procured from the horological industry.

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 (in event of mobilization) without disturbing the production of other military items already planned for the particular firms.

3. The horological industry is not essential to the missile program.

The service laboratories having technical responsibility for safety and arming devices (the principal item produced by watch and clock companies for the missile program) 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.

No missile manufacturer questioned (18 firms building 26 missiles) 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."

4. All interested Departments concur that the domestic horological industry is not essential to national defense.

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.

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.

The Interagency Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry (composed of officials from Defense, Labor, Commerce, State, Treas-

ury, and ODM) is of the opinion that the level of imports of horological products does not threaten to impair the national security.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us know that the administration has taken many drastic actions during the past few years to curtail jeweled watch imports on the fallacious assumption that the domestic manufacturers were essential to the national security. I believe it is fair to suggest that these actions should now be reconsidered and reversed in light of the current findings of the Director of Defense Mobilization.

Surely, I hope we shall hear no more about new punitive moves by the administration against watch importers. It is high time for the domestic watch and clock manufacturers, and for the Government, to cease these continual efforts to curtail foreign competition. Let us hope that the new ODM report will signify a resumption of the traditional American free enterprise system in the watch and clock industry, with the consumer able to exercise his choice of domestic and imported products without the Government intervening to narrow the choice or to raise the price through needless trade barriers.

Mr. Gray is entitled to commendation for the forthright and fair manner in which he has handled the difficult problem which faced him, particularly in view of the terrific pressures which have been leveled in this field.

In its editorial of March 3, which I submit herewith, the Washington Post and Times Herald has very accurately and correctly analyzed the significance of this action:

TIMELY REVERSAL

The Office of Defense Mobilization has acted wisely in reversing its 1954 ruling that the domestic watch and clock manufacturing business is essential to national security. The ruling was sought by the industry to obtain tariff protection against Swiss imports. The argument was that the skills of American watchmakers would be needed for a defense emergency but that these skills would be lost if the country depended mainly upon imported timepieces.

Whether the contention ever had any validity is doubtful. But the Defense Department now has clearly ruled that whatever defense need once existed for precision jeweled watches and clocks has now greatly diminished. At the same time, however, similar precision skills have been developed and greatly expanded in other fields. All of this does not mean, of course, that the watch industry is to be thrown to the wolves. It does mean that it must meet import competition without the help of the defense essentiality shield—a device that could seriously undercut freer trade policy if used without real justification.

CONSENT DECREE IN THE CASE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST UNITED FRUIT CO.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the preceding session of the Congress, a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor of being chairman, conducted a hearing on March 28, 1956, in which it inquired into proposals for a consent decree in the case of United States of America against United Fruit Co., which was then pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. On February 4, 1958, I learned with considerable interest that this important case has been settled by means of a consent decree.

Under the terms of the final judgment, a competing corporation will be created out of United Fruit assets to take over a large part of the banana importing business.

Numerous restrictions of a technical nature on the operations of United Fruit are prescribed in this consent decree, but the heart of the matter is the provision that a new corporation be set up to handle 35 percent of United's imports in 1957, a share estimated at nine million stems. Not since the American Tobacco Co. was divided into competing corporations many years ago, has any antitrust action had such impact upon a truly giant monopoly as in this case.

In addition, the decree requires that not later than June 30, 1966, United shall divest itself of all of the capital stock or other interest it owns in the International Railways of Central America. Of more particular interest to the jobbers and dealers in the United States is the provision in the decree which bars United Fruit "from engaging anywhere in the United States, directly or indirectly, in the business of ripening, processing, and selling bananas," and also obliges United Fruit to liquidate one of its subsidiaries, the "Banana Selling Corp., within 9 months from the effective date of this final judgment."

The testimony heard by the subcommittee showed that sales abuses and practices contrary to the interests of jobbers, distributors, and the consuming public had been practiced for many years by this large monopoly. United Fruit had acquired the power to fix prices at which bananas were sold in the United States and also, it was charged by some of the witnesses heard, had the ability to impose severe restrictions on competition. The banana jobbers in this country were caught in a price squeeze by United Fruit, which they claimed sold directly to retailers at prices the jobbers could not compete with on the basis of what United Fruit charged.

Perhaps the subcommittee's hearings on this matter were a factor in expediting the ultimate conclusion of this case. However, in any event, the hearings did arouse considerable public interest and helped to focus attention to the activities of this huge monopoly.

The benefits of this consent decree in the form of competition will, obviously, not begin to accrue on any large scale until the competing corporation is set up. How extensive these benefits will eventually become, only time will tell. The important thing is to insure that the competition will be genuine. It is a fundamental belief of our country that a dynamic and free democracy rests secure only on the foundation of a free economy. In the meantime the jobbers and dealers should benefit from the decree as quoted above if the decree is fully and quickly implemented. It is these small-business men I hope our committee has been instrumental in helping.

A SHELL GAME WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days I have devoted considerable time and effort to a careful examination of the immediate future of the Civil Rights Commission. The future looks black indeed at this time.

Recent debate in the House brought out the confusion and total inaction consequent to that confusion for which Americans now being deprived of their civil rights are being penalized. I am speaking of the appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission. During the debate the only thing that appeared perfectly clear was that the fate of the appropriation is at best undecided.

On one aspect of this muddy and disgraceful question there is, however, agreement. That is, that the executive department, as represented by the Civil Rights Commission itself, was duty bound to make a justification and explanation of the plans of the Commission to the committee. It did not do so.

The House by its previous action has in effect called upon the Commission to now submit its budget and justification to the Appropriations Committee, and has indicated that the committee, after consideration, resubmit the appropriation bill previously deferred including in it an appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission.

After much telephoning to the staff of the Appropriations Committee and the staff of the Civil Rights Commission, it became clear to me that no action was forthcoming in spite of the appointment of Mr. Gordon Tiffany as Staff Director. Pending action upon his confirmation by the other body, he has been given an appointment as a temporary consultant to the commission. Therefore, I sent the following telegram to the chairman of the commission, Dr. John Hannah, and to Mr. Gordon Tiffany, Staff Director designate:

Since it has been 18 days since debate on the floor of the House brought to light the fact that no justification for the Civil Rights Commission appropriation has been made, and the intent of Congress clearly demonstrated that such justification must be given highest priority; and since 8 days have passed since your nomination as staff director and some days have passed since you were put on the payroll as staff consultant, I respectfully submit that justification for the appropriation be given immediate action and that a request be immediately forwarded to the House Appropriations Committee for a hearing to present it at the earliest possible moment. Please inform me of your plans in this respect.

I received the following telegram in response from Mr. Tiffany:

Appreciate your views expressed in your telegram. The budget has been studied with care. Be assured every step will be taken to expedite a carefully supported presentation before the Appropriations Committee at its earliest convenience.

I then ascertained by telephone to Mr. Tiffany's office on Monday, March 3—Mr. Tiffany was in New Hampshire and would not be returning until Wednesday—that the Civil Rights Commission had made no request to appear before the Appropriations Committee. I thereupon sent Mr. Tiffany the following wire:

I wish to point out that it is the responsibility of the Commission to ask the Appropriations Committee to set a date for presentation of the budget justification. The Appropriations Committee properly should not be expected to act until such request is received from the Commission. Please advise me when such request is made.

I, of course, eagerly await action by the Commission and an answer to my wire. This is not a personal matter. The American people are entitled to action under the terms of the law passed by the Congress of the United States in 1957. Pious pronouncements are not sufficient. It is my intention to keep after the matter until action is achieved or the blame for inaction is clearly placed. Time is running out. The life of the Commission will expire on September 9, 1959. One quarter of its active life has already passed. It is the duty of the members of the Commission and of the President who appointed them to save every single day that can be rescued for the important work that the law has given the Civil Rights Commission to perform.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is working on a pay-increase bill for postal employees that should have been passed last summer. Unfortunate delays prevented final and successful action before Congress adjourned.

In fact, there is no question as to whether or not the Congress should pass a pay-raise bill. The only points at issue are: Should it be a flat, across-the-board raise or by different percentages according to different levels and steps; and to what date should it be retroactive?

In working out an agreement regarding increased compensation for postal workers, we bear in mind our obligation to provide similar raises for all other classified Federal employees.

To refresh our memories on this subject, I want to emphasize that classified and postal employees have received only one increase of 8 percent since 1951, while the wages paid by private industry have more than doubled in that same period.

The cost of living has continued to climb since the long and protracted hearings on this subject began a year ago. Which means that the postal workers have actually lost ground in the past year, and any bill we pass now will only make up in part for the income deficit they have experienced since 1951.

In the report of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dated July 8, 1957, there is this language:

Witnesses * * * stated that it was necessary for thousands of postal employees to seek additional employment or to have their wives or children work in order to meet the costs of raising their families. The majority of the committee believes that the present take-home pay of most of the postal employees is completely inadequate to support an average family in most metropolitan areas where the largest number of postal employees are working. The majority of the committee believes that the pay of postal employees should be measured in terms of adequate compensation for the work performed. Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield stated that the productivity of postal workers had increased 17 percent over the past 6 years. This is a compelling reason why the salaries of postal employees should be readjusted. Loyal, faithful, and highly productive service should be recognized not merely by commendation but in the take-home pay of postal employees.

Those words must be kept in the forefront so that the legitimate salary increase claims of postal workers will not be jeopardized by those who would have it both ways by their insistence that the post office is a public service, yet would deny postal workers a substantial pay raise by arguing that they should be tied to rates which they are reluctant to increase. These are the same people who privately agree that the postal workers are deserving of a raise, but will not publicly support it.

The failure to put through a pay raise last year has had a damaging effect on employee morale. We have lost a number of our best employees to private industry and will lose more until we deal forthrightly with this issue and proceed to prompt and constructive action.

After all the smokescreen of political skirmishing has lifted, it is clear that the Congress is responsible for the wages of Federal employees, and these employees know it.

If we ignore their needs, we can expect a further deterioration in morale and in the quality of Federal personnel for which we will only have ourselves to blame. To rectify this damage will require time and much more money than is asked for under the pay-increase bill.

The Government, in order to carry out the vital services entrusted to it, must recruit and hold better-than-average employees.

It can only do so by providing a higher level of wage incentives, beginning with its postal workers.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions since I have been a member of this great body I have addressed myself to the war of 60 years ago that started our country on the road to her destiny as the leader of the free nations charged with tremendous world responsibility.

Today I have requested time that I may read to my colleagues and to leave in the permanent RECORD of the 85th Congress, where it forever will be available to future researchers, the almost forgotten address of Maj. Gen. William R. Shafter before the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

General Shafter was the commander in chief of the first American expeditionary force in our history. His story of the campaign in Cuba, resulting in the investment and surrender of the city of Santiago in a siege of 24 days, is of thrilling and illuminating interest. The address before the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce was made shortly after the termination of hostilities. It deserves to be preserved as part of the glorious history of our Republic, and I hope that my rereading today of this address of almost six decades ago will make some contribution to that end. Unfortunately, because of the rapid sweep of great events following the Spanish-American War, this address by the commander-in-chief of our first American expeditionary force is today almost forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, a word or two of explanation I think advisable in order that General Shafter's reference to the danger of summer campaigning in the tropics better may be understood by the present generation. At the close of the 19th century malaria, which even at the present time exacts an annual toll of 2 million lives, was a ravishing ailment without any known remedial tratment and to which all who came from northern climes were quick prey. As to yellow fever the situation was so hopeless that the plan for the construction of an interoceanic canal in Panama was abandoned because of the impossibility of even hardened men digging in a land where yellow fever was rampant. Among the great benefits coming to mankind from the war with Spain of 60 years ago was the conquering of the dread yellow fever plague.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now commence the reading of Major General Shafter's forgotten address before the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles:

GENERAL SHAFTER'S ADDRESS

Gentlemen of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, no man with a particle of sensibility can fail to be profoundly moved by such acclaim as you have given me tonight upon the mention of my name. There is nothing so dear to a public servant as to feel and to know that his countrymen, the people who employ him, approve his course. I take your enthusiastic welcome as evidence that you do approve the campaign which I recently commanded. (Applause.)

In time of peace the Army of the United States occupies perhaps a not very enviable position. We are tolerated because we may be necessary. But when war comes and we can be made useful to the state and to the great army of militia of the United States, which we always have, and we achieve victory for our country, you then give us praise—all that we deserve, and probably

more in many instances. [Voices, "No, no, no."]

I cannot feel that I have done anything more than that for which I have been paid for many years; and it has been my fortunate lot that I was selected to command the campaign that, to the astonishment of myself and everyone in this country, resulted in peace between the United States and Spain.

No one dreamed that the little expedition to Cuba would result as it did. But with the destruction of the Spanish fleet, and the capture of 24,000 of the 160,000 troops that were in Cuba, Spain saw that there was but one thing to do; that sooner or later, she had to surrender, and she had the good judgment to accept it at the outset. Although her fleet was destroyed, she still had 145,000 of her best soldiers on the Island of Cuba, but it was impossible to reinforce them by a single man, or carry to them a single pound of provisions or a dollar in money. And without men, money, and provisions, an army cannot long survive.

SPAIN SUES FOR PEACE

It was for that reason, and appreciating our position, that, immediately after the destruction of Admiral Cervera's fleet—the last fleet of any consequence in the Spanish Navy—and the fall of Santiago, she sent the French Minister to our Secretary of State, and asked him upon what terms peace could be had.

In talking with General Toral about his surrender, after the proposition had been made to him that his army should be transported free or at the expense of our Government, he asked me if that would embrace his entire command. Up to that time I knew nothing of his territorial command. And I said to him, "What does your command consist of?" He replied, "The Fourth Army Corps." I said, "Where is it?" He said, "11,500 men are here, 7,000 are at Guantanamo (which was 55 miles from us), 3,500 men at San Luis (which was 25 miles away), and about 1,500 about 25 or 30 miles away." I said, "Certainly, it takes everything."

I do not hesitate to say to you that I was simply thunderstruck that, of their own free will, they should give me 12,000 men that were absolutely beyond my reach. I had no earthly chance of getting them. My men were not strong enough, and we could not have proceeded against them at that time of year. A fresh army could not have marched through that country; they would have sickened and died. They might have reached the 3,500 men at San Luis, which was only 25 miles away, but they could not have marched to the others.

At first, I thought General Toral meditated treachery. I had, at first, thought that the whole of that army of 25,000 men, none of whom were more than 55 miles away, and 3,500 of them only 25 miles away, would any day be upon us. Why they did not come, is something no military man can appreciate or understand.

SCENE AT SURRENDER

When a single officer of my command, with a troop of cavalry, went out to receive their surrender 5 days after the fall of Santiago, the Spanish troops proposed to fire on the white flag they carried. But our troops kept marching on, and they did not fire.

When the Spanish officer who accompanied our men informed the general in command that General Toral had surrendered him as part of his command, he refused to believe it, refused to believe that the city of Santiago had fallen.

They did not molest the troops, although they could have wiped my men up in a minute. They would not surrender, however, unless an officer was permitted to go into Santiago to see if the American Army had possession. I was surprised that afternoon to see a detachment ride into town. And when I asked the officer what it meant, he said, "These fellows have come down to see if you have Santiago." They soon made known, through an interpreter, what they had come for, and I said, "Look about." They said they didn't care to look any more. They mounted their horses and rode back, and the next morning the command at San Luis surrendered.

You can hardly appreciate that, in a campaign which actually lasted from the 23d of June until the 16th of July—about 24 days—these Spanish troops should have remained so near and, as they claimed, have been absolutely unaware of the fighting that was going on at Santiago. I do not believe it. But they said that they did not know, and they acted as though they didn't.

HISTORY OF TROPICS CAMPAIGNS

It would take me too long to enter into any detailed account of that campaign, but you know and every student of history knows, that every expedition which has been made to the Caribbean Sea, has either been an absolute disaster or met with very poor success. The single exception, where they were successful, was on account of the death by disease of nearly all the Spanish troops. In 1761, from the 6th day of June until the 12th day of August, the English and the American colonial troops assisting them, did succeed in capturing the few poor, sickly wretches in Habana. Napoleon sent an army of 25,000 men to Santo Domingo in 1801, and it is said in his history that within 3 weeks 20,000 of the 25,000 were dead or dying, including his brother-in-law, the commander of the expedition. And of the 34,000 men he sent there in the course of about 6 months, he managed to get back to France less than 2,000 men.

Considering the history of that expedition, and the history of Walker's Nicaragua expedition, and Admiral Vernon's expedition against Santiago in 1840—in which the men actually quit upon the same ground over which I took ours—our victory was remarkable. At that time, 1840, the men actually quit without armed resistance, because they were unable at that time of the year to march and cut their road through the jungle and live in that climate. They became sick in a couple of weeks, so ill that they were absolutely broken up, and had to take to their ships and go away.

When English troops in the last century, at a period when they were not overly particular about loss of men and suffering, quit under such circumstances, you can imagine it was a pretty hard task that our men had.

BATTLE AGAINST DISEASE

With knowledge of these previous expeditions before me, you can imagine the feelings with which I entered upon that campaign. I have had yellow fever myself, and I knew just as well before I landed as I do now, that within 3 or 4 or perhaps 5 weeks (it came sooner), that army would be prostrated with disease. And I determined I would make it a question of brawn and strength of the American Army against disease and death which lurked in the jungles of that island.

If I could get Santiago before the men gave out, well and good. If not, we were gone. There was nothing else to do. We had declared war against a nation. The President ordered me to Washington and gave me my orders, which were entirely different than to go to Santiago; that was not contemplated at that time. The President said at that time no matter what clamor the newspapers made, he would not order the volunteers who had been called out into Cuba during the sickly season. He would wait until later in the autumn when they could be moved there with greater safety.

When the news came that Cervera's fleet was cooped up in Santiago Harbor, and Admiral Sampson telegraphed that it was impossible to go into the harbor, but that with 10,000 men the harbor could be taken within 48 hours, the President ordered me to proceed without delay.

The orders given me were: "Proceed without delay, land your forces at such places as you see fit, capture the city of Santiago, and assist in driving the Spanish Fleet out of the harbor."

With these orders I started, and I was never interfered with. There has been some talk that I was. It is a mistake. I never was interfered with by anyone. I had lots of advice, but I did not have any orders from anyone who could interfere with me. I might claim that if the campaign had been a failure, no one else would have been responsible but myself. [Applause.]

NO FATAL MISTAKES IN CUBA

I speak more freely than I have at any other time, because I am at home and, I feel, among my friends. And although I dislike to speak of that campaign as I think it ought to be spoken of, for it would seem egotistical on my part to do so, still there are some things that I can tell you about, I can tell you what we had to do with, and what the results were. There has been a lot of criticism about that campaign. There never has been a campaign which was not criticized. You men who are businessmen and take responsibilities every day know that you see things much better after they have happened than you did before. I doubt if there is any businessman of many years experience who has not made mistakes. It is more than likely, some mistakes were made in this campaign. I do not say there were not, but there were no fatal ones. The result speaks for itself.

As I say, we had declared war. And although we might have waited, and made some minor attacks in Cuba which would have kept the troops employed until cold weather came in October, and the great campaign could have been made at Habana where the great body of Spanish troops were—when the Spanish fleet was caught in the harbor at Santiago, it had to be captured or driven out, or we would have been the laughing stock of the world.

For this reason I was sent out and ordered to proceed with my troops as early as possible. I was to take not less than 10,000 men. I had been ready for a week to go. We had been stopped by a scare that some Spanish men-of-war had been seen in the vicinity, and I had been lying in Tampa harbor for a week. The animals had been taken off ships during this delay.

It took a little longer to put the animals on board the transports than it did the men, and by the time the 2,000 horses and mules were on board, I had managed to get 17,000 men on board instead of 10,000. I can tell you that it was almost necessary to use force to keep the men who were to stay back, from coming on board, so anxious were they to go. The ships were packed full, and if we had had storms, there would have been suffering. But we did not have any storms. You may call it luck or anything else, but there was no disaster or suffering.

AMERICAN ARMY OUTNUMBERED

We needed every one of the 17,000 men before we got through, as we had opposed to us when we started, 8,500 men in Santiago and 3,000 reinforcements which came in on the night of the 2d of July. There were within 50 miles of us, 21,000 troops against less than 17,000. This was in addition to the 11,500 Spaniards in Santiago. Including officers and men, we had 16,800 who went aboard the ships. Many who are here, who have been in the military service, know what numbers of soldiers are necessary to do work about camps, and care for the sick.

As a matter of fact, during the engagements of the 1st and 2d of July, I did not

have more than 13,000 men on the firing line at any one time. As I have told you, I determined to rush it, and I did rush it. [Applause.] If we had not started from the morning we landed and kept going—with only 1 or 2 short stops to get a little more ammunition, a few more rations, and a few men—that army would have broken down and would have been a defeated army today, and we would not have taken Santiago.

There is no more use in thinking that men can go into that climate at that season of the year and escape diseases, than there is that you can put your hand in the fire and escape burning it. It is sure to come. That army, I believe, was the best that ever stood up in America. [Applause.] I won't except even the gallant fellows of the northern and southern armies at the close of the Civil War. The armies of the North and South excelled my men in only one thing—they knew what fatigue meant. In every other respect, that army has never been excelled by any army we ever had in this country. They were intelligent and enthusiastic. Every man of them felt that he could whip his weight in Spaniards, if he could only get at them. [Laughter.]

CERTAIN DISASTER PREDICTED

I had with me going to Cuba, a number of foreign attachés. They predicted disaster. They talked to me most consolingly. One, a French major who was very friendly, said that it was certain to be a disaster. We were not prepared for foreign service, and he cited the time it took the French to get ready for Madagascar a few years ago; that they were a year in embarking and disembarking; that they had all sorts of boats to go on shore with, etc. We had only two scows and 2 tugs. One tug ran away, and 1 scow was lost, leaving but 1 scow and 1 tug—a little thing about the length of this room—and one steam lighter. So, we had to depend mainly on the ships' boats and those of the Navy, to get ashore.

Some people do not understand that every man in that command knew enough to get himself into a boat and go ashore alone. [Applause.] People do not appreciate what a thinking American soldier is. [Applause.] That is the secret of the whole business. The men piled into the boats themselves; they did not have to be led in; they rowed themselves ashore. They say the first man who landed inquired the way to Santiago. [Laughter.] [Applause.] I don't know whether he did or not, but the first organized command which reached shore, took the road to Santiago, and didn't stop until they got there. [Applause.]

A Spanish Lieutenant-Colonel who was shot through the body, said—"Oh, if we had only known that you would treat us as you have done, we would have surrendered when the demand was first made, because we knew your command was larger than ours. But we thought we were going to be killed and we would die fighting."

As I told you, I started General Wheeler and General Kent in at 10 o'clock. They were under fire all the morning in the road, and really lost more men there than they did after the charge was made. I knew that no disaster could come to Lawton, although it was taking him longer than he anticipated to get in a position to assist in the main attack. The order to charge San Juan Hill was given and it took 2 or 3 hours to take those heights. They were taken with comparatively little loss. The city is about half or three-quarters of a mile away from these heights, and in plain sight.

Lawton captured El Caney, as I told you, at half past four o'clock, and early the next morning he was in his place on the right and prepared to resist or assist in any attack, if it was necessary.

CAPTURE OF SANTIAGO

The Spanish troops made a weak attack on the morning of July 2, but were soon driven back, and the city of Santiago was captured, practically within 10 days from the time we landed. To be sure, the talk and negotiations went on about 12 days longer, but there was no time in that week that it would not have been possible—with the reinforcements that were coming in every day amounting to about 4,000 (21,000 in all)—to have taken the place by assault. But had we taken it by assault, 2,000 good American soldiers, who are now alive at home, or have gone back to Cuba, would had laid their bones in front of that place; and all we would have had would have been that 11,000 men in front of the city of Santiago. General Toral, as a prisoner, could not have surrendered the rest of his corps, because being a prisoner would have relieved him from any authority, and they would not have respected a surrender made by him. The war would not have come to a close when it did.

During the few days of talk, I had every opportunity to strengthen my lines and I improved it. I convinced the Spaniards of the absolute uselessness of their cause and gave them time to deliberate at home. On July 14 they had received approval from their home government and they surrendered. They feared to accept our terms and go back to Spain without approval of the home government, for fear that they would be torn to pieces by the populace when they got there. And they refused finally to accept the terms that had been agreed upon, until permission was accorded them to surrender. After they had received such permission, they informed me that they were ready to complete their surrender.

I telegraphed the President, notifying him that day of that fact, and said that in my opinion that closed the war with Spain. It was thought that I was over sanguine and that part of my dispatch was not given to the public. But when, 4 days later, the French minister called and asked on what terms they could have peace, it was given out.

As you know, the result of that surrender was 23,446 prisoners who were captured, several million rounds of cartridges, 16,000 good guns and a large number of poor ones, and the destruction of the Spanish power in Cuba. The object for which we had gone to war with Spain was accomplished. [Applause.]

LOTS OF SUFFERING

That there was suffering and lots of suffering, there is no use in denying. Men who go to war, those who are unfortunate, always suffer; and if you are going to get yourself in a position to hurt your enemy, you have got to give him a chance to hurt you. It is not all on one side if you get close to him, and you have got to get close to him if you are to accomplish anything.

But at the same time, the losses were comparatively small. We lost less than 250 men killed in action and 1,400 wounded. Of these 1,400 wounded, but 13 died. You could hardly stand up a lot of men and shoot 1,400 of them and try to wound without killing—and have but 13 of them die. As far as I know, there was but one capital operation—a man had his leg taken off on the troop ship on the way home.

We were ill prepared for war as you all know. We declared war with an Army of but 25,000 men, when the Army opposed to us and in the country in which we were to operate, numbered 165,000 men. Those are pretty big odds, but those are the odds that were against us. But it was over quickly, and it was over so quickly that but few of the volunteers who gallantly turned out, were able to have a hand in it. They did have a little of it in Puerto Rico, but it was simply a walk-over. It was a foregone conclusion that they would not make a stand. They knew it and did not try it.

I want to say a word for the doctors. It has been said that we didn't have medicine enough. We didn't have very much medicine; they did not have as much as they should have had. But at the same time, I don't think that anyone suffered materially from want of it. The medical men tell me they did not. I don't know about it, but I can say that the doctors there worked as the doctors of our Army have always worked. They were magnificent fellows, but they are men, and they became sick as other men did. But that they neglected any man or that any man was neglected unnecessarily or carelessly, is absolutely untrue.

If there are any here who went through the Civil War on either side, you know how many times we went hungry and did not complain of it either. On the 1st of January 1865, within 2 miles of Joe Wheeler's farm in Alabama, in the pursuit of Hood, we had so far outstripped our transportation that my regiment and the whole division was without food. And at the little town of Courtland, ears of corn were issued to us and we were glad to get them, and there wasn't a complaint uttered.

DISEASE HITS THE ARMY

There is all the time that haunting fear which men cannot avoid in a strange country, when they are expecting disease they know nothing of. The health of my command held up remarkably well until the 17th of July. We had five or six hundred cases of yellow fever before that, and a few hundred cases of malarial fever.

But after that they became sick very fast, so that on one occasion about the 3d or 4th of August, there were 842 men placed on sick report in 1 day. That same day, 600 odd men were returned to duty, but they were returned to duty still sick. They were not so sick as those men who came in, but they had to go back to their quarters to make room for others. It was out of the question to hope that men coming from the North would recover in that climate, and it was very fortunate that we were able to get them away as soon as we did.

I have it from the Adjutant General's Office that, including the loss in battle and by death from the 1st of June until the 30th day of September, there were only 500 men who lost their lives—250 men in battle and 250 men by disease. Five hundred men are a great many men to waste on Cuba, but we had to do it; and I am of the opinion that that loss, great as it is, is amply paid for by the magnificent results achieved.

I have recently been through the South and the West with the President, and such enthusiastic loyalty I have never seen anywhere as I have throughout every part of the United States where I have been. [Applause.] It is the first time in the history of this Nation that there has been but one side. In every other war, we have had bitter opponents. In the Civil War we were pretty nearly evenly divided, but in this war we were a unit. [Applause.] I tell you that a knowledge of that fact was a wonderful sustainer of the spirits of our soldiers. We knew that we had the sympathy of every man, woman, and child at home, and we knew that everything that could be done, would be done to help us.

I was going back to speak of that wounded Spanish lieutenant colonel. Doctor Goodfellow, who is present tonight, said that it would be a good thing to send the wounded prisoners into Santiago. I asked General Toral if he would take some dangerously wounded prisoners we had into the town; that I could not give them proper care. He answered promptly that he would like to have them. Doctor Goodfellow went over the next morning and put them in ambulances, 27 of them, and carried them into the town of Santiago with a military escort.

SPIRIT OF SPANISH SOLDIERS

It was something unheard of, and the men were received with the greatest joy. It was the first time the Spanish Army had had opportunity of finding out what was going on outside, and I was told that the story those men gave of their treatment had a marked effect upon the men inside Santiago. These men were suspicious, they were starving, they had no heart in the business. It was as foreign to them as it is to our men who are in Cuba now. They wanted to go back to their beloved Spain, and they were only too happy to know that they would be accorded the treatment given by civilized armies to prisoners, and I believe this, in a great measure, brought them to the opinion that the best thing they could do was to surrender.

I had given to me by a friend, a copy of a telegram sent by a Spanish general who was severely shot on the first day of the battle, written on the 12th of July, in which he said he had risen from a sick bed to notify the Minister of War in Spain of the condition of affairs at Santiago; that surrender was inevitable; that the enemy had the town invested where he could with impunity and without loss to himself, shell the town; and that it was only a question of time when they must surrender. Furthermore, he stated that the cablegrams he had received, urging him to make an assault, were impossible of execution; that it was useless to think of it; that a third of his men could not march out of the rifle-pits; that another third would be killed in any assault which would attempt to break through our lines; and that the remaining third would soon fall an easy prey to our army.

He was right about it. If he had had three times the number of men he did have, he could not have broken out of those lines. It was absolutely impossible for him to do it with anything like the force he had. He very wisely counseled surrender, and 2 days later he did surrender.

There was one thing that struck me more than anything else, and that was the sentiment that pervaded my own army and the Spanish army, the moment the surrender was made. To us who served throughout the Civil War, it is known that the most bitter feeling had to be brought about before civil war could possibly have started. And although prisoners were always treated humanely and with propriety by both the North and the South, at the same time there wasn't any love lost between them.

FRIENDLY MINGLING

But these men, the moment they were prisoners, mingled with my men upon the friendliest terms. The camp was full of them. My own men mingled with the Spanish soldiers in such numbers that I feared there might be trouble, until I rode my horse in among them and discovered they were simply swapping trinkets, and were as happy as could be, without animosity or hatred, although the day before they had been doing their utmost to kill each other. It was a revelation to me in warfare.

Upon leaving Santiago, I received a letter from a Spanish soldier, written on behalf of 11,000 men, thanking the American Army in the kindliest terms for the treatment which had been accorded them; that they had been given everything that civilized armies accorded. It was a remarkable letter, such as, I think, had never before been received by a commanding general from a defeated army. [Applause.]

There has been, as I said in the beginning, a great deal of criticism, and some of it was very bitter. But I am glad to say that there has never been any by any military man of any prominence or by any person whose judgment was ripe enough to give a sound opinion.

On the contrary, every military writer, both at home and abroad, has spoken of that campaign as one of the most remarkable in modern history. There has never been a campaign finished as quickly as this one was, except perhaps the 6-weeks war between Germany and Austria, where they only had to walk across the road and they were in the enemy's country.

I believe the results of that war will redound immensely to the benefit of this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), until further notice, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 20 minutes, on Thursday, March 6.

Mr. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on Thursday next.

Mr. MACK of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLIER, for 10 minutes, on Thursday, March 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER on two different subjects.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. MACK of Illinois.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. KEAN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of the birthday of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. ROBERTS in four instances.

Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI).

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI).

Mr. MCFALL (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI).

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1041. An act to amend 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; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

S. 1538. An act 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1706. An act 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; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

S. 2114. An act 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 activities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2224. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2231. An act 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; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2255. An act to amend section 607 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2283. An act to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2725. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2752. An act 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; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3016. An act to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3057. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3341. An act to extend the Armed Forces dairy-products program for 3 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3342. An act to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3343. An act to extend the accelerated brucellosis-control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5809. An act to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor; and

H. R. 8795. An act to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 5, 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:

1667. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of requirements determinations and related procurement for J-57 aircraft jet engines in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1668. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of phaseout operations of the Southern Air Materiel Area, Europe (SAMAE), Air Materiel Force, European Area, Department of the Air Force, Nouaseur, Morocco, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1669. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 22, 1958, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Port Everglades Harbor, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate and House of Representatives, adopted February 26, 1954, and July 29, 1954, respectively (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1670. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1671. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1672. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the settlement of a certain tort claim by the Bureau of the Budget, during calendar year 1957, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1673. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of power billings and related activities under Atomic Energy Commission contracts for electric power with Ohio Valley Electric Corp., Electric Energy, Inc., and Tennessee Valley Authority for the 18-month period ended December 31, 1956; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1674. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1676. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department, 1957; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1677. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1678. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1679. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1680. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Fong Mon, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1681. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain individuals, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1682. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Francesco Ianni, A-5357406, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and requesting the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; 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:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1448. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10792. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 10459. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9645. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9999. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8268. A bill to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 493. Resolution for consideration of S. 2448, an act to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 494. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5309, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7870, a bill to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional $10 million for the completion of the Inter-American Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 11109. A bill to extend the loan guaranty program for World War II veterans for 2 years, extend the direct loan program for a like period, authorize an interest rate on guaranteed and direct loans commensurate with that applicable to mortgages insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, to increase the maximum direct loan to $13,500, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 11110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to the wife, dependent husband, or child of an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 11112. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and em-

ployment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 11113. A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 11114. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNISON:

H. R. 11115. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 11116. A bill to provide that the individual income tax on the first $1,000 of taxable income shall be reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 11117. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hular Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11118. A bill to provide that a portion of all surplus cotton sold or exchanged for export by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be processed cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 11119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 11120. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 11121. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11122. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States, comprising a part of Beale Air Force Base, Calif., to the South Sutter Water District, East Nicolaus, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11123. A bill providing for the extension of certain authorized functions of the Secretary of the Interior to areas other than the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 11124. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11125. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Valparaiso, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 11126. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept title to Grant's Tomb in New York, N. Y., and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 11127. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 11128. A bill to enable the States to provide an additional 26 weeks of unemployment compensation for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 11129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that unemployment benefits shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 11130. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11131. 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. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 11132. 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. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11133. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 11134. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11135. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11136. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 11137. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 11138. 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. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11139. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Columbia Basin Project Act with respect to delivery of water to State and Federal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 11140. A bill to provide immediate annuities to certain widows and widowers otherwise entitled to deferred annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11141. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953, chapter 509, 67 Stat. 592 (Public Law 284, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), to revest title to the minerals in the Indian tribes, to require that oil and gas and other mineral leases of lands in the Riverton reclamation project within the Wind River Indian Reservation shall be issued on the basis of competitive bidding only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request).

H. R. 11142. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide detention and other benefits thereunder to certain Guamanians killed or captured by the Japanese at Wake Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 558. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 560. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in the month of October as National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. J. Res. 563. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital-improvement programs and amending provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 564. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the month of March in each year as "Neighborhood House Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution to request the President to proclaim March as "Neighborhood House Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission to place a statue of the late Maria Sanford in the rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 11143. A bill for the relief of Miss Marguerite Ann Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 11144. A bill for the relief of Chiang Chen Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 11145. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (by request):

H. R. 11146. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Frederick J. Boudreau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11147. A bill for the relief of Antoun S. Ghantous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 11148. A bill for the relief of Mary Therese Chen, also known as Chen Li Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 11149. A bill for the relief of Feng Yeah Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 11150. A bill for the relief of Maria Veneranda Machargo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 11151. A bill for the relief of James H. Presley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 11152. A bill for the relief of Chava Chaya Yarnicky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 11153. A bill for the relief of Miss Kang Cha Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11154. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Dunham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 11155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annunziata Julietta Plijnaer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 11156. A bill for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11157. A bill for the relief of Eladio Aris (also known as Eladio Aris Carvallo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 11158. A bill for the relief of Charles Blue and Dona Blue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 11159. A bill for the relief of Kwong Kock Kue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11160. A bill for the relief of Jesus Martinez-Silvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 11161. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Point; 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:

456. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Eckley L. Mills, Bloomsburg, Pa., and other citizens of Columbia County, urging favorable action on a bill to grant pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

457. Also, petition of Robert W. Michael, Bloomsburg, Pa., and other citizens of Columbia County and adjacent area, urging favorable action on a bill to grant pensions for all veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the first of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY

PART I: INDIANS AND EARLY HISTORY

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Indians, first to reap benefits in the Coosa-Alabama River basin, dominated the virgin valley for nearly three centuries.

Their role in the area's history dates back to an ancient tribal town named "Coosa," located on the west bank of the river in what is now Talladega County.

It was at Coosa that Hernando DeSoto, the Spanish explorer, rested his men and horses during his ramblings in the Coosa River Valley. He had entered the valley in 1540 by crossing the river in the present St. Clair County.

Traveling south, DeSoto later fought, near the Alabama River east of Selma, what has been called the bloodiest battle ever waged between whites and Indians on the North American continent. But it was far from the last such fight.

In the 18th century, Bienville, French former governor of Louisiana colony, found his way into the Coosa Valley. In need of a post among the Creek Indians in warring with the French, Bienville in 1714 built Fort Toulouse.

From this fort at the junction of the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, Bienville was to conduct an extensive missionary campaign among the Indians. The effort would foreshadow the first permanent white settlement of a large Alabama area.

More white men were drawn to the Coosa basin. Andrew Jackson's warring with the Creeks during the War of 1812 brought him deep into the valley.

He built Fort Strother on the Coosa in the land which would become St. Clair County; he used the river to move his flatboats southward, ultimately to fight the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

It was the beginning of the end of the Indians' bountiful life in the woods and valleys of the Coosa Basin. When Jackson vanquished the Creeks, the Coosa River became the line beyond which the Indians could not wander.

In 1818, the last Indian fight west of the river was fought because a handful of Creeks, refusing to obey the treaty, were roaming along the wrong side of the river and were killing the new white settlers.

Shortly thereafter, in 1819, Alabama became a part of the Union. First capital of the new state was Cahaba, near the Alabama River in Dallas County.

From DeSoto's entry into the Coosa Valley to Alabama's admission to the Union had been an eventful 279 years. The mighty Coosa-Alabama waterway and its first inhabitants had been a significant part of it all.

Next: Steamboats and Freight.

Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in the RECORD relative to a belief and concern I have for the family in remaining the center of American life.

Often I have read from wise men that if one look at the family life of a nation, you will know many other things about it, its strength and weaknesses.

Lately I have been reading of the serious incidents occurring in our schools in different parts of the United States. My reactions have not been approving. I cannot help but wonder if one had the time to examine the backgrounds of those involved, the evidence disclosed would overwhelmingly point to laxity and callousness about the family unit, and in many instances family living as I know it would be nonexistent in a great number of cases. As a defense counsel for many, many years, I have seen what the lack of respect, absence of authority in the family, does to young boys and girls or young men and women.

Some schools of thought it seems consider acknowledgment of the sanctity of the home as out of step with today. A person who adheres to this belief is thought to be old fashioned. Be that as it may, as the father of eight, I know the need for a close family unit. Many virtues are needed in meeting the challenge today if our future leaders are to have the principles we know to be right. Infinite love, patience, understanding, intelligence, and commonsense and a genuine interest in our children's life are but some of the cardinal ingredients necessary, if these children are to mature into solid citizens, possessed with a steadfast belief and faith in God, Almighty, and a primary desire to serve God, country, and State with honor and devotion.

Parents are confronted with the need to be constantly alert to influences which

seek to destroy the ideals we endeavor to inject into our family life.

This week's Washington Post and Times Herald reported that information released recently by the Kinsey Institute for Sex states there is an increasing frequency of illegal abortions in the United States. I was heartened however to note that Dr. David Allman of Atlantic City, N. J., who is president of the American Medical Association, does not altogether agree with the statistics released by the Kinsey Institute.

There are other signs to make the picture brighter. I wish to commend and congratulate a family in my constituency, Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. Fulton, of 8035 South Emerald Avenue, Chicago, on the arrival of their ninth child. The Fulton's with their nine are one up on the Byrnes since we are only eight.

The father of this fine family is a Democrat precinct captain and I knew him when I was a Republican precinct captain.

I sincerely hope that Walter Fulton is successful in finding that they are "cheaper by the dozen."

This family is a wonderful example of the kind of family life needed. The Fulton children have the security of a united family. The more examples we have of family life as the Fultons live it, the better it augurs for the future of our country and the moral fiber of our citizenry.

Whether we have one or a dozen children, parents must offset the avenues leading to delinquency with plenty of healthy, wholesome family living.

I commend the Southtown Economist for giving such wholesome news coverage on the first page of its Sunday edition, February 23, 1958. The Fultons indeed can feel gratified.

Two Hundred and Tenth Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey know well the name of Casimir Pulaski, for we have named a monumental skyway which soars over the meadows between Jersey City and Newark in his memory.

Today, March 4, marks the 210th anniversary of the birth of Pulaski, that great Polish patriot and hero of the American Revolution.

General Pulaski is a fine symbol of the brave people of Poland and the people of Polish ancestry who have contributed so much to the cause of freedom over the centuries. His entire life was spent fighting for the traditions of freedom which we all cherish.

From the days when Pulaski fought so bravely in the American Revolution, we Americans have had a friendly feeling for the Polish people and sympathy with their struggles for liberty.

The Polish people were one of the first in Europe to show a liberal spirit and, in spite of continual attacks by their neighbors, that spirit of liberty has persisted.

Those who live in that land and those here and abroad who take pride in their Polish descent pray for that day when tyranny will be wiped out and the principles of freedom for which General Pulaski fought so valiantly will again be restored.

Will H. R. 8002 Do What It Says?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8002, the so-called accrued expenditure appropriations bill, comes up for consideration this Wednesday, March 5. The paramount question is, will it do what it says it is designed to do? It says it will do three things. They are stated in the opening paragraph, as follows:

> It is the sense of the Congress that revisions in 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 the Congress, to reduce or eliminate the large carryover balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to another, and to bring about economy in Government expenditures. It is therefore the policy of the Congress that estimates for proposed appropriations will be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

It will not do any of these things as now written. I urge all Members to consider the following facts on each of these three things:

WILL H. R. 8002 PROVIDE A MORE INFORMATIVE BASIS FOR THE ENACTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS?

H. R. 8002 would delude the people for 1 year, and to some extent for 2 years, into thinking that a lot of money was being saved by the reduction of appropriations and the substitution of contract authority. Such a program would look attractive and painless, but the day of rude awakening would of course come in confusion and frustration.

If, for example, we had converted last year's budget to this accrued expenditure basis of making the appropriations, we could have shown a cut of about $24 billion. But it would have been completely phony.

Generally, in appropriation bills we now fully finance long-range programs for aircraft, ships, and other long-lead time items. Congress and the country know in advance just how big and expensive the programs are. Under H. R. 8002 we would follow the confusing process of changing the appropriation bills to provide the following: (a) Funds to liquidate prior contract authority; (b) funds for the regular annual functions of the Government; and (c) additional contract authority for partially completed programs and for the initiation of new programs.

This would make less effective the work of the Appropriations Committee, it would be confusing to members of the committee and to Members of Congress generally, and it would tend to conceal from the people the fiscal actions of Congress because the press would have difficulty in reporting to the people just what was happening to them under this installment-buying dollar-down contract-authority hodge-podge.

WILL H. R. 8002 "REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE LARGE CARRYOVER BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS FROM ONE FISCAL YEAR TO ANOTHER"?

Yes; it will. But therein is the catch. Note the word "appropriations." That is the catch, because it says nothing whatever about what would happen to contract authority carryovers. If you will look at section 2, and the committee report, you will see that contract authority is to be substituted for appropriations for things that run beyond 1 fiscal year. What would happen there?

What would happen if the shift were made to the suggested basis of appropriating, would be the elimination of large unexpended appropriation balances—which, of course, is not cash in the Treasury—and substitution of large unfunded contract authorization balances. Under either system, the grant of authority to obligate the Treasury to future cash expenditure occurs at the outset. A fiscal system cannot change the operating realities of the vast and complex programs of the Government or the point of time at which the necessities of the situation make a claim on the Treasury. Under either system, the large carryovers—and there will be similar large carryovers under both—will consist of (a) outstanding obligations and (b) unobligated amounts. Under either system, the die is cast as to eventual payment when the obligation is created. On this important point of timing of the obligation to future payment, therefore, the proposition is essentially a distinction without a difference. The day of reckoning—the day of payment—is inevitable and, furthermore, the payment will normally occur at the same time under either system. Once the obligation or commitment sets the machinery in motion, the Congress can do little if anything to postpone the day of cash payment.

This is partial funding. And the present Budget Director, who urges H. R. 8002, is against partial funding. Here is what he stated in a letter of May 17, 1957—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 6, page 7497:

> I believe we should continue to follow the sound procedure of fully funding the procurement of all items necessary for the full operation of such major things as airplanes, tanks, and ships when the initial appropriation is made. We would lose budgetary control of these programs if we adopted a policy of partial funding for such items.

This statement from the executive branch—from one who is supporting H. R. 8002—ought to be read and reread by those who advocate H. R. 8002,

because H. R. 8002 would require exactly what the Budget Director says should not be done.

WILL H. R. 8002 "BRING ABOUT ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES"?

Some of the proponents have said it would, but it will not. The people have been told it would. The Hoover Commission never said it would save a specific sum. The task force expressed a belief that about $4 billion annually could reasonably be expected to be saved. Merely a belief. No proof. No evidence. Just picked out of the air.

Now, what do they lay their belief on? The main objective of this bill, so they say, is to compel a systematic review and reauthorization each year of the large unexpended carryover balances. They suggest that, somehow, a formal, prescribed procedure for such review will bring vast savings. But not a shred of evidence to prove savings has ever been offered—because none exists.

The standing practice of the Committee on Appropriations has been to review the balances 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 Budget Bureau does the same thing. Mr. Brundage—and the strange thing is that he supports H. R. 8002—made this statement in a letter of May 17, 1957 to Senator SALTONSTALL. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 6, page 7497.

In preparing the 1958 budget we gave very careful consideration to the use of balances wherever possible in lieu of requesting new authority for 1958.

But what about the vast savings? Will the bill in its present form save money?

Mr. Brundage, the Budget Director, is for the bill. And he makes up the budget. If it will save vast sums, he surely ought to be the one who could put his finger on any savings and tell us where, how much, and in what manner.

But what is Mr. Brundage's opinion as to the validity of claimed savings? Here is his opinion—and it is devastating. Here are quotes from hearings of the Committee on Appropriations of June 18, 1956:

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the Director would tell us how they propose by this change in the budgetary system to make a saving of $4 billion annually.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. The chairman of the task force, Mr. CANNON, said that he had estimated the $4 billion by taking 8½ percent of all the controllable expenditures per year and, quite frankly, I would rather not express an opinion on either the computation or how they got it.

Mr. CANNON. That is what we are anxious to have you do. You know a saving of $4 billion annually is a very impressive objective. * * * I would like to know how you propose to save $4 billion by this change in the system.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I would not say we would save $4 billion in this way. I think it will save money and give better control, but I have never been willing to estimate what any savings would amount to. It is too intangible.

Mr. CANNON. This idea has been sold to the country. I am getting letters asking "Why do you not adopt this plan and save $4 billion every year?"

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I avoided mentioning any savings in any testimony or correspondence I have on the subject.

Mr. CANNON. I am not differing with you. I am not objecting. I merely want more information on the subject.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I feel satisfied that we will save several million dollars.

Mr. CANNON. Several million?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. There is a great difference between several million and the $4 billion advertised. The fact that you are satisfied does not necessarily satisfy us.

Mr. Speaker, there it is in black and white. Not billions of savings. Not even millions. Just a feeling of satisfaction that it would save several million. And, Mr. Brundage even avoids any mention of that in testimony or correspondence.

Mr. Speaker, hard experience of the Committee on Appropriations over the years shows that this bill, as now written, will cost more money, not save money. It will do so partly because it requires that we return to the use of contract authority as a substitute for appropriations which run beyond 1 year.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the second of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY

PART II: STEAMBOATS AND FREIGHT

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Paddle wheels churned the placid waters of the Coosa-Alabama River in the 19th century as steamboats heralded the arrival of the basin's most colorful era.

The steamboat *Harriett* in the fall of 1821 ushered in the era. Numerous boats followed.

The *Coosa* steamboat ran between Greensport, in Calhoun County, and Rome, Ga. Later, on the Alabama, a 155-foot stern wheel snag boat, the *Wm. J. Twining*, was put into a service by the Government to remove snags and keep the waterway clear.

Economic and social development which had clung to the meanderings of the river and its tributaries at the turn of the century now took on new increase under the influence of the paddle wheelers.

Even before the War Between the States, industrial products were transported. Iron produced in Calhoun County, for instance, was flatboated to market in Wetumpka.

During the war, the riverway helped move the materials of destruction and even the battles themselves ultimately reached the Coosa-Alabama's banks.

An intriguing incident was when Cummins M. Lay (father of the organizer of Alabama Power Co.) steered the steamboat *Laura Moore* from Rome to Mobile to prevent Union forces from taking it. The harrowing trip was the first and only by a steamboat through the rapids of the Coosa.

Later, in the 1870's the Government made improvements on the river.

Saffold Berney, a chronologer of the day, reported this result on the Alabama: "The work done has resulted in clearing the channel of dangerous snags and overhanging timber; in improvement of the worst bars. * * * Boats run by night as well as by day, at all stages of water."

In 1890, an estimated $10 million in freight was carried on the Alabama River. Three large steamboats were making regular weekly round trips between Montgomery and Mobile.

On the Coosa, water travel was less ambitious. From Greensport to Rome, steamboats navigated at all seasons; but south to Wetumpka, the river's 142 miles was a tortuous route, with varying pools, high shoals, and jagged rocks.

If these obstacles could be removed, leaders reasoned, the river could be navigable from Rome to Mobile. Interest in such a plan sparked creation of the Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association by William Patrick Lay and other valley residents.

The Government in the eighties built a series of low-lift locks and dams on the upper Coosa, but they were determined impractical and were abandoned. Upland silt settled in the stream beds, making them too shallow for large boats, and railroads began assuming most of the responsibility for hauling freight.

A hopeful era was dying and a blossoming dream had received its first disappointment. Next: Strength of a Dream.

Influence Peddling at the FCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Mack has finally resigned. Unfortunately, the case against the Federal Communications Commission goes much deeper than the headlines about Commissioner Richard A. Mack. I have been among the strongest proponents of a thorough investigation of the charges which have been made against Commissioner Mack and other members of the FCC. And I was first to expose Mr. Mack's interest in the now famous insurance firm. I want that investigation to continue. But we must go further than personalities and ferret out the reasons that influence peddling on the FCC, and possibly some other regulatory agencies, has been able to flourish.

Millions of dollars worth of valuable television franchises have been parceled out by the Commission within recent years. The most important question for the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee to decide is whether these franchises were issued, in line with the public interest, to the most meritorious applicants, or whether personal and political favoritism played a major role in the Commission's decisions.

If the channel 10 case in Miami is typical, I am afraid we must conclude that FCC concerns itself very little with the documented evidence so painstakingly—and, I might add, expensively—built up through public hearings before impartial hearing examiners.

These comparative hearings on rival applications for TV channels frequently last for years and years. The cost to the Government and to the private applicants is colossal. To communities waiting for television service, these proceedings before the FCC seem endless. If a channel fight ends with the Commission's decision, it is almost an exception rather than the rule. They usually land in court. Perhaps the frequency of court appeals is itself the best indication of the inconsistent and arbitrary fashion in which the FCC has decided these contests in recent years.

Theodore Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to pay tribute to a great President of the United States, inaugurated 53 years ago today. His party is my party—the Republican Party, and the man is Theodore Roosevelt. I would like my remarks to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Few men are without ideals and dreams. Theodore Roosevelt was what so many of us would like to be. He was fearless and had infinite courage; a high sense of honor, and was dedicated to raising the standards of public life by refusing to let personal cost deter him from public service. He was a man of action always. It was not possible for him to wait for things to happen. This characteristic manifested itself early in his life. Whatever the endeavor or task, he gave it his best.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who recognized the fact that America must prepare for the new forces at work in the world. Things were changing in 1900, just as they are now. It was incumbent up n us to begin to enforce the Monroe doctrine. We could no longer confine ourselves to devoting our energies solely to internal affairs and a larger role in international affairs was slowly but certainly being thrust upon us.

April 10, 1899, Theodore Roosevelt addressed the Hamilton Club in Chicago. I find his remarks timely today:

> I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease but the doctrine of the strenuous life.
>
> Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.
>
> We must remember not to judge any public servant by any one act, and especially should beware of attacking the men who are merely the occasion and not the causes of disaster.

In the capital of Illinois, Springfield, on July 4, 1903, Theodore Roosevelt had this to say:

> A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterward. More than that no man is entitled to, and less than that no man shall have.

This great President of our Republic lived as he believed. Life was an adventure for him, a great one and full of fun, too. These things and many more too, are why he is beloved by Americans and spoken of as Teddy Roosevelt by so many of us. I am happy and privileged to serve as a member of the Centennial Commission honoring him.

Kalevala and the Finnish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the brave people of Finland have a great and glorious national tradition going back many centuries, and this tradition is preserved in its natural simplicity in their national epic, the great poem known to the world as Kalevala. This epic poem of almost 25,000 lines—of 50 runes or cantos—was probably composed at various times and put in writing by different hands. As an artistic whole it is in sympathy with the great traditions of the Finnish people. Its blend of symbolism and realism reflects the instincts of this brave people. Thus it is characteristically Finnish, both in form and in content. It is the faithful portrayal in beautiful metric verse of the folklore of the primeval Finnish race in their ancestral homes.

The date of the composition of this classic is, of course, unknown. Until the 19th century, Kalevala lived on the lips of the peasants and the simple folk. Then students and specialists of the subject collected parts of the poem bit by bit, arranged, and published them. The great importance of Kalevala was at once recognized in Europe, and by 1852 it was translated into Swedish, French, and German. Later it was also translated into English. It is almost impossible to overemphasize the importance of Kalevala in the spiritual, religious, and national history of the Finns. What the great classic epic Iliad had been to ancient Greeks, Kalevala continues to be for the Finns, as it has from the very beginning of their national history.

The people of this country have always had great admiration and sympathy for the brave, sturdy, industrious, and patriotic Finns. They have always deserved our aid and assistance. They have not only been appreciative of such aid, but have been most conscientious in repaying it, even under the most adverse circumstances. Since the end of World War II, we have extended, in grants and loans, almost a quarter of a billion dollars to them. They have already repaid a substantial amount of the portion advanced as loan.

There has always been friendly and cordial intercourse between the peoples of the two countries, and since 1950 such intercourse is being broadened to the mutual advantage of all concerned. In matters of immigration the Finns have enjoyed considerable advantage over southern Europeans. The present quota system does not permit as many Finns to enter this country as the Finns wish, but there is the hope that this quota will be liberalized and more Finns will come here. The Finns who have migrated here have become loyal and patriotic citizens of this country.

Social-Security Improvements Would Bolster Our Economy at Once

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about increasing the purchasing power of the rank and file of the American people to help overcome the present recession. So far it has been all talk and no action. Talk alone won't do the job that needs to be done.

Many fantastic schemes have been proposed but most of them unfortunately would make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Most of these fantastic schemes would also increase the taxes of the rank and file of the people and defeat the very purpose intended—namely, to give the people more purchasing power. Increasing taxes would decrease their purchasing power.

The surest and the most commendable way in which our Government could immediately increase the purchasing power of the rank and file of the people back home without increasing taxes would be to improve the social security program. This would not cost the taxpayers any money because at the present time there is a twenty-six billion dollar surplus in our social security trust.

The changes that should be made in the present social security law are as follows:

First. The minimum payments should be increased to $50 per month and the maximum should be increased to $200 per month and proportionate increases across the board.

Second. All disabled people should be entitled to receive social-security payments regardless of age rather than waiting to age 50 under the present law. The present laws should be liberalized on this point so that one does not have to be half dead to receive social security.

Third. The eligible age for men should be brought down to age 62 and the eligible age for women should be brought down to age 60. This would open up many jobs for younger workers.

Fourth. The limitation that social-security recipients can earn should be raised from the present $1,200 per year to $1,800 per year if single and $2,400 per year if married.

Fifth. Widows receiving social security for minor children should continue to

draw social security even after the minor children reach 18 years of age. In fact the widows need this social security more as they get older than they do when they are younger. Under the present law when the children reach 18 years of age the widow goes off of social security until she reaches age 62. This is unfair and a severe hardship.

Sixth. All old-age pensioners should be included automatically under the social security program and receive monthly benefits rather than the costly supervisory old-age pension system that we have at the present time.

Seventh. Veterans should not be denied social security disability benefits because they are drawing veterans benefits or vice versa. A veteran should be entitled to both social security and veterans benefits.

If these changes are made in the social security law, there will be at least a billion dollars additional annually put into the hands of the rank and file of the people of America. This would increase the purchasing power of more than 5 million of our people who need it most.

If this Congress really wants to do something to help the rank and file of our people who are having a hard time of it at the present time this is the surest and best way to do it and it can be done without increasing the taxes of the American people. If the Congress is sincere and really wants to do something for the people, here is a wonderful chance to do it.

What is more, these benefits can be paid within 30 days of the passage of these improvements and the effect can be immediate to bolster our economy. I know of no better, speedier, effective, or economical way to give an immediate boost to our sagging economy. Why not act today?

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the third of a series of eight articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY

PART III: STRENGTH OF A DREAM

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

The sanguine dream of a fully developed Coosa-Alabama River has proved its durability.

It has withstood depression, wars, and three-quarters of a century of delays, setbacks, and near failures.

But the dream persists. It is shared by many groups—Alabama Power Co., the United States Government, the Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association, chambers of commerce, city and county governments—and by many men, from Congressmen to businessmen.

The dream gained sustenance when, in 1870, the United States Army Corps of Engineers began investigating the practicability of improving the Coosa and the Alabama Rivers.

But the first Federal project, authorized in this era of bleakness for the South, fell short of expectations. A series of low-lift navigation locks and dams, built on the upper Coosa, were found to be impractical and were abandoned.

Alabama Power Co. was an early part of the Coosa dream. Organized in 1906 to facilitate development of the river, the company had to overcome Government refusal to make survey material available before it finally obtained the right to build a dam on the Coosa. In 1914, following a long struggle to get money for the project, Lay Dam (named for Alabama Power's organizer, William Patrick Lay) was completed north of Clanton. Plans were already under way to build more dams.

But the plans ran aground in 1912 when President Taft denied Alabama Power's application to erect a plant south of Clanton. Taft said such applications should await creation of a Federal agency to act upon such matters and he contended that enabling legislation should let the Government tax waterpower.

A fight to maintain State rights ensued and it was 1921 before the power company got its second license. The waterpower bill of 1920 had not included the Federal taxation idea and the way was paved for Mitchell Dam.

This dam completed, the company began more constructions. By 1930, it had a third dam on the Coosa (Jordan, above Wetumpka) and three other dams on the Tallapoosa, which merges with the Coosa to form the Alabama River.

Meanwhile, the Corps of Engineers made its surveys. Then, in 1934, it entered a report calling for a system of locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa above the existing dams; and for locks in the three existing dams.

A 9-foot-deep channel for navigation upstream to Rome, 650 miles above Mobile, and for additional power, was recommended.

The fiber of the dream seemed more stable. But the road to fulfillment lay ahead, rough and shaky, in the indefinite future.

Next: Boost for the Coosa.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Americans throughout the Nation join in paying tribute today to Franklin D. Roosevelt on this 25th anniversary of his first inauguration, it is well to pause and give thought to an era that made history, following our national economic collapse only 25 years ago.

The following years of prosperity in which all our citizens shared began with the leadership of President Roosevelt—leadership that united the American people in a common bond to support his bold and courageous programs and leadership that pulled this country out of the depths of a national depression and started it up the road of national prosperity.

Franklin D. Roosevelt inherited a depression economy when he took office on that fateful March 4, 1933. Millions of unemployed stood in breadlines, millions of others worked for subsistence wages, factories stood idle, farmers were turned off their land.

"I pledge you," he said, "I pledge myself, to a new deal for the American people." And he made good that pledge. A confident people began to buy goods from a confident business that began to produce it. A new agricultural program that helped to put the farmers back on their feet had its impact in developing purchasing power for that important segment of our economy. Land utilization, conservation, reforestation, were all long-range programs that paid off in increased agricultural production providing a decent living for farmers and protecting the Nation's natural resources.

Federal bank insurance closed the tragic chapter when lifetime savings were wiped out in bank failures.

Unemployment insurance, social security, minimum-wage laws were all measures to prevent a repetition of the extreme suffering and hardships of another economic crisis.

The memorable first 100 days of the New Deal were exciting and vigorous. The legislative proposals were imaginative and were eagerly accepted by the American people.

Now after only 5 years of a Republican administration we find a parallel to that earlier era in the serious economic problems again facing us. We have mounting unemployment, an increasing rate of small-business failures, a deepening depression among American farmers, and a record high cost of living. But these problems are not being met with the vigor and determination that made history just 25 years ago. We see none of the urgency and excitement, the courage and leadership from the highest office in the land which united the American people in their faith and confidence for the present and future. From the President of the United States today, there is only vacillation and indifference to the economic suffering, with soothing assurances that everything is going to be all right. There are calls for confidence and faith—but there is no leadership to rally that confidence and faith.

This attitude is epitomized in the words of former President Herbert Hoover, who chose to repeat the same old Republican chins-up philosophy on February 22, 1958, that he stated on February 22, 1931. It is a philosophy that is as deeply ingrained in the Republican administration of President Eisenhower as it was in that earlier Republican administration of President Hoover.

Today's economic problems call for aggressive leadership from the President of the United States if we as a Nation are to meet and solve them. They call for the same kind of leadership that rallied our citizens in confidence and in faith by the man to whom we pay tribute today—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Congress Receives America's Democratic Legacy Award From the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, I accepted America's Democratic Legacy Award given to the Congress by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at a dinner in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, Monday, March 3, 1958. The text of my remarks follows:

ON BEHALF OF CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER RECEIVES AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY AWARD BY THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1958

I believe all of us here tonight recognize how significant, how profoundly moving, this moment is—and without precedent. The Congress of these United States receives the America's Democratic Legacy Award of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for the passage of the first Civil Rights Act in 82 years and for the high level of debate that accompanied the passage of this act.

In recognizing Congress for these achievements, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is paying tribute actually to the Nation, for Congress mirrors the Nation and only those principles can survive to which the Nation is dedicated. Let me add, too, that Congress reflects as well the weaknesses, the fears, the doubts, the prejudices, the strength, the moral fiber, the integrity, inherent in all people everywhere.

Congress is not building chambers, committee rooms, Statuary Hall, and underground passageways. Congress is 531 men and women behind whom press 170 million people who inhabit this country. There is no one more representative group in the world than the Congress of the United States and in this great debate on civil rights the Congress revealed all that is best in America's legacy.

Congress reflected each diversity of opinion and the freedom which is inherently ours to give expression to these opinions, convictions, passions and prejudices. Let it be noted the world over that while the majority conviction rested on our fundamental principle that the United States guarantees to all its citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, equality of opportunity no one, no one, was denied the right to express his opposition to this conviction.

On the opening day of this great debate, which I profoundly hope shall serve forever as the model for Congressional decisions, I said on the floor of the House, and I believe it bears repeating:

"When there is a denial of constitutional rights to any person or to any segment of our society, it is the duty of Congress, a duty which it has shriked much too long, to provide the remedy.

"What we have before us is not a question of conscience, ethics, morality, or custom. What we have before us is a matter of rights, rights guaranteed by the Constitution, rights that have been withheld, and, as a consequence, we have done a singular dishonor to our Constitution.

"This is not to say that the acceptance of the proposals before us will be a simple matter, that the acceptance will not be painful to many in our country who have absorbed uncritically a regional way of life. The breaking of a pattern is never easy but we, the Congress of these United States, cannot permit any longer constitutional guaranties to be submerged and drowned by a pattern which has been permitted to harden and encrust the basic values of democracy.

"I personally deplore the necessity for engaging in argument which must necessarily bring pain to many Members of the House who represent a southern constituency, but if the espousal of the bill that bears my name touches the raw nerves of those so deeply and emotionally involved, I cannot retreat. It is not that I have any less affection for my colleagues from the South but rather it is I have a compelling adherence to the Constitution and to its guaranty of civil rights to all the people, regardless of race, color, or creed. To have the color of one's skin determine whether the Constitution governs him or not is a thesis for which I can have no stomach.

"I realize the sectional differences obtaining in these fair United States. We have always had dissidence to contend with from our very beginning, when we were a mere confederation of States, but we soon learned that each section cannot have its own measuring rod. That leads along an endless trail of absurdity and confusion, which tends to national ossification. We cannot have the Constitution meaning one thing to one section and another thing to another section. Our Constitution must be one thing to all men—not many things to many men. Otherwise, we belie our history."

I believe that the debates on the floor of the House and the Senate should be required reading for all. When we keep in mind how intense, how passionate, and how deep were the emotions involved in this debate, we as a Nation have reason to be proud of the discipline, the restraint, and the scholarliness which all participants—and I stress all—exercised. I have listened to debates in the Bundestag of the West German Republic, in the House of Commons of Great Britain, in the National Assembly of France, in the Senate at Rome, in the Council of the Workers at Belgrade, in the House of the People in New Delhi, India, in the Knesseth in Israel—but never have I heard a debate in those chambers that was on a higher plane—or as dignified—or as courteous—and parliamentary—as the debate on civil rights in the House. This is a great tribute to our American tradition of fair play and free speech. It is to the everlasting credit of the Anti-Defamation League that it recognized and acknowledged the magnificent quality of this kind of debate which bespeaks to the world the real meaning of the democratic tradition. And after the great debate, sectional as it was, the ranks closed and there was no sediment of bitterness left behind.

However, let us acknowledge that the Civil Rights Act is only one step forward. It leaves many, many troublesome areas untouched. Its enactment symbolized victory in only a skirmish. There is still need to shed light in some dark places. The past history in a number of States has not been a creditable one as far as civil rights were concerned and the past seems to gnaw at the future of those States. They still remain recalcitrant. The remedy applied must be continued. I know it may bring great discomfiture, if not pain, but suffering is the price that must be paid for the prevention and the cure. While we cannot change the past, we can mold the future. This we can no longer do—preserve segregation against the tide of history. We cannot any longer accept the separate but equal doctrine to be applied anywhere in these United States, as against the imperatives of the law, as against the Supreme Court decision. If we are to have liberty, it must, in the ringing voice of Leviticus, be 'liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." Liberty is one thing you can't have—unless you give it to others. It cannot be the privilege of the white man alone—it must be shared with all.

It has been said that justice is the bread of the Nation, because all hunger for it—white and colored.

Indeed, justice is denied if civil rights are trampled.

To those who disparage the Negro and at the same time boast of their nobler blood, I say send your noble blood to market and see what it will buy.

To those who boast of their forebears and their better traits, I say a man can't very well make for himself a place in the sun if he keeps continually taking refuge under the shadow of the family tree.

I am not interested so much in race, color, creed, or national origin, as I am in character. Character is what you are in the dark. Character is what you do when no one is watching. Woodrow Wilson said: "Character is a byproduct; it is produced in the great manufacture of daily duty." Rudyard Kipling said, "It is not good to be a Negro in the land of the free and the home of the brave." We must so conduct ourselves as to make repetition of that thought unthinkable.

There are before the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, 18 comprehensive bills which will carry us forward into greater realization of civil rights for all.

Let it not be thought that, having enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1957, we shall remain smugly content. This is a promise. As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I shall hold hearings on the bills pending—more particularly on the comprehensive bill I offered. I shall endeavor to have it reported favorably to the House. When that time comes, as it inevitably will, for the further enactment of the necessary laws to curb the still-rampant denial of civil rights in sections of this land, it is my fervent hope—I might even say prayer—in which all of you I know join with me, that once again in this most delicate of areas when we meet on the floor possessed by divergent and conflicting convictions, we will speak, persuade, and vote, in humble acknowledgment of America's democratic legacy of freely expressed opinion—without rancor and without recrimination, in fairness and openness, in the highest of American tradition.

Wisdom is knowing what to do next—skill in knowing how to do it and virtue in doing it. I am sure the Congress possesses that wisdom, that skill, that virtue.

On behalf of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, I accept in all humility this tribute to the Congress of the United States.

Port of Stockton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, today in Stockton, Calif., the United States Army engineers are holding hearings important to the future of the port of Stockton, fastest growing deep-water port in the west.

The engineers are seeking information about the proposed new false river route for the San Joaquin River and they are checking the need of deepening the existing channel to 35 feet.

These studies were ordered last year by the House Public Works Committee. Members of the committee, of which I am a member, were checking the port of Stockton and its channel in person last October.

I am confident the studies will show the need and the justification for these improvements.

The port has a bright future of service to California and the Nation, but today I want to discuss its past.

I would like to pay tribute to the citizens of Stockton who mortgaged their future to develop this great port.

The port celebrated its 25th anniversary last Friday and there were glowing words about its accomplishments.

Today is it easy to agree that the port is necessary and important; the port has proven itself in time of peace and war. Twenty-five years ago, it was a different story. It required vision and courage in those days to support this fledgling venture.

When the *Daisy Gray* pushed her nose through the delta fog in 1933, no one knew for sure that this first cargo carrier to dock at the port would not be the last.

Although the entire community is deserving of credit and praise, the larger measure of tribute must go to the small band of leaders who paved the way.

The commissioners who first directed the port were five—Irving Martin, Sr., Pliney E. Holt, Otto E. Sandman, Samuel Frankenheimer, and N. M. Brisbois.

Today, only Sandman and Brisbois are still living to see even their most optimistic dreams surpassed.

In the interim years, six other men served as past commissioners—Paul E. Weston, E. H. Wolf, Newton Rutherford, Martel Wilson, C. C. DeYoung, and Julius Blum.

And of these, only Weston and DeYoung are still here to see the product of their efforts.

Present commissioners: Col. H. E. Sanderson, W. L. Maxwell, John D. Turner, Sr., R. L. Eberhardt, and Norman E. McGurk.

They are carrying on the proud tradition of continued progress laid down by their predecessors.

First director of day-to-day port activity was B. C. Allin. He was succeeded by the late Henry Ohm.

For the past 10 years, the port director has been Elmo Ferrari, a sprinter in his undergraduate days at USF who has not slowed down since.

Today, ships flying the flags of every free nation realize the trade possibilities of the port of Stockton sending agriculture and maufacturing production of the West to the centers of the world and bringing in return needed cargo to our rapidly expanding western United States.

Central California's agricultural and industrial wealth has been economically served by the modern facilities at the port of Stockton. The five commissioners, serving without remuneration, represent the spirit of cooperation and interest that has built the port to its present eminent position.

We in the Nation's Capitol have seen great strides made in close cooperation between the United States Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the United States Corps of Engineers, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and the port of Stockton officials.

We anticipate renewed progress in the handling of surplus goods, storage of grain, and providing increased trade with the free nations of the world.

With this continued cooperation of all concerned, I know that the next 25 years will prove even more rewarding to the port of Stockton and the Nation.

Chemicals in Our Food—The Consumer Is Not Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1906 the Food and Drugs Act was passed by the Congress to safeguard the consumer. Despite several amendments to the law since then, overwhelming evidence indicates that full protection still does not exist. With the increase in the use of chemicals in all phases of food production it is entirely possible that the consumer today enjoys less protection than 50 years ago.

I submit that Congress has been remiss in fulfilling its obligations in this area. I am convinced that most consumers eat their food with complete confidence, assuming the Government has provided for the necessary protection. The days are long gone when the individual consumer was qualified or in a position to assess the purity of the food he consumed. With the present complex and farflung system of food production and distribution the Government must assume the responsibility of assuring the safety and purity of the food which goes to the Nation's dinner tables. New laws are required for the Government to discharge this vital task.

Two articles in the January and February issues of Consumer Reports tell the story. The 1938 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act did not solve the problem. I am sure that we are all shocked to know that of the 700 or so chemicals now used in our daily food, more than 150 have not been adequately tested for safety. The problem lies in the fact that the law forbids only the addition to food of a chemical known to be poisonous or harmful, but it does nothing to prohibit the addition of chemicals whose safety is unknown. The urgent need is for legislation requiring pretesting of chemicals before they are introduced into the food supply. Cancer experts have repeatedly emphasized that the absence of incriminating evidence is not a guarantee that a suspected chemical is safe. The danger is in the insidious, long-time toxic and cancer-inciting effect of small, daily amounts of food chemicals consumed over years.

I will not here go into this in any greater detail. I assure you that many of the details are quite alarming.

There is a bill before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will provide the needed protection. I refer to the bill introduced by our good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DELANEY, of New York.

Congressman DELANEY has performed an outstanding service in making the public and the Congress aware of this problem. As chairman of the House Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics, 1950–52, Mr. DELANEY became the leading expert in Congress on this subject. He has introduced his bill in every Congress since the 83d. It is a good bill and I urge the committee to give the House an opportunity to vote on the Delaney bill and provide the necessary protection for the consumers of the country.

Coosa-Alabama River Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include for the RECORD the fourth in a series of articles which I have prepared on the great Coosa-Alabama River system in Alabama:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER STORY

PART IV: BOOST FOR THE COOSA

(By KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Member of Congress)

Congressional action of a summer day in 1954 assured activity which can turn the Coosa-Alabama River Basin into a second Ruhr Valley.

The historic event evoked comment from the Secretary of the Interior and from the President. In Alabama, it caused sheer jubilation.

Here is the background for the event:

In 1941, the United States Corps of Engineers, which had been studying the Coosa-Alabama for a number of years, submitted a report calling for comprehensive development of the basin's water resources in accordance with plans of the Chief of Engineers.

Congress approved the program in the River and Harbor Act of 1945, thus authorizing development of the river system for navigation, flood control, power, and other purposes. The work would be done by the Federal Government.

Then, Alabama Power Co.—which had built three dams on the Coosa and had long shown interest in the river's growth—reentered the picture. Now, the company said, it was ready to further develop the power potentialities of the river.

The company proposed to build a series of new dams, if the Federal Government would relinquish its plans to do something similar. Federal officials agreed.

In June of 1954, the 83d Congress cleared the way. It suspended operation of the Rivers and Harbors Act so Alabama Power,

and not the Federal Government, could build the dams.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay hailed the action as an endorsement of the partnership principle. President Eisenhower, in his 1955 state of the Union speech, called the Coosa River development an example of Federal Government working with private industry to coordinate developments.

Alabama newspapers, Congressmen, and civic leaders were unanimously joyous. Not only would the river system be improved as early as practical, but the work would be done by an Alabama concern.

Alabama Power applied for license to build four new dams—near Centre, in Cherokee County; near Ohatchee, Calhoun County; at Howell Mills Shoals, south of Pell City; and near Wetumpka—and to rebuild and heighten the Lay Dam north of Clanton.

Last fall, Federal Power Commission gave final approval to the multi-million dollar project and Alabama Power said it will begin work shortly on the Weiss Dam near Centre.

Next: Navigation the Goal.

Imports Ruining Industry in Northern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the people of northern Wisconsin and other areas of our Nation which have untapped natural resources take a look at the Washington scene to see what is happening. The present trend of encouraging imports is raising havoc and discouraging the development of natural resources in our area and in other areas similar to ours on the national scene.

For the past 20 years, our national leaders have been encouraging and financing with American money, resources in other parts of the world, which are directly competitive to our own natural resources. If this policy continues for the next 10 years, as it has the past 20 years, areas like northern Wisconsin will become ghost areas with their natural resources untapped.

At the present time we have several thousand miners in our area who are out of work. In spite of that fact, imports of iron ore are growing by leaps and bounds. The following table of imports since 1952 will clearly show why iron-ore mining in our area is in a terrible slump:

United States imports of iron ore

Year:	*Long tons*
1952	9,760,325
1953	11,084,185
1954	15,768,771
1955	23,443,220
1956	30,412,018
1957	34,000,000

It is interesting to note that the importation of iron ore into our Nation is duty free in every respect, with no protection to the American industry or the American worker. To give a clearer view of the picture, in 1952 foreign imports amounted to only 10 percent of our iron ore consumption. In 1956 our imports amounted to 21 percent of our national consumption. In 1957 our imports amounted to 24 percent of our national consumption. With this trend, it is estimated that foreign imports of iron ore, by the end of this year, will amount to 33 percent or one-third of our national consumption.

The rapid rise of imports has been mainly at the expense of Lake Superior ores from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. This mining region, long the raw material backbone of the steel industry, now supplies about 60 percent of United States needs, compared with 75 percent 5 years ago and about 85 percent 10 years ago.

What is more tragic is the fact that in Venezuela, for instance, iron ore production is financed by American capital and the Federal Government gives tremendous tax advantages to these foreign investments which American producers cannot possibly compete with.

It is high time that the people of our area scrutinized very closely what our international do-gooders are doing to our area. For the past 15 years since I have been in Congress I have been trying to awaken the people of our area to these dangers that lie ahead; but unfortunately, there has been little response.

What has, and is, happening to the iron-ore industry is likewise happening to our wood-products industry in our area.

In April 1957, 30 percent of the working people were laid off in our plywood industries because of the cheap imports of plywood from Japan. At the present time, more than 60 percent of the workers in the plywood industry in America are without jobs because of the cheap importation of plywood from Japan.

When you consider that in such areas as Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota, the plywood and veneer industry is the very lifeblood of their economic existence, this problem of imported hardwood plywood and veneer should give us all, including the Congress and other agencies of Government, cause for concern.

Communities such as Algoma, Antigo, Ashland, Butternut, Birnamwood, Crandon, Gillette, Marshfield, Mattoon, Mellen, New London, Oconto, Oshkosh, Shawano, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, Two Rivers, Rhinelander, Wausau, and so forth, all in Wisconsin, and Newberry, Munising, Marquette, Gladstone, Grayling, just mentioning a few in Michigan and numerous others in Minnesota and other areas of the Nation, all of which depend to a large degree, if not entirely, upon the plywood and veneer industry for their economic life and well being.

Many other related industries such as logging, hardboard, lumber, and so forth, also are affected indirectly by this cheap imported hardwood plywood problem.

When you consider that the American plywood and veneer worker competes each hour with a Japanese worker being paid only 11½ cents per hour, it is reasonable to say that the workers in both countries suffer hardship.

When you consider the American plywood and veneer industry competes with imported plywood from Japan that is sold duty-free for less than the cost of production in the United States, is it any wonder that plant after plant in this area is being shut down with thousands of skilled workers being thrown on the scrap heap, and numerous communities becoming ghost towns.

Examples: Japan's exports to the United States in the January–June, 1957 period totaled a 57-percent increase over the same period in 1956. Imports from Japan of hardwood plywood has increased 4,120 percent since 1951. These imports have eaten up 46.6 percent of the total American market in 1956 alone.

Consumption of hardwood plywood in the United States is up 74 percent since 1951. Low priced imports captured 99.4 percent of this 74 percent increase in consumption.

Japanese plywood industry has increased their production 400 percent since 1951, mostly with the help of American capital—American plywood industry has increased their production in the same period by only six-tenths percent since 1951.

Japanese labor cost per 1,000 square feet of plywood is $4.17 as compared to from $30 to $34 per 1,000 square feet in the United States.

These are but two examples of what is happening to the areas of northern Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and northern Minnesota. For 15 years I have tried vainly to warn the people of our area of these consequences of our foreign policy. Unfortunately, it was not until workers actually got laid off that they are now beginning to stop, look, and listen, and are beginning to pay some attention to the sad results of trying to take care of the rest of the world at the expense of American resources and the American worker.

I have introduced bills to impose a tariff on imports of iron ore and wood products. But with the leaders of both parties plugging for more imports instead of less, such bills receive little consideration. Only the rude awakening of our citizens back home will reverse this trend.

The Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the entire Nation has been focused currently on the important regulatory agencies of the Federal Government. Such attention is in itself valuable insofar as it awakens the American people to the vital role which these agencies play in our governing process. The current investigation and publicity centered on the agencies will be of much greater valued, however, if permanent corrective measures are taken to make the regulatory agencies better able to do their work in the public interest.

Our able colleague from Arizona, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, has stated the basic problem of the agencies so clearly in his newsletter of March 6, that I have asked for permission to include his statement in the RECORD as follows:

REGULATORY AGENCIES: COURTS OR FORUMS OF "INFLUENCE"?

If the current investigation of the important Federal regulatory boards and commissions serves only to attract wide public attention to the vast power held by these agencies a worthwhile purpose will have been served.

And if it results in adoption of new procedures which preclude the use of influence by either high administration figures, Members of Congress, or the industries which are supposed to be regulated we might be well on the way toward correcting a situation in which abuses are practically inevitable.

Millions of dollars hang on many of the decisions of such regulatory bodies as the Federal Communications Commission (which has authority over licensing of television stations), the Civil Aeronautics Board (which decides matters affecting airlines) and the Federal Power Commission which, for example, will decide who—if anyone—will build Bridge Canyon Dam in northern Arizona.

These agencies, which have the power of life and death over the industries they regulate, exercise enormous powers. One historian has suggested that, in terms of decisions which count most in the day-to-day life of Americans, these exert more power than either Congress, the President, or the Supreme Court.

Yet, though they are quasi-judicial bodies, in many ways they are not run like courts. Whoever heard, for example, of the judge in an Arizona Superior Court being loaned money by one of the parties in a major civil suit being tried before him? Or, for that matter, of being wined and dined at the expense of a litigant in an undecided matter?

Pursuing it further, whoever heard of a legislator interceding with a judge on a case involving a vital public policy?

And yet, not only are the Federal agencies operated in such a way as to encourage these questionable activities, but constituents frequently call on Members of Congress to intervene for them simply because that is the way things are done under present laws and practices.

The Service to Phoenix case last year provides a good example. The question before the CAB was which airline or airlines would best provide the service needed by Phoenix—and the rest of the State. In keeping with the practice of the CAB I appeared, along with other members of the Arizona delegation, to urge that the best possible service be granted.

However, 13 Senators and half a dozen Representatives from other States—some from as far away as Minnesota and Nebraska—dropped their work and went before the CAB to plead, not the need for better service to Arizona, but for consideration to airlines predominant in their areas which sought the profitable Arizona business. If Phoenix today still lacks adequate service, this intervention may partly explain that fact.

While rules of the CAB permit such Congressional appearances, as far as I am concerned these cases should be considered solely on the merits, and even Congressmen from the States affected should not participate in the hearings.

The right to an impartial hearing is deeply imbedded in the thinking of our people, and the decisions arrived at by unjudicial methods are suspect even when they are just.

Under our system of justice there are no friends at court, only advocates of law and fact in open court. And understandably those who hold court after hours, or in the market place, should not expect that the decisions they hand down from the bench will stand upright in the public eye.

I believe all of these regulatory agencies have the power to adopt rules and customs which will eliminate the influence factor when decisions are made. I once heard a wise Arizona judge put it this way: "If you want your court to have respect and dignity, you must always maintain a judicial demeanor and conduct your proceedings like a court."

It is my sincere belief that if these agencies adopted rules which completely stopped intervention in matters before them except for requests to expedite action or for status reports, thus creating a true judicial atmosphere, most Members of Congress would applaud to the echo.

Today our citizens have a right to expect that even quasi-judicial public bodies will adhere to the best judicial practices. Nothing less will win and keep public esteem.

Legislation Introduced To Exempt Wheat-growers from Overseeding Penalty for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call attention to legislation introduced on March 3, 1958, by myself and the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, Mr. CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma.

The measure is designed to accomplish one basic purpose; that is, to exempt for 1958 from the base-acreage-loss penalty, enacted last year, the wheat producer who planted in 1957 for harvest in 1958.

The bill, H. R. 11089, represents the technically refined version of H. R. 9814, which I introduced on January 8, 1958, for the same legislative purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it was not until October 3, 1957, that the Kansas State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) Committee, and many other wheat-State committees, received information from the United States Department of Agriculture which spelled out specifically the operation of Public Law 85–203, the so-called feed-wheat law, as it applied to excess-wheat farms, particularly the penalties involved.

I have been a wheat farmer all my life, Mr. Speaker, and for 30 years in the Fifth District of the State of Kansas, the district which I have the privilege of representing. And I know that winter wheat operators in my area begin planting as early as August 15. Under the law governing the production of wheat, as revised in 1957, there simply was not sufficient time for the farmer to be on notice that he could be punished for overseeding through the loss of some of his base acreage.

To correct this retroactive inequity, my bill, H. R. 11089, and Mr. ALBERT'S bill, H. R. 11086, identical measures, would free for 1 year, 1958, from base-acreage-loss penalties the 1957 winter-wheat planter who planted without knowledge of the overseeding penalty. For the year 1959 and all subsequent years, wheat-growers will be subject to the full slate of penalties for noncompliance with the wheat laws, including the acreage-loss penalty, designed to discourage wheat production in excess of allotment.

The text of the measure follows:

H. R. 11089

A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history

Be it enacted, etc., That section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end thereof two new sentences reading as follows: "For the purpose of establishing farm acreage allotments (i) the past acreage of wheat on any farm for 1958 shall be the base acreage determined for the farm under the regulations issued by the Secretary for determining 1958 farm wheat acreage allotments; (ii) if subsequent to the determination of such base acreage the 1958 wheat acreage allotment for the farm is increased through administrative review, or court proceedings, the 1958 farm base acreage shall be increased in the same proportion; and (iii) the past acreage of wheat for 1959 and subsequent years shall be the wheat acreage on the farm which is not in excess of the farm wheat acreage allotment, plus, in the case of any farm which is in compliance with its farm wheat acreage allotment, the acreage diverted from the production of wheat: *Provided,* That for 1959 and subsequent years in the case of any farm on which the entire amount of the farm marketing excess is delivered to the Secretary or stored in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, the past acreage of wheat for the year in which such farm marketing excess is so delivered or stored shall be the farm base acreage of wheat determined for the farm under the regulations issued by the Secretary for determining farm wheat acreage allotments for such year, but if any part of the amount of wheat so stored is later depleted and penalty becomes due by reason of such depletion, for the purpose of establishing farm wheat acreage allotments subsequent to such depletion the past acreage of wheat for the farm for the year in which the excess was produced shall be reduced to the farm wheat acreage allotment for such year."; and

(2) by striking out in subsection (h) the language "future State, county, and farm acreage allotments" and inserting in lieu thereof "future State and county acreage allotments."

As evidence of the gross injustice and widespread protest caused by the retroactive application of the base-acreage-loss penalty, Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD, an article entitled "Southwest Kansas Farmers Protest Overseeding Penalty," which appeared in the Hutchinson (Kans.) News on February 13, 1958:

SOUTHWEST KANSAS FARMERS PROTEST OVERSEEDING PENALTY

(By Don Kendall)

On September 26, 1957, most of Southwest Kansas land not laden with ripening milo was the womb for embryo wheat.

The 1958 crop, which at the present time promises to be a big one, was almost completely seeded.

In past years it had been a practice on the part of many farmers, particularly those on the high plains, to overseed their allotments in good years.

WEATHER FICKLE

The reason was obvious. Weather in fickle Kansas can't be relied upon, so the farmer overproduces in good years and hopes for the best in lean.

Since 1938, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was revamped, overseeding has tended to increase county and State crop histories.

This, in turn, has resulted in some bigger allotments for farms, counties, and the State.

On September 26 the Department of Agriculture announced by letters to State agricultural stabilization and conservation offices the following:

"The county and State will receive only the allotted acres on excess farms and no credit will be given for acres planted in excess of the farm allotments."

In fact, the letter stated, this policy would tend to reduce farm wheat allotments because of overseeding.

Four years' production are included in computing base acreages for wheat farms. For 1958, for example, years 1953 through 1956 are used.

Beginning with the 1960 crop, as you can see, the 1958 acreage would be included by ASC offices in computing that year's allotments.

If a farm had been overseeded for the 1958 wheat crop, that farm would receive only its allotment as crop history.

The effect would be eventually to reduce base acreages. For example: A farm with a base of 100 acres would have an allotment of about 66 acres of wheat.

If that farmer overseeds his 1958 crop, only 66 acres would be entered for that year's history.

If this is pursued each year by a farmer—overplanting his allotment in 1959, and so on—it would be possible to have a radically reduced allotment by 1963.

ASC offices throughout the State have received form letters from the State to send to wheat producers.

This letter states that producers having overseeded allotments will receive notice to tear up extra acres by a certain date.

The farmer who has stayed within his allotment for 1958 will receive full credit on his farm's crop history.

PROPOSAL MADE

There has been a proposal made in Congress which would suspend this acreage penalty on farmers who overseed.

The proposal was made in bills offered by Representative J. FLOYD BREEDING, Fifth District, and Representatives HILL and CHENOWETH of Colorado.

It has been opposed on several sides by Congressmen who say it might serve to favor a few farmers at the expense of those who complied.

The fallacy in the objections, as far as southwest Kansas is concerned, is that farmers who seeded within their allotments last fall are in the minority in parts of the area.

MOST OVERSEED

Stanton County, for example, had about 145,000 acres seeded in and around its allotment of 128,000 acres.

The policy statement of the Department of Agriculture sifted through channels and landed in the State ASC office about October 1.

Four days later the State office issued the statement to county offices.

Through a maze of interpretations by county office managers, farmers and newspapermen, the policy by which over-seeded wheat would penalize allotments was publicized.

But by that time all wheat for 1958 had been planted.

The Department of Agriculture said, "We have been receiving many reports indicating that the farmer who overplants would lose his allotment in the future and other misstatements of facts.

DISCUSSION LIMITED

"We would prefer that in discussing this matter with producers, you (ASC offices) could confine your discussion to the provisions of the law."

This policy led to the bumbling method in which the new regulation was handed out to the public.

The provisions of the law may have been clear to the lawyers who wrote them in Washington and may have been lucid to State officials.

But in many instances it was not clear on the county level and to the farmers.

The ASC recognized this on January 24 and issued the form letter to be issued by county offices to wheat producers.

Excuses that the policy came after wheat seeding apparently weren't valid.

"Those producers who are protesting," the Department of Agriculture said, "can dispose of their excess acreage by the disposal date, if they desire to be in compliance and receive diversion credit."

Arab Boycott of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which I addressed to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, on February 28, 1958, on the subject of the Arab boycott of Americans. The text of the letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1958.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Again, I convey to you the protests of a great many citizens in this country against the Arab boycott of American citizens and commercial firms who travel in or do business with Israel. This action on the part of the Arab nations is tantamount to international intimidation and blackmail.

I believe it is incumbent upon the United States, in pursuance of an American foreign policy, to oppose as strongly as possible this Arab boycott. It has already earned the disapproval of the United States Senate in a resolution adopted in July 1956. It is asked that the policy of the United States be no different from that of West Germany which refused to yield to Arab threats to cease business with Israel and no different from the policy of France and Switzerland in the sense that both have resisted the boycott by instructing their representative nationals not to respond to questionnaires circulated by the Arab League, inquiring whether certain companies employ or are controlled by Jews.

Thus far our Government has taken no public stand against this Arab bludgeoning. Indeed, it seems that the silence of our Government lends encouragement to this boycott based on bigotry. Under your guidance, an agreement with Saudi Arabia was renewed whereby United States consents to screen American military, diplomatic and civilian personnel so that no Jews are assigned to the United States airfield at Dhahran.

This is tantamount to saying that American Jews are not equally protected in their citizenship. American vessels that stop at Israeli ports are denied the right to make calls at Arab ports. Ships of American registry have been blacklisted by countries of the Arab League because they sail to Israel. American planes that land in Israel cannot fly over Arab countries. American aircraft is denied flight information or any rescue service from Arab States. Beyond that, Arab diplomats accredited to the United States are directing this boycott on our own territory.

This Arab boycott has interfered with the International Wheat Agreement. The Arab League states refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or buy wheat from exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. You have thus far failed to take the necessary diplomatic action to the end that this discrimination might be discontinued. In a sense then, we as a nation, are forced to submit to the operation of a boycott, the effect of which is to tax Americans for wheat subsidy although a segment of the American public is barred from any participation.

The dignity of our Nation demands that representations be made to the guilty nations that the United States views with grave concern these outrageous acts.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Nebraska's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, March is the birthday month of the great State of Nebraska. It was on March 1, 1867, 91 years ago, that the proclamation making the Territory of Nebraska one of the United States of America was signed by President Andrew Johnson. Nebraska thus became the 37th State in the Union.

It has been my practice for the past several years to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of facts concerning Nebraska, her past and her future.

In the long span of time the written history of Nebraska goes back for only a comparatively short period. According to the Nebraska Blue Book, the earliest records show that huge fossil beds and glacial deposits give proof that in past geologic ages this region was the bottom of an inland sea which was later elevated above the water.

At one time, a tropical climate prevailed and during a later period glaciers covered the land. Archeological explorations have uncovered considerable evidence indicating the presence of prehistoric man in the State.

It has been estimated about 40,000 Indians lived in Nebraska at the time of the earliest white visitors. Their settlements in the State must have covered a period of several hundred years. It has often been presumed the Spaniards were the first white people to come to Nebraska. That would be about the year 1541. In that far gone day, the Indians dominated the area and bison roamed the prairies by the thousands.

In later years, about 1700, French trappers began to venture up the rivers. By 1739 nearly the entire length of the State had been traveled. In those days Nebraska was an uncharted wilderness. At one time or another the region was claimed by Spain, France, and England. Eventually France established claim to the area and sold it to the United States in 1803. Following the Lewis and Clark expedition in the years 1804–6 came the story of the pioneers who carved a great State out of the prairie wilderness.

The first military post was established at Fort Atkinson on the present site of the village of Fort Calhoun, just a few miles north of Omaha. Then came the first pioneer settlement by the white man in this particular territory. By the year 1832 covered wagons had started to cross the State. The Oregon Trail, which for the next 40 years was the greatest wagon road in the world's history, was established. Other great trails across Nebraska included the Mormon Trail, the Denver Trail and the Nebraska City Cutoff. Thousands of covered wagons carrying pioneers westward traveled over these trails each year until the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad made their operation no longer feasible.

Rugged frontier conditions were evidenced in Nebraska during those years when the pioneers carved their homes out of prairie sod. The pioneers faced the heat of summer and cold of winter, the marauding Indians, the droughts and prairie fires with indomitable will. Their bright vision of a new land they could call home was entirely justified.

TERRITORIAL HISTORY

The history books tell us the Nebraska region was made part of the Territory of Indiana in 1804. The following year it was made a part of the Territory of Louisiana. After 1812 it became part of the Territory of Missouri, and in 1821 it became a part of an unorganized region usually called Indian country.

Nebraska was first organized as a Territory in 1854. It included all the present State plus part of North and South Dakota and most of Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado.

STATEHOOD IN 1867

Nebraska had a long, hard fight in the effort to become a State. There was a sharp division of opinion between residents of free and slave territories and as a result many delays were encountered. In fact, many residents of the Territory were opposed to the idea of statehood. The Congress passed an enabling act April 19, 1864, and an election was held on June 2, 1866, on the statehood issue. The tabulation showed 3,938 Nebraskans in favor of statehood and 3,838 against—a margin of only 100 votes. Statehood came finally March 1, 1867.

The Nebraska picture was rapidly changing. In 1865 the Union Pacific started to build a railroad across the State. This revolutionized transportation in the area.

The passing years found more settlements starting in all parts of the State. New railroads were built. The new homestead law brought in people from many of the States to the east. They came in a wide variety of nationalities but these individuals blended into the communities and Nebraska was on its way.

IRRIGATION

In the western part of the State, men of vision watched much-needed water flow down the rivers to be wasted in the sea. They organized irrigation projects in the North Platte Valley. Crops blossomed as they never had before. Irrigation spread to other parts of the State and it is still spreading.

Right now I am seeking approval of funds for other irrigation projects. Ainsworth and Farwell have been authorized but no funds appropriated to start. Mid-State is in the planning stage. They will pay back their costs to the Government. They are an investment in the future of America. In the years ahead we must conserve every possible drop of water. Additional flood-control projects are also needed.

New industries came into Nebraska. The raising of livestock grew by leaps and bounds and Nebraska ranchers now send thousands of head of cattle, hogs, and sheep to the market. Nebraska boasts of having the finest steaks in the world.

Nebraska still seeks new industries. Towns and cities have committees working throughout the year in an effort to bring in such industries.

The State government has a Division of Nebraska Resources which has done much good work in attracting industry to our State.

With the passing of years we see the need for many changes. This has become the air age and right now Nebraska is seeking to improve its airline facilities to provide new service to many parts of the State.

THE STATE FLAG

The State flag, designated by the legislature, consists of a reproduction of the great seal of the State, charged on the center in gold and silver on a field of national blue.

The design for Nebraska's seal was prescribed by the State's first legislature in 1867. The smith in the foreground typifies the mechanical arts. Agriculture is represented by shocks of grain, the growing corn and the settler's cabin. The steamboat on the Missouri River and the train represent the State's appreciation for transportation which hurried its settlement. The State seal under the signature of the Governor and the secretary of state must be affixed to all official State documents.

The State bird is the western meadowlark.

The State flower is the goldenrod.

The State tree is the American elm.

THE UNICAMERAL SYSTEM

Since 1937, Nebraska has had the only one-house, or unicameral, legislature in the Nation. This system was adopted by constitutional amendment and has proved signally successful. The unicameral is made up of 43 members elected on a nonpartisan ballot for 2-year terms. Regular sessions are held in odd-numbered years. The Lieutenant Governor of the State serves as presiding officer. The speaker is elected from the membership.

NEBRASKA'S CAPITOL

Nebraska, commonly called the Cornhusker State, has had 5 capitols—two Territorial capitols in Omaha and three State capitols in Lincoln. The present State capitol in Lincoln is considered one of the most beautiful government buildings in the world. Built on a pay-as-you-go basis, the capitol cost over $10 million. It was free of debt upon completion in 1932.

The length and breadth of the building, which takes the form of a cross within a square is 437 feet. The 400-foot central tower is crowned by a 32-foot statue of The Sower, symbolic of the State's agriculture.

Each of the building's four corners represents a cornerstone of the law. There are 18 panels in the outer court, depicting the history of the law starting with Moses and the Ten Commandments and ending with the admission of Nebraska to the Union. The series is broken on the south facade by panels representing the Magna Carta, flanked by the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the framing of the Constitution.

Eight great figures, symbolizing the ideals of culture which are protected by the law, make up the lower buttresses of the tower. They are an Egyptian Scribe for History, a Prophet of Israel for Vision, a Greek Philosopher for Reason, an Emperor for Statecraft, an Apostle for Faith, a Saintly King for Chivalry, Sir Isaac Newton for the Science of Nature, and Abraham Lincoln for the Liberties of Peoples.

FACTS ABOUT NEBRASKA

Nebraska has a total area of over 77,000 square miles. The largest county, Cherry, is as large as the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined.

Nebraska's population on July 1, 1957, was estimated at 1,426,000.

Nebraska's altitude ranges from 835 feet in the southeast to 5,340 in the northwest.

Nebraska has 22 million acres under cultivation, a larger percentage of land in farms than any other State. We have substantial irrigated acreage and over 21,000 irrigation wells.

Nebraska has approximately 1,400 industrial plants employing about 60,000 people. New plants are being added every year. Omaha, the largest city in the State, is the world's largest livestock market.

Nebraska has 17 four-year colleges and universities and 5 junior colleges.

Nebraska has the highest life expectancy rate of any State in the Union.

We have in Nebraska a people of courage, ambition, and common sense who seek to be good Nebraskans and good Americans. They will help to keep our Nation great.

"Equality before the law," "honesty before men," and "reverence before God," are the precepts upon which Nebraska built and is building. These are the precepts which will keep Nebraska great and enduring through the years to come.